

In the Matter of SOUTHERN CENTRAL COMPANY, EMPLOYER and MEMPHIS PRINTING PRESSMEN'S UNION No. 18, INTERNATIONAL PRINTING PRESSMEN AND ASSISTANTS UNION OF NORTH AMERICA, AFL, PETITIONER

*Case No. 32-RC-1.—Decided April 21, 1948*

*Mr. Clarence Clifton*, of Memphis, Tenn., for the Employer.

*Messrs. Robert A. Tillman* and *R. F. Brown*, of Memphis, Tenn., for the Petitioner.

*Messrs. W. A. Copeland* and *Joe Rinaldi*, of Memphis, Tenn., for the Intervenor.

DECISION  
AND  
DIRECTION OF ELECTION

Upon a petition duly filed, hearing in this case was held at Memphis, Tennessee, on January 20, 1948, before Anthony J. Sabella, hearing officer. The hearing officer's rulings made at the hearing are free from prejudicial error and are hereby affirmed.

Upon the entire record in the case, the National Labor Relations Board<sup>1</sup> makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

I. THE BUSINESS OF THE EMPLOYER

The Southern Central Company, a Tennessee corporation, has its principal office and plant at Memphis, Tennessee, where it is engaged in the production of paper products including envelopes, stationery, and writing tablets. During the past year, the Employer purchased raw materials exceeding \$100,000 in value, of which more than 80 percent came from sources outside the State of Tennessee. During the same period, the value of the Employer's finished products exceeded \$100,000, of which more than 80 percent was sold and shipped to points outside the State of Tennessee.

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to the provisions of Section 3 (b) of the Act, the Board has delegated its powers in connection with this case to a three-man panel consisting of the undersigned Board Members [Chairman Herzog and Members Houston and Reynolds].

The Employer admits, and we find, that it is engaged in commerce within the meaning of the National Labor Relations Act.

## II. THE ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVED

The Petitioner is a labor organization affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, claiming to represent employees of the Employer.

United Paper Workers of America, herein called the Intervenor, is a labor organization affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations, claiming to represent employees of the Employer.

## III. THE QUESTION CONCERNING REPRESENTATION

The Employer refuses to recognize the Petitioner as exclusive bargaining representative of its employees until the Petitioner has been certified by the Board in an appropriate unit.

We find that a question affecting commerce exists concerning the representation of employees of the Employer, within the meaning of Section 9 (c) (1) and Section 2 (6) and (7) of the Act.

## IV. THE APPROPRIATE UNIT; THE DETERMINATION OF REPRESENTATIVES

The Petitioner seeks a unit of printing pressmen, assistant pressmen, platen and cylinder feeders, in the printing department of the Employer's plant. The Intervenor contends that only a comprehensive plant-wide unit is appropriate, because of a long bargaining history on this basis.<sup>2</sup>

The record indicates that the Employer's pressmen are required to serve an apprenticeship similar to pressmen in commercial shops and newspapers and are generally qualified to cross industrial lines.

The printing pressmen sought herein constitute a highly skilled, well-recognized craft group, employed in an industry in which craft units of pressmen are frequently encountered.<sup>3</sup> Under these circumstances, we believe that the printing pressmen involved herein may, if they so desire, constitute a separate unit notwithstanding the history of bargaining on a more inclusive basis. However we shall make no unit determination pending the outcome of the election hereinafter directed. If the employees participating in this election select the

<sup>2</sup> The Petitioner, through an affiliate, was the bargaining representative of the Employer's plant-wide unit from 1940 to 1946, wherein the Pressmen were represented as part of the larger unit. In September 1946, the present plant-wide unit was set up by a consent-election agreement between the Petitioner, the Intervenor, and the Employer. The Intervenor won the election, and thereafter entered into a contract, which was renewed on November 1, 1947, but left the question of printing pressmen open pending the outcome of the instant proceeding.

<sup>3</sup> See *Matter of Wilson-Jones Company*, 75 N. L. R. B. 706.

Petitioner, they will be taken to have indicated their desire to constitute a separate unit.

We shall direct that an election be held among all the printing pressmen, assistant pressmen, platen and cylinder feeders, employed by the Employer, excluding supervisors, as defined by the Act, subject to the limitations and additions set forth in the Direction of Election.

#### DIRECTION OF ELECTION <sup>4</sup>

As part of the investigation to ascertain representatives for the purposes of collective bargaining with Southern Central Company, Memphis, Tennessee, an election by secret ballot shall be conducted as early as possible, but not later than thirty (30) days from the date of this Direction, under the direction and supervision of the Regional Director for the Fifteenth Region, and subject to Sections 203.61 and 203.62 of National Labor Relations Board Rules and Regulations—Series 5, among the employees in the voting group described in Section IV, above, who were employed during the pay-roll period immediately preceding the date of this Direction, including employees who did not work during said pay-roll period because they were ill or on vacation or temporarily laid off, but excluding those employees who have since quit or been discharged for cause and have not been rehired or reinstated prior to the date of the election, and also excluding employees on strike who are not entitled to reinstatement, to determine whether they desire to be represented by Memphis Printing Pressmen's Union No. 18, International Printing Pressmen and Assistants Union of North America, AFL, or by United Paper Workers of America, C. I. O., for the purposes of collective bargaining, or by neither.

---

<sup>4</sup> Any participant in the election directed herein may, upon its prompt request to, and approval thereof by, the Regional Director, have its name removed from the ballot.