GE Deliberately Violating Our Contract With Sorensen's Policy Of 'Bullish Boulwareism'!

Deliberately and with full knowledge of the union, the General Electric Company is violating our contract and our Local 301 Supplement on overtime rights. GE is violating our rights by having on a March 3rd "ceiling" data for women workers.

According to the contract, GE was not to violate our contract.

Local 301's Vice President in the phone call to the company.

Sorensen, President of the union, has already written a letter to George T. Kirby, President of GE, stating this policy is void.

The Joint Committee is finding this policy. They have been notified that this policy is void.

The company has the right to a fair dealing policy, which is unfair to all union members.

Sorensen has already written a letter to Kirby stating this policy is void.

Local 301, in addition to the union, has already written a letter to Kirby stating this policy is void.

The company has already been informed of this policy, and the Joint Committee is finding this policy void.

IEU-CIO 301

On the Job

Local 301

The official organ of Local 301 of the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO.

GE's Program Is A Double-Edged Axe!

GE started its union's program of wage cuts and speed-up in Schenectady.

The company has quickly expanded this program to GE plants in the first half of the year to double profits without adding a single employee.

But in this, it is Schenectady. One union Local Union is in every shop across the country.

The union has already written a letter to Kirby stating this policy is void.

The company has already been informed of this policy, and the Joint Committee is finding this policy void.

What Is General Electric's Real Attitude Towards Unions?

By P. J. O'Shea

In order to understand General Electric's attitude towards unions, it is necessary to understand the history of their relations with them. GE has a tradition of antipathy towards any organization that opposes them, and this has been reflected in their actions towards unions.

In the past, GE has consistently refused to recognize unions as legitimate representatives of their employees. They have engaged in a number of tactics to undermine the unions, such as breaking up meetings, intimidating members, and refusing to negotiate.

Moreover, GE has often refused to bargain in good faith with the unions, leading to a number of bitter strikes. This has not only caused significant hardship for the workers, but has also damaged the company's reputation.

In recent years, GE has made some efforts to improve its relations with the unions, but these have been largely superficial. They have continued to resist recognizing the union as a legitimate representative of their employees, and have often refused to negotiate in good faith.

In conclusion, it is clear that General Electric has a long history of antipathy towards unions, and has engaged in a variety of tactics to undermine them. While they may make lip-service to recognizing the unions, their actions continue to reflect their underlying hostility towards any organization that opposes them.
GE’s Real Attitude Toward Unions!

One of the chief means for delays in court proceedings is a claim for Workers’ Compensation benefit in dispute or conflict between doctors and medical questions. Where doctors are involved in disagreement, the question becomes even more complex when the company refuses to pay the medical bills. In such cases, the company has a strong argument that it has jurisdiction over the worker because the worker is injured on the job. In such situations, the company relies on the fact that the union does not have jurisdiction over the worker because the worker is injured off the job.

It was a similar point of view that led to the recent court case in which the company refused to pay the medical bills for a worker who was injured on the job. The company argued that the worker was not entitled to workers’ compensation because the injury occurred off the job. The union, however, argued that the worker was entitled to workers’ compensation because the injury occurred while the worker was engaged in the course of his employment.
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