

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Operative Plasterers' and Cement Masons' International Association, AFL, Local Union 797, is a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2 (5) of the Act.

2. By executing and enforcing the contract of December 18, 1950, the Respondents, Haddock-Engineers, Limited, and Associates IV, Joint Venturers, have engaged in and are engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 8 (a) (3) of the Act.

3. By interfering with, restraining, and coercing employees in the exercise of rights guaranteed in Section 7 of the Act, the Respondent Employer has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 8 (a) (1) of the Act.

4. By causing the Respondent Employer to discriminate against employees in violation of Section 8 (a) (3) of the Act, the Respondent Union has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 8 (b) (2) of the Act.

5. By restraining and coercing employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in Section 7 of the Act, the Respondent Union has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 8 (b) (1) (A) of the Act.

6. The aforesaid unfair labor practices are unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of Section 2 (6) and (7) of the Act.

[Recommendations omitted from publication.]

HENRY S. MUSKETT, trading as WILSON MANUFACTURING COMPANY *and* PHILADELPHIA JOINT BOARD, WAIST AND DRESSMAKERS' UNION, INTERNATIONAL LADIES' GARMENT WORKERS' UNION, A. F. of L. Case No. 4-CA-664. May 15, 1953

DECISION AND ORDER

On March 13, 1953, Trial Examiner Sidney Lindner issued his Intermediate Report in this proceeding, finding that the Respondent had engaged in certain unfair labor practices in violation of Section 8 (a) (1) and (3) of the Act, and recommending that it cease and desist therefrom and take certain affirmative action, as set forth in the copy of the Intermediate Report attached hereto. Thereafter, the Respondent filed exceptions to the Intermediate Report and a supporting brief.

The Board¹ has reviewed the rulings of the Trial Examiner and finds that no prejudicial error was committed. The rulings are hereby affirmed. The Board has considered the Intermediate Report, the Respondent's exceptions and its brief, and the entire record in this case, and hereby adopts the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Trial Examiner.

ORDER

Upon the entire record in this case, and pursuant to Section 10 (c) of the National Labor Relations Act, the National

¹ Pursuant to the provisions of Section 3 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act, the Board has delegated its powers in connection with this case to a three-member panel [Chairman Herzog and Members Murdock and Peterson].

Labor Relations Board hereby orders that the Respondent, Henry S. Muskett, trading as Wilson Manufacturing Company, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, his agents, successors, and assigns, shall:

1. Cease and desist from:

(a) Threatening to cease the operation of his Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, plant before negotiating with, or signing a contract with, Philadelphia Joint Board, Waist and Dressmakers' Union, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, A. F. of L., or Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO, or any other labor organization.

(b) Interrogating his employees as to their membership in, sympathy for, or activities on behalf of Philadelphia Joint Board, Waist and Dressmakers' Union, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, A. F. of L., or Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO, or any other labor organization.

(c) Discouraging membership in Philadelphia Joint Board, Waist and Dressmakers' Union, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, A. F. of L., or Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO, or in any other labor organization, by discharging or refusing to reinstate any of its employees, or by discriminating in any other manner in regard to their hire or tenure of employment or any term or condition of their employment.

(d) In any other manner interfering with, restraining, or coercing its employees in the exercise of the right to self-organization, to form labor organizations, to join or assist Philadelphia Joint Board, Waist and Dressmakers' Union, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, A. F. of L., or Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO, or any other labor organization, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, to engage in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection, or to refrain from any or all of such activities except to the extent that such rights may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment as authorized in Section 8 (a) (3) of the Act.

2. Take the following affirmative action which the Board finds will effectuate the policies of the Act:

(a) Offer to Betty Rota and Darline Tartar immediate and full reinstatement to their former or substantially equivalent positions without prejudice to their seniority or other rights and privileges and make whole Betty Rota, Georgina Loriga, and Darline Tartar, in the manner set forth in the section of the Intermediate Report entitled "The Remedy."

(b) Upon request, make available to the Board or its agents for examination and copying all payroll records, social-security payment records, timecards, personnel records and reports, and all other records necessary to analyze the amount of back pay due and the right of reinstatement under the terms of this Order.

(c) Post at his plant in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, copies of the notice attached to the Intermediate Report as Appendix A.² Copies of said notice, to be furnished by the Regional Director for the Fourth Region, shall, after being duly signed by the Respondent, be posted immediately upon receipt thereof and be maintained by it for sixty (60) consecutive days thereafter in conspicuous places including all places where notices are customarily posted. Reasonable steps shall be taken to insure that said notices are not altered, defaced, or covered by any other material.

(d) Notify the Regional Director for the Fourth Region, in writing, within ten (10) days from the date of this Order, what steps the Respondent has taken to comply therewith.

²This notice shall be amended by substituting for the words "The Recommendations of a Trial Examiner" in the caption thereof, the words "A Decision and Order." In the event that this Order is enforced by a decree of the United States Court of Appeals, there shall be substituted for the words "Pursuant to a Decision and Order," the words "Pursuant to a Decree of the United States Court of Appeals, Enforcing an Order."

Intermediate Report and Recommended Order

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Upon a charge and amended charges duly filed by Philadelphia Joint Board, Waist and Dressmakers' Union, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, A. F. of L., hereinafter called the Union, the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board by the Regional Director for the Fourth Region (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania) issued a complaint dated May 26, 1952, against Henry S. Muskett, trading as Wilson Manufacturing Company, hereinafter called the Respondent, alleging that the latter had engaged in and was engaging in unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of Section 8 (a) (1) and (3), and Section 2 (6) and (7) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, 61 Stat. 136, 29 USC, sub. 1, Sec 141, *et seq.*, hereinafter referred to as the Act

With respect to the unfair labor practices the complaint as amended at the hearing alleged in substance that: (1) The Respondent terminated the employment of Georgina Loriga, Betty Rota, and Darline Tartar, its employees, on or about February 4, 1952, and has at all times since said date refused or failed to reinstate said employees to their former or substantially equivalent positions because Loriga and Tartar joined or assisted the Union and because Rota joined or assisted the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO, and for the further reason that each of the said employees had engaged in other concerted activities for the purposes of collective bargaining and other mutual aid or protection; and (2) Respondent through its agents or representatives did, from on or about February 1, 1952, to on or about February 4, 1952, interrogate its employees concerning their affiliation with, interests in, and activities on behalf of, the Union and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO.

By its answer duly filed the Respondent admitted that it is engaged in commerce within the meaning of the Act, but denied the commission of any unfair labor practices

Pursuant to notice a hearing was held at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on January 8, 1953, before the undersigned Trial Examiner The General Counsel, the Respondent, and the Union were represented at the hearing and all parties were afforded full opportunity to be heard, to examine and cross-examine witnesses, and to introduce evidence bearing on the issues Upon the completion of the taking of all testimony the General Counsel moved to conform the pleadings to the proof with respect to formal matters not involving substance. The motion was granted without objection. The parties were given opportunity to present oral argument before the Trial Examiner and also to file briefs, proposed findings of fact, and conclusions of law. Briefs have been received from counsel for Respondent and from the Union and have been duly considered.

Upon the entire record in the case and from his observation of the witnesses, the Trial Examiner makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

I. THE BUSINESS OF THE RESPONDENT

Henry S. Muskett, trading as Wilson Manufacturing Company, is an individual proprietorship with its principal office and place of business at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, where it is engaged in the manufacture of infants' and children's cotton underwear. In the course of its business operations during the 12-month period immediately preceding the issuance of the complaint herein, the Respondent purchased raw materials valued at approximately \$250,000 all of which was received directly from points outside the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. During the same period, it caused to be manufactured products valued in excess of \$500,000 over 60 percent of which was sold and shipped to points outside the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The Respondent admits and it is hereby found that it is engaged in commerce within the definition of the Act.

II. THE ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVED

Philadelphia Joint Board, Waist and Dressmakers' Union, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, A. F. of L., and Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO, are labor organizations admitting to membership employees of the Respondent.

III. THE UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

The Facts

The principal issue in this case is whether the Respondent discriminatorily discharged Betty Rota, Georgina Loriga, and Darline Tartar on February 4, 1952.

Interest in union organization among the Respondent's employees commenced during the lunch period on February 1, 1952. Darline Tartar, a sewing machine operator in the Respondent's employ from September 1951 to February 4, 1952, when she was allegedly discriminatorily terminated, testified that a group of employees were discussing a reduction in some piecework rates, when she was advised not to try to earn more than \$10 per day otherwise she might suffer a cut in her prevailing rate. Tartar, a member of the Union previous to her employment with the Respondent, remarked that if Respondent's employees were organized "things could not go like that, [the employer] could not do that." This comment aroused a discussion about unions generally and Tartar was requested by several employees to obtain information regarding the steps to be taken to organize Respondent's employees. Actively participating in the union discussion along with Tartar were employees Betty Rota and Georgina Loriga. Their alleged discriminatory discharges on February 4, 1952, will be more fully discussed hereinafter. Rota inquired among the girls how they felt about joining a union and Loriga who had been a union member in the past talked about the advisability of having a union represent them.

After work that evening Rota went to see an organizer for the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO, who told her to turn over to him the names of 10 or 15 employees interested in joining and he would hold a meeting with them to explain details concerning the Union.

That same evening Tartar contacted Jack Weiss, organizer for the Union. Weiss brought a number of union membership cards to Tartar's home for the employees to sign.

On her way into work on February 4, Tartar told Loriga she had the union cards and asked Loriga to obtain employees' signatures to the cards. Loriga told Tartar to give her the cards during the lunch hour.

The employees met again in the ladies' restroom during the lunch period¹ on February 4. Tartar did not attend. Nor had she turned over the union cards to Loriga. After some further discussion led by Rota and Loriga regarding the advantages of having a union represent the employees, Loriga obtained the names of several interested employees on blank slips of paper which she subsequently turned over to Weiss.

Tartar testified that after she returned from lunch on February 4 she spoke to employee Rose Cirillo about the Union while they were both working at their respective machines.

May Muskett, head supervisor in the plant and sister-in-law of Henry Muskett, owner of the Respondent Company, testified that about 11 a.m. on February 4 she was inspecting thread on the balcony just outside the ladies' restroom. While she could not see inside the restroom she stated she was able to observe in the mirror of a medicine cabinet on the restroom wall

¹ The lunch period was from 11:45 a. m. to 12:15 p. m.

Rota, Loriga, and Tartar engaged in conversation. She heard them talking about soliciting the employees to join a union and mention that if a "certain number" of names were obtained a meeting would be called. May Muskett was unable to testify with certainty as to the period of time the girls were in the ladies' restroom discussing organizational activity. At one point she testified that after she first observed them it was "a period of seconds" before all of them left the room. Upon further questioning she testified the conversations in the ladies' restroom went on from 2 to 5 minutes.

When Henry Muskett returned to the plant shortly after the lunch period ended,² May Muskett reported to him what she had observed and heard discussed in the ladies' restroom.

Rota testified that about 12:30 p.m. while working at her machine, Floorlady Price told her she had a telephone call in the office. Upon arrival at the office Rota found Henry Muskett and May Muskett there. She was immediately confronted by Henry Muskett with a series of questions regarding the union. Muskett asked what union she was a member of and she replied the Amalgamated. Muskett inquired why she thought there should be a union in the Respondent's shop and if she had not been treated right. Rota answered that although she had been accorded good treatment she nevertheless thought that the employees needed a union in order to obtain, among other things, vacations with pay and hospitalization. Muskett told Rota that all of the other employees were contented with conditions at the plant until she started the commotion about a union. He stated he did not have a union in his plant for the 11 years he was in business and he would go out of business rather than have a union. Rota admitted that Muskett told her she was acting on behalf of the union on his premises and on his time. Muskett, according to Rota, told May Muskett to get Rota "the hell out of the office before he lost his temper." May Muskett accompanied Rota to her machine and then to the coatroom where she obtained her belongings and left the plant. While in the coatroom May Muskett asked Rota for the names of the other girls involved with her in the attempt at union organization. She refused to disclose the names.

About 10 minutes after Rota left the office, Loriga was told by Floorlady Price to report at the office. Loriga testified that Henry Muskett and May Muskett were there. Henry Muskett asked Loriga if she was not satisfied working for him, and displayed her earnings record to her. She replied that she was satisfied. He inquired if she was one of the organizers for the Union which she denied.³ He then told her she was discharged "on account of the Union."

At about 1 p.m. May Muskett came to Tartar's machine and told her that Muskett wanted to see her in his office. May Muskett escorted Tartar to the office. Muskett, according to Tartar, started the interview by telling her he heard she was unhappy working for him. Tartar asked Muskett what he meant by "unhappy." He stated he heard she was dissatisfied with the way things were going in the plant and remarked that she was "talking to the wrong people."⁴ They then talked about employees' earnings and Tartar said she did not like Muskett's method of cutting the piecework rates. A discussion ensued about why and how rates were reduced. Muskett told Tartar that since she was unhappy in his plant she was not needed any longer. He also told her that she did not have to worry about getting other employment because she had "a good pair of hands" and was a good operator.

Regarding the events of the morning of February 4 Henry Muskett testified⁵ that when he arrived in his office shortly after lunch May Muskett told him that earlier in the morning she overheard a conversation between Loriga, Tartar, and Rota that they would start soliciting names to get a union organized at the Respondent's plant. As a result of May Muskett's report he sent for Rota, Loriga, and Tartar and spoke to them individually in his office in that order.

Muskett, by and large, corroborated Rota's testimony regarding the interview in his office. He did not deny that he threatened he would go out of business rather than have a union in his plant. He testified also that he told Rota "... we have a very happy business family here. It is a small company. I know the problems of each and every employee. We have been sympathetic to their needs. We have helped at every time we could, but I did not feel that it

²Henry Muskett was in the plant in the early morning, left on company business, and did not get back to the plant until the employees' lunch period was over.

³Loriga testified that although she had proselytized the cause of the Union on the occasions referred to above, she denied this when Muskett inquired regarding her activity for fear that she would involve other employees.

⁴May Muskett admitted that earlier that morning employee Lucy Hagerty informed her that Rota and Tartar were making efforts to organize a union among Respondent's employees.

⁵This testimony was corroborated in essential details by May Muskett.

was fair to me, because of what we endeavored at all times to do for our workers, that [she] should be out there on my time and in our premises, to be canvassing applicants for a union, and disrupting the morale of our fine organization "

Muskett testified that he asked Loriga why she was endeavoring to form a union in the plant on his time and premises He stated that she denied that she engaged in such activity He testified further that when Loriga "took upon herself to use our premisses and our time to destroy and disrupt the organization, that we had nursed so carefully from a small flower, 12 years earlier, then [he] just felt that the end of the road had been reached "

Regarding the Tartar interview, Muskett testified that he inquired if she was happy and if her earnings were satisfactory. She answered yes He then asked why she was attempting to form a union on his time and premises Tartar replied that it was none of his business Muskett stated that it was his business since she was in the plant to work 8 hours a day Tartar, according to Muskett, told him it was none of his "God-damn business" what she did in the plant He thereupon told her she was no longer needed and discharged her ⁶

I credit the testimony of Rota, Loriga, and Tartar set forth above and find that the conversations with Muskett immediately preceding their terminations on February 4 took place substantially as testified to by them.

Conclusions

It is the contention of the Respondent raised at the hearing and in its brief that Rota, Loriga, and Tartar were discharged for engaging in union activities during working time, thereby disturbing the efficiency of its plant

Muskett testified that there were two bulletin boards in the plant on which general announcements were posted.⁷ No notice was ever posted nor were the employees told that solicitation on behalf of a union was forbidden

Although Muskett knew that the employees carried on solicitations in the plant for gifts for one of their members about to embark on a marriage career or upon the birth of a child to a worker and in fact did nothing to stop it he claimed he was not aware that the solicitation for these collections took place on Respondent's time I credit Rota's testimony that solicitations for gifts for employees were taken up during working hours by employees who left their machines for that purpose

There was no showing that employees were ever disciplined much less discharged for talking with their fellow workers The fact is, as May Muskett admitted, that Respondent never attempted to stop its employees from talking to each other while working at their machines Nor does it appear that there were any restrictions against employees leaving their machines to obtain threads and other materials or to go to the restroom.⁸

Although it is Respondent's claim that Rota, Loriga, and Tartar were discharged for disrupting the productivity of the plant, no evidence was adduced to bear out this claim Muskett testified that for the week prior to February 4, the plant "wasn't in tune" and production had gone down No investigation however was undertaken by the Respondent to determine the cause for the drop in production. Furthermore, it is clear from the record that if any union solicitation did take place on working time it was only on February 4 and not prior to that date. Having been out of the plant for most of the morning on February 4, Muskett did not have any knowledge of interference with production that morning

The only disruption in the plant observed by May Muskett on February 4 was talking between Rota and Tartar who worked at adjacent machines and some conversation between the said employees and employee Lucy Hagerty whose machine was directly behind the one occupied by Rota. Admittedly none of the girls had to leave their machines to talk to one another and as noted previously the Respondent did not prohibit its employees from talking while at work.

Moreover, even assuming arguendo without conceding that Rota, Loriga, and Tartar did engage in union activity for 3 to 5 minutes on Respondent's time was that sufficient cause for their termination? As previously noted, there was no rule in Respondent's plant forbidding solicitation or prohibiting its employees from going to the restroom or from engag-

⁶While insubordination is of course a lawful reason for discharge, there is no contention herein that Tartar's alleged insubordination was the reason for her discharge. See Cathey Lumber Company, 101 NLRB 1406, and cases cited therein.

⁷Notices advising the employees not to leave soda pop bottles around the plant; the birth of a child to a worker; or that the plant would be closed over the Christmas weekend were typical of the general announcements posted on the bulletin boards.

⁸There was no regular rest period for employees.

ing in conversation on its time and property. Nor did the Respondent adduce any evidence to show that the activity of Rota, Loriga, and Tartar interfered with their work or the general production in the plant. It is axiomatic that working time is for work. Further, it is within the province of an employer to promulgate and enforce a rule prohibiting union solicitation during working hours. However, the Board has properly required that such a rule to satisfy the statutory prohibition against discrimination for union activity must not be adopted for a discriminatory purpose and must be impartially enforced. See *N. L. R. B. v. Peyton Packing Co.*, 142 F. 2d 1009 (C. A. 5), enforcing 49 NLRB 828, cert. denied 323 U. S. 730. The fact that the Respondent had no rule against solicitation in its plant and the further fact that it summarily discharged Rota, Loriga, and Tartar without prior warning merely serves to emphasize in my opinion that the Respondent was concerned only with the purpose of their activities.⁹

It is clear that what we are faced with here is not disruption in production but rather fear on the part of the Respondent of the disruption in the "very happy business family" and of "the morale of our fine organization" that it claimed existed prior to the talk about union organization by Rota, Loriga, and Tartar. As May Muskett testified, the Respondent "never had any disruption in the plant prior to these ladies [referring to Rota and Tartar who were practically newcomers] coming in." It is significant that disruption in production took on such great importance practically simultaneously with the employees' talk about organizing into a union and their discharges came about within a matter of hours after such event.

Upon the basis of all the foregoing including the fact that Rota and Tartar were able employees,¹⁰ that Respondent interrogated its employees regarding their concerted and union activities and threatened to close its plant rather than have a union, and in view of the timing of the events under consideration, I am impelled to find that the evidence preponderantly supports the conclusion that the Respondent discriminatorily discharged Rota, Loriga, and Tartar because of their concerted activities and their role in attempting to organize the employees and that it thereby has violated Section 8 (a) (1) and (3) of the Act. I also find that the Respondent violated Section 8 (a) (1) of the Act by interrogating its employees regarding their union membership and threatening to shut down its plant rather than have a union.

IV. THE EFFECT OF THE UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES UPON COMMERCE

The activities of the Respondent set forth in section III, above, occurring in connection with the operations of the Respondent described in section I, above, have a close, intimate, and substantial relation to trade, traffic, and commerce among the several States and tend to lead to labor disputes burdening and obstructing commerce and the free flow of commerce.

V. THE REMEDY

Since it has been found that Respondent has engaged in certain unfair labor practices, it will be recommended that it cease and desist therefrom and take certain affirmative action to effectuate the policies of the Act.

It has been found that Respondent violated the Act by discriminating with respect to the hire and tenure of employment of Betty Rota, Georgina Loriga, and Darline Tartar. It will be recommended that Respondent make them whole for any loss of pay resulting from the discrimination against them by paying them a sum of money equal to the amount they would have earned from the dates of their discharge to the dates of reinstatement¹¹ or offers of reinstatement less their net earnings¹² to be computed on a quarterly basis in the manner

⁹See *EI Mundo, Inc.*, 92 NLRB 724, where even though union activity on plant premises indirectly resulted in an impairment of plant efficiency the Board held a discharge of an employee engaged in such activity to be discriminatory. It ordered the reinstatement of the discharged employee stating that that is the price which must often be paid in order that the rights guaranteed by the Act be preserved. See also *Atlantic Company*, 79 NLRB 820, where there was no formal rule against solicitation in the plant and no evidence of interference with work when the discharged employees engaged in union solicitation on company time. See also *Jaques Power Saw Co.*, 85 NLRB 440; *Rubin Bros. Footwear Inc.*, 91 NLRB 10; *Hartland Plastics, Inc.*, 93 NLRB 439.

¹⁰Loriga, although not as able a worker as the others, was not discharged for inefficiency.

¹¹The record reveals that Loriga was reinstated in May or June 1952.

¹²*Crossett Lumber Company*, 8 NLRB 444.

established by the Board in F W Woolworth Company, 90 NLRB 289 Earnings in one quarter shall have no effect upon the back-pay liability for any other such period It will also be recommended that the Respondent make available to the Board upon request payroll and other records to facilitate checking the back pay due. F. W. Woolworth Company, supra.

In view of the nature of the unfair labor practices committed I shall also, recommend that the Respondent cease and desist from in any manner infringing upon the rights guaranteed employees in Section 7 of the Act.¹³

Upon the basis of the foregoing findings of fact and upon the entire record in the case I make the following

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1 The Respondent has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 8 (a) (1) and (3) of the Act

2 The aforesaid unfair labor practices are unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of Section 2 (6) and (7) of the Act

[Recommendations omitted from publication]

¹³May Department Stores v. N. L. R. B., 326 U. S. 376, affirming as modified 145 F. 2d 66 (C. A. 8), enforcing 53 NLRB 1366.

APPENDIX A

NOTICE TO ALL EMPLOYEES

Pursuant to the recommendations of a Trial Examiner of the National Labor Relations Board and in order to effectuate the policies of the National Labor Relations Act we hereby notify our employees that:

WE WILL NOT threaten to shut down our plant rather than have a union.

WE WILL NOT interrogate or question our employees concerning their concerted or union activities

WE WILL NOT discourage membership in Philadelphia Joint Board, Waist and Dress-makers' Union, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, A. F. of L., Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO, or in any other labor organization, by discriminating in any manner against our employees, in regard to their hire or tenure of employment or any term or condition of their employment

WE WILL NOT in any other manner interfere with, restrain, or coerce our employees in the exercise of their right to self-organization, to form labor organizations, to join or assist the above-named unions or any other labor organization, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities for the purposes of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection, or to refrain from any or all of such activities except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment as authorized in Section 8 (a) (3) of the Act.

WE WILL offer to Betty Rota and Darline Tartar immediate and full reinstatement to their former positions or substantially equivalent positions without prejudice to any seniority or other rights and privileges previously enjoyed and we will make whole Betty Rota, Georgina Loriga, and Darline Tartar for any loss of pay suffered as a result of the discrimination against them

HENRY S. MUSKETT, TRADING AS
WILSON MANUFACTURING COMPANY,
Employer.

Dated By
(Representative) (Title)

This notice must remain posted for sixty days from the date hereof and must not be altered, defaced, or covered by any other material.