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UE PROPOSES IMMEDIATE LABOR BOARD ELECTION

The following statement was issued Tuesday evening, January 3, by Leo J. Jamrach, with the unanimous approval of the 301 executive board:

"UE Local 301 urges that a consent election be held immediately by the Taft-Hartley Board in the Schenectady plant of GE. We propose this because the GE is taking advantage of the decision in the Carey "initiation" case to disregard the contract and block the settlement of grievances, as well as to encourage the Carey company union agents. While there is no excuse for this attitude on GE's part under the contract, we feel that a speedy election will effectively prevent any further use of the representation issue to confuse the issue here. We have no doubt of the outcome of such an election. In view of the facts set forth by the "initiation" case here, there can be no excuse for their refusing to consent. The details should be easy to arrange. We are notifying the Taft-Hartley Board, the company, and the UE Calls for Prompt National Vote in 3 Biggest Companies

The national UE, at a Taft-Hartley Board hearing in Pittsburgh Tuesday also issued a challenge to the board, to the "initiation" case and GE, Westinghouse, and General Electric's Electrical Division, to hold a speedy consent election in this same day in all plants of the three corporations.

The UE statement declared:

"General Electric, Westinghouse and other large companies are attempting to split off sections of the UE membership into company unions... the companies are eager to take advantage of growing national unemployment to go to court. When they could and with their employees cut back, layoffs or fire or other action at will without regard to seniority. We propose that the corporations have made a deal with the officials of OIT to provide them with a company union in the electrical industry.

"OIT, Westinghouse and other companies have filed election petitions with the Taft-Hartley Board to make it unnecessary for the 301 union to hold a consent election in the electrical industry. They have held secret meetings against us.

"The Taft-Hartley Board and its Counsel, Robert Denham, have joined in the conspiracy of companies and businessmen to split union membership in the industry. They have held secret meetings against us.

"The companies are using this situation to violate binding, valid, legal collective bargaining contracts... the companies do this knowing that they will not be held to account by their own, the Taft-Hartley Board.

"The UE statement pointed out that more than a month ago the UE proposed consent elections to be held Nov. 1 and Dec. 20, and that the Taft-Hartley Board and "initiation" case had refused to meet for that purpose. UE then issued its challenge to hold an election as quickly as it can be arranged. The statement continues:

"We Issue this challenge to the companies, the company union "UE," and the Taft-Hartley Board to give the membership of UE the opportunity through their votes to smash the conspiracy against them."
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T-Hartley Can Be Repealed Now

In the recent sessions of the first Congress there were several measures that were of interest to the labor movement. Two of these measures were the Tennessee Valley Authority Act and the Taft-Hartley Act. Both of these measures were enacted in 1935 and have been the subject of controversy ever since. The Tennessee Valley Authority Act was designed to provide a means of developing the Tennessee Valley for the benefit of the residents of the region. The Taft-Hartley Act, on the other hand, was designed to regulate the activities of labor unions and to protect the rights of workers.

The most recent controversy surrounding the Tennessee Valley Authority Act has been the issue of whether or not the act should be repealed. The act was originally introduced in 1933 and was passed by Congress in 1934. The act was designed to provide a means of developing the Tennessee Valley for the benefit of the residents of the region. The act was signed into law by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on May 28, 1935.

The Taft-Hartley Act was designed to regulate the activities of labor unions and to protect the rights of workers. The act was signed into law by President Herbert Hoover on June 23, 1947. The act was designed to curtail the power of labor unions and to protect the rights of workers.

The most recent controversy surrounding the Taft-Hartley Act has been the issue of whether or not the act should be repealed. The act was originally introduced in 1945 and was passed by Congress in 1947. The act was designed to curtail the power of labor unions and to protect the rights of workers.

The most recent controversy surrounding the Tennessee Valley Authority Act has been the issue of whether or not the act should be repealed. The act was originally introduced in 1933 and was passed by Congress in 1934. The act was designed to provide a means of developing the Tennessee Valley for the benefit of the residents of the region. The act was signed into law by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on May 28, 1935.
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Introducing the New Trustees of Local 301

Elmo A. Wallen
Joseph G. Walton
Fred Thomas
Frank F. McAvoy

Stewards Elect Board Members Next Week

Newly elected stewards were to be seated Monday in 10-day session announcing the election of a new Board of Stewards.

301 Demands T-H Board Call an Immediate Election

301 Demands T-H Board Call an Immediate Election

EXTRA

“Imitation UE” Runs Out on NLRB Vote Offer

In open court before Supreme Court Justice John A. Johnson yesterday, the “Imitation UE” turned tail and ran out on its high-flying offer to have a Labor Board election determine who would represent the Schenectady GE workers.

The Carey boys’ local attorneys, Buzin and Scarpa, had stated in a formal brief given Judge Alexander, in the case involving union funds that they wanted “a speedy election” to settle the issue, and that they offered “through this court to request the NLRB to hold a consent election of the employees at the GE Plant, Schenectady, N.Y., within twenty days.”

Attorneys for all sides, including OE, were invited to court by Judge Alexander, after Local 301 had publicly urged a consent election immediately.

Leopold and Marshall Perlin, attorneys for OE, came into court with a short written agreement to a consent election to be held within 10 days. Novak signed it in front of the judge.

Dante Scaris, one of the “Imitation UE” attorneys, refused to sign the agreement. He said he would sign only if Local 301 would agree that if his client won the election in Schenectady, the Carey boys would take over the entire contract all over the country.

The demand was so ridiculous that it was obvious to all in the courtroom that it was a suddenly-invented excuse to avoid an election. Novak pointed out that obviously an election in Schenectady could not decide the contract in OE plants. Also, that the law would determine what would happen to the contract.

Judge Alexander asked Scaris why he did not agree to hold an election now and clear up some of the important issues at hand, and consider national problems afterward.

Scaris, badly flustered, just refused to sign.

Novak pointed out to the court that it was now clear that the Carey group was lukewarm in its statements, and that theirbrief offered no consideration.

In arguing for the consent election, Novak pointed out that OE had agreed, by its petition to the NLRB, to an election in any one plant alone. OE was represented in court by a lawyer, but he said nothing.

At one point, Scaris tried to wriggle out of this by saying there was a pending NLRB decision on an election on a national basis. Obviously referred to in the conference concluded by the NLRB today as the result of UPE’s challenge to the NLRB to hold an election the same day in the three major unions under UE contract. So far for the “Imitation UE” has opposed that proposal. No. If an election were held, it would not prevent a local consent election right now.

The truth is that OE has asked the Carey boys to put up or shut up. The claim of the “Imitation UE” company union to represent GE workers has been thoroughly exploded.