

16-RC-2452 embraces within the certified unit all employees at Addison engaged in the fabrication and installation of electronic systems. As the IAM petition in the instant case does not raise a question concerning representation, we shall dismiss the petition.<sup>13</sup>

Accordingly, the certification of the IAM in Case No. 16-RC-2452 is hereby clarified to include in the unit all employees at the Addison Airport engaged in the fabrication and installation of electronic systems in both aircraft and in transportable systems other than aircraft.<sup>14</sup>

[The Board dismissed the petition.]

MEMBERS BEAN and JENKINS took no part in the consideration of the above Decision, Order, and Clarification of Certification.

---

<sup>13</sup> In its petition, the IAM also sought to represent maintenance employees of Alpha and production employees of Alpha in all of Dallas County. The record indicates, however, that Alpha currently employs no maintenance employees and no production employees other than at Addison. In accordance with Board policy, we shall make no determination with respect to categories of employees who are not currently employed by the Employer. (*Westinghouse Electric Corporation*, 110 NLRB 475, 477.) The IAM also sought to represent radio technicians employed at Addison. The radio technicians were expressly excluded from the 1959 certification of the IAM. Assuming that the radio technicians may appropriately be included in the IAM unit, it would be necessary to ascertain by means of a self-determination election whether the radio technicians wished to be included in the IAM unit (*The Zia Company*, 108 NLRB 1134). However, to warrant a self-determination election among previously unrepresented employees, the union seeking such an election must make a separate showing of interest among these employees (*Pennington Bros., Inc.*, 124 NLRB 935). The Board has been administratively advised that the IAM has made no separate showing of interest among radio technicians. On the basis of the foregoing, we shall dismiss the IAM petition in its entirety.

<sup>14</sup> We make no determination as to whether the IAM certification covers nonaircraft employees, or any other employees of the Employer, who may be transferred from Addison Airport to any other facility of the Employer.

---

**Aerojet General Corporation and International Union, United Welders, Petitioner.**<sup>1</sup> *Case No. 21-RC-6192. July 25, 1960*

### DECISION AND DIRECTION OF ELECTION

Upon a petition duly filed under Section 9(c) of the National Labor Relations Act, a hearing was held before Wilford W. Johansen, hearing officer. The hearing officer's rulings made at the hearing are free from prejudicial error and are hereby affirmed.

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 Leedom and Members Rodgers and Fanning].

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of the Petitioner appears as amended after the close of the hearing by agreement of the parties.

Upon the entire record in this case, the Board finds:<sup>2</sup>

1. The Employer is engaged in commerce within the meaning of the Act.

2. The labor organizations named below claim to represent certain employees of the Employer.

3. A question affecting commerce exists concerning the representation of certain employees of the Employer within the meaning of Section 9(c) (1) and Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

4. The following employees of the Employer may constitute a unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining within the meaning of Section 9(b) of the Act:<sup>3</sup>

All welders at the Employer's Azusa, Chino, and Sacramento, California, missile plants, including layout, combination, and maintenance welders,<sup>4</sup> but excluding all other employees and supervisors as defined in the Act.<sup>5</sup>

5. If a majority vote for the Petitioner, they will be taken to have indicated their desire to constitute a separate appropriate unit, and the Regional Director conducting the election directed herein is instructed to issue a certification of representatives to the Petitioner for the unit described in paragraph numbered 4, which the Board, under such circumstances, finds to be appropriate for purposes of collective bar-

---

<sup>2</sup> The requests of the Employer and the International Association of Machinists, District Lodge No. 94, Local Lodges Nos. 1893 and 946, AFL-CIO, the Intervenor herein, for oral argument are denied as the record, including the briefs, adequately presents the issues and positions of the parties.

<sup>3</sup> The Petitioner seeks to sever a craft unit of welders from the existing production and maintenance unit presently represented by the Intervenor. The Employer and the Intervenor contend, in effect, that severance should be denied because (1) the requested employees do not constitute a distinct homogeneous craft group, and (2) experimental missile production, as distinguished from aircraft production, is so highly integrated that severance would not be feasible. We find no merit in either of these contentions. As to (1), the record shows conclusively that the layout and combination welders involved herein are highly skilled craftsmen. They are required to have a minimum of 5 and 3 years' experience, respectively, before they are hired. They use the traditional welding processes of gas, electric arc, and hellarc and must pass Air Force certification tests, which require renewal at 6-month intervals, before they are permitted to work on such metals as stainless steel, aluminum, 4130 molybdenum, titanium, and other new metals used in the production of rockets and guided missiles. In addition, layout welders, the higher classified category, work from blueprints and lay out their own work. As to (2), we find, contrary to the contention of the Employer and the Intervenor, that the welders involved herein are, in effect, engaged in the same industry as the welders found to be craftsmen in *Hughes Aircraft Company (Tucson Operations)*, 117 NLRB 98, and exercise duties and skills similar to those of the welders in that case. See also *Northrup Aircraft, Inc.*, 117 NLRB 1717; *Royal Jet Incorporated*, 118 NLRB 1558; and *Lockheed Aircraft Corporation*, 121 NLRB 1541. Accordingly, we find that the employees requested by the Petitioner constitute a craft group, and they may, as the Petitioner is a traditional representative of such employees, constitute a separate appropriate craft unit. See also *E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company*, 126 NLRB 885, at footnote 3.

<sup>4</sup> As the maintenance welders are in fact layout welders and are required to exercise the same skills, we shall include them in the unit.

<sup>5</sup> As no employees, other than employees classified as welders, spend more than 50 percent of their time in welding operations, we do not pass on the Petitioner's request for the inclusion of any employee, regardless of classification, who spends more than 50 percent of his time performing fusion welding.

gaining. In the event a majority do not vote for the Petitioner, these employees shall remain a part of the existing unit and the Regional Director will issue a certification of results of election to such effect.

[Text of Direction of Election omitted from publication.]

---

**National Gypsum Company and District 50, United Mine Workers of America, Petitioner**

**National Gypsum Company and United Cement, Lime and Gypsum Workers International Union, AFL-CIO, Petitioner.**  
*Cases Nos. 8-RC-3798 and 8-RC-3801. July 25, 1960*

**DECISION AND DIRECTION OF ELECTION**

Upon separate petitions duly filed under Section 9(c) of the National Labor Relations Act, a hearing was held before Harold A. Ross, hearing officer. The hearing officer's rulings made at the hearing are free from prejudicial error and are hereby affirmed.

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 Leedom and Members Rodgers and Jenkins].

Upon the entire record in this case, the Board finds:

1. The Employer is engaged in commerce within the meaning of the Act.<sup>1</sup>
2. The labor organizations involved claim to represent certain employees of the Employer.
3. A question affecting commerce exists concerning the representation of certain employees of the Employer within the meaning of Section 9(c) (1) and Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.<sup>2</sup>
4. The Petitioners seek a unit of all production and maintenance employees at the Employer's Lorain, Ohio, plant, excluding office clerical employees, professional employees, guards, and all supervisors as defined in the Act. The Employer, in opposition to the Petitioners, would exclude from this unit a janitor, the repair parts clerk, four

---

<sup>1</sup>The Employer is a Delaware corporation with principal offices located in Buffalo, New York, and doing business in various States of the United States. It is engaged in the production of building materials such as wallboard and plasterboard at some 40 plants including the plant at Lorain, Ohio, involved herein. Although this plant has been in operation only since March 14, 1960, it has already received from the Company's mine in northern Michigan rock ore valued in excess of \$50,000. The parties do not contest the Board's jurisdiction.

<sup>2</sup>The Employer moved to dismiss the petitions on the ground that they were prematurely filed in view of the fact that the plant has been in operation only since March 14, 1960, and readjustments and reassignments of work tasks are currently being made. For the reasons stated in section 5, *infra*, the Employer's motion is hereby denied.