

In the Matter of BELOIT IRON WORKS and PATTERN MAKERS LEAGUE
OF NORTH AMERICA

In the Matter of BELOIT IRON WORKS and INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF MACHINISTS

Cases Nos. R-577 and C-433, respectively.—Decided May 16, 1938

Paper-Making Machinery Manufacturing Industry—Interference, Restraint, and Coercion—Company-Dominated Union: domination of and interference with formation and administration; support; soliciting membership in, during working hours; disestablished, as agency for collective bargaining—*Discrimination:* discharges, for union activity—*Reinstatement Ordered:* employees discriminatorily discharged—*Back Pay:* awarded—*Investigation of Representatives:* controversy concerning representation of employees—*Unit Appropriate for Collective Bargaining:* pattern makers; desires of employees; skilled; no controversy as to—*Representatives:* proof of choice: comparison of pay roll with union list—*Certification of Representatives:* upon proof of majority representation.

Mr. Bernard J. Donoghue, and *Mr. W. G. Stuart Sherman*, for the Board.

Mr. Otto A. Oestreich and *Mr. R. J. E. Wood*, for the respondent.

Mr. Joseph A. Padway, by *Mr. A. G. Goldberg*, for the P. M. L.

Mr. R. W. Blakey, for the Employees Association.

Miss Ann Landy, of counsel to the Board.

DECISION

ORDER

AND

CERTIFICATION OF REPRESENTATIVES

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On July 8, 1937, the Pattern Makers League of North America, herein called the P. M. L., filed a petition with the Regional Director for the Twelfth Region (Milwaukee, Wisconsin) alleging that a question affecting commerce had arisen concerning the representation of employees of the Beloit Iron Works, herein called the respondent, and requesting an investigation and certification of representatives pursuant to Section 9 (c) of the National Labor Relations Act, 49 Stat. 449, herein called the Act.

On August 27, 1937, International Association of Machinists, herein called the Machinists, filed a petition with the Regional Director for

the Twelfth Region alleging that a question affecting commerce had arisen concerning the representation of respondent's employees and requesting an investigation and certification of representatives pursuant to Section 9 (c) of the Act. This petition was introduced in evidence at the hearing, but since investigation was not authorized in the matter, the National Labor Relations Board, herein called the Board, will not pass upon its merits.

On September 13, 1937, the Machinists filed a charge, and on October 1, 1937, an amended charge with the Regional Director for the Twelfth Region against the respondent alleging that the respondent had engaged in unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of Section 8 (1), (2), and (3) and Section 2 (6) and (7) of the Act.

On October 15, 1937, the Board, acting pursuant to Article III, Sections 3 and 10 (c) (2), and Article II, Section 37 (b), of National Labor Relations Board Rules and Regulations—Series 1, as amended, ordered a consolidation of these cases and ordered an investigation of representatives, authorizing the Regional Director to conduct it and to provide for an appropriate hearing upon due notice.

On October 18, 1937, the Regional Director issued a complaint alleging that the respondent had engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices affecting commerce, within the meaning of Section 8 (1) and (3) and Section 2 (6) and (7) of the Act. The complaint was amended at the hearing to include further allegations that the respondent had engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices affecting commerce, within the meaning of Section 8 (1), (2), and (3), and Section 2 (6) and (7) of the Act.

Copies of the complaint and notice of hearing to be held upon the complaint and the petition on November 1, 1937, in Beloit, Wisconsin, were duly served upon the respondent, the P. M. L., the Machinists, and the Beloit Iron Works Employees Association, herein called the Employees Association. The respondent filed its answer to the complaint and the petition on October 23, 1937, and to the amended complaint on November 3, 1937, denying the essential allegations in the complaints and petitions.

Pursuant to notice a joint hearing on the complaint and petition was held in Beloit, Wisconsin, commencing on November 1, 1937, before Leo J. Kriz, the Trial Examiner duly designated by the Board. The Board, the respondent, the P. M. L. and the Employees Association were represented by counsel and participated in the hearing.

Full opportunity to examine and cross-examine witnesses, and to introduce evidence bearing upon the issues was afforded to all parties. We have reviewed the rulings of the Trial Examiner on motions and objections and find that no prejudicial errors were committed. His rulings are hereby affirmed.

On February 11, 1938, the Trial Examiner filed his Intermediate Report in which he found that respondent had engaged in unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of Section 8 (1), (2) and (3) and Section 2 (6) and (7) of the Act.

On February 23, 1938, the respondent filed its exceptions to the Intermediate Report, excepting to certain findings of fact, conclusions, and recommendations of the Trial Examiner. On March 31, 1938, the respondent presented oral arguments before the Board in support of its exceptions. The Board has considered the exceptions and finds no merit in them.

Upon the entire record in the case, the Board makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

I. THE BUSINESS OF THE RESPONDENT

The respondent, Beloit Iron Works, is a Wisconsin corporation having its principal office and place of business in Beloit, Wisconsin. It is engaged in the design, assembly, manufacture, and sale of paper making machinery.

The principal raw materials used by the respondent are iron, other metals, coke, coal, and lumber. Eighty-three per cent of the iron, 42 per cent of the lumber and all of the nonferrous metals and coal are purchased outside the State of Wisconsin. The total sales of respondent's products for 1936 were approximately 4½ million dollars. Over 85 per cent of these sales were made to purchasers outside Wisconsin.

The total number of respondent's employees is 823, 600 of whom are engaged in production work.

II. THE ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVED

Pattern Makers League of North America is a labor organization affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. It admits to membership the pattern makers and pattern changers employed by the respondent.

The International Association of Machinists is a labor organization affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. It admits to membership employees of the respondent in the following departments: Machine shops, erecting floor, tool room, electrical, steam-

fitting and welding departments, blacksmith shop, subassembly, boiler and engine room, and the crane operators.

Beloit Iron Works Employees' Association is an unaffiliated labor organization established in May 1937. It admits to membership all employees of the respondent except supervisory employees who have authority to hire and discharge.

III. THE UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

A. Domination of and interference with the Employees Association and discrimination against the Machinists

In 1933 the respondent established a Compliance Board in the plant, composed of representatives from each department. This board met weekly with Wood, the plant superintendent, to consider complaints. After the National Labor Relations Act was held constitutional by the United States Supreme Court and the Wisconsin Labor Relations Act was enacted in April 1937, respondent decided to end the functioning of the Compliance Board. At that time, Wood called in Horne, a molder in the foundry and chairman of the Compliance Board, and told him that since the Compliance Board had become illegal, it had to be dissolved, and that it was Horne's duty to notify the other employees of that fact. In parting, Wood presented Horne with a copy of the Act to read.

Witnesses for the respondent testified that at a meeting of the foremen around April 21, 1937, Wood discussed the Act and advised the foremen to refrain from expressing their personal feelings toward labor organizations and to get in touch with the men and inform them that the respondent will follow a "hands off" policy.

On April 27, 1937, Horne called a meeting of employees during the noon lunch hour on the erection floor of the plant. He declared the Compliance Board dissolved and proceeded to elaborate upon the need for an organization of employees and the advisability of forming an inside union. A general discussion followed during the course of which the men expressed their interest in different unions. Horne suggested that another meeting should follow and informed the men that the law required that it be held off company property. He appointed a committee of three to take care of the arrangements.

The next meeting of employees was held on April 28, 1937, in the local Moose Hall. In the forenoon of that day the members of the committee left the plant during working hours without checking out and made the arrangements for the meeting. They invited two speakers and secured police protection for the evening. The employees from the night shift walked out of the plant in order to attend the meeting. One of the speakers was a local attorney, Johnston, who was instrumental in forming an inside union at the Yates American

Machine Company, in Beloit. Both speakers advocated the formation of an inside organization. Several employees spoke in favor of affiliation with the American Federation of Labor.

Before the close of the meeting it was decided by the vote of an overwhelming majority that another meeting should be held on the following Sunday, May 2, 1937, where representatives from the American Federation of Labor and the Committee for Industrial Organization and a proponent of the inside union were to be invited to speak. It was the understanding among the men that they would all join the organization which the majority selected after hearing all sides discussed.

The following morning Simpson left the plant during working hours in order to have cards printed for the Beloit Iron Works Employees Association.¹ In the evening as soon as the cards were printed, the solicitation for membership began. Within 26 hours approximately 360 employees signed application cards. Baptist, a clerk in the foundry, alone, recruited 130 members during that time. It is not denied that most of the solicitation for membership was done openly during working hours, and it was done under circumstances which compel the conclusion that the supervisory staff knew and approved the procedure. Jones testified and two other employees confirmed, that Roy Quilkey, a foreman, made the following statement to them: "I got one machine down, been down about three hours now, I can't do a damn thing about it, he (Le Fever, of the Employees Association) is out getting members for his union."

The three most active organizers of the Employees' Association, Dave Simpson, Bert Baptist, and William Sowl, occupy positions superior to that of other employees. Simpson is a clerk in the production department and is a salaried employee,² Baptist is a clerk in the foundry, and Sowl works in a quasi-supervisory capacity in the shipping department. They gave as reasons for their participation in the formation of the Employees Association their dislike of unions and desire to keep outside labor organizations away from the plant,³ and their gratitude to the respondent for the treatment they had received.

¹ Simpson testified that he obtained a sample for the application cards from an employee of the Yates American Machine Company, who was displaying it in a bowling hall.

² Simpson admitted on the stand that the other employees may have looked up to him as one of the management.

³ After Simpson was asked numerous questions about the bylaws and rules of the Employees Association and he answered each time "I couldn't tell you that", the following testimony appears:

Q. Are you the fellow that organized the union?

A. I think so.

Q. You don't know anything about a union?

A. I don't think so.

Q. Why did you do something you did not know anything about?

A. I told you, to keep the outsiders out.

After a substantial membership had been secured for the Employees Association in this manner, its sponsors posted a notice on the bulletin board announcing a meeting for the following Sunday, May 2, for members only. Inasmuch as that was the date designated for the open meeting by the vote of the employees attending the Moose Hall meeting on April 28, this caused much resentment among the men. The suspicion arose that it was an attempt to "put something over on them." Since the Employees Association was having a separate meeting for members only, those who had not joined that organization proceeded with the original plans and held their open meeting, where representatives from the American Federation of Labor and the Committee for Industrial Organization spoke. On May 11 this group voted in favor of an outside affiliation, and of the two national labor organizations the American Federation of Labor was chosen. Subsequently the Machinists and the P. M. L. have organized the employees of the respondent.

Following the meeting of the Employees Association held on May 2, 1937, the articles of incorporation and the bylaws for the organization were drawn up by Richard Blakey, attorney. The bylaws provide that membership is limited to hourly paid employees; * that members cannot belong to any other labor organization; that no one can be elected an officer unless he has been employed by the respondent for one year; that dues are 25 cents per month but may be waived by the president and treasurer.

The Employees Association has made no attempt to secure any agreement with the respondent. Its grievance committee met with Wood and asked for a general raise. Two days later Wood reported to Baptist that they would grant a two and a half cents an hour raise to everyone. The same procedure was followed a few days later when the request for a week's vacation was granted to all employees who had been employed by the respondent for a year or more. Members of the Employees Association were informed of these concessions at their meeting before the others were notified.

Several employees testified that McNabb, a foreman, told them to "be sure you join the right union," and that they felt sure that he meant thereby the Employees Association. We also have the testimony of Mason, former employee, that when he asked Russel Hartman, his foreman, for a raise, he was told that he would get it but that he would have to vote right.

The respondent posted a notice on the bulletin board on July 14, 1937. It provided for an 8-hour day and 40-hour week and for time

* This provision later was amended to include salaried employees as well, excluding only such employees who have authority to hire and discharge.

and a half for overtime. In the following paragraph the respondent expressed its labor policy :

No employee is required to join or not to join any organization whatever and no employee will be discriminated against in any manner whatever for not joining or joining any organization. No employee shall coerce, threaten or intimidate any other employee in an attempt to influence him to join or not to join any organization or interfere with the work of others during working hours or on the company's property.

It is significant that this declaration of policy was posted only after the organization of the Employees Association was an accomplished fact and three of the discharges described below had occurred. Up to this time the respondent had not laid down any rules against union activities, and it was only through directions given at a foreman's meeting that the respondent had voiced its alleged "hands off" policy.

Although the respondent carefully planned to clothe the Employees Association with an appearance of independence, its connection with the organization is clear. We cannot give much weight to the testimony that Horne's suggestion of forming an inside union was not prompted by Wood. If it had been his own desire to have such an organization, it seems impossible that he would disclaim, as he did, all interest in it, after having started the movement. Solicitation of members while the Employees Association was being organized was openly permitted within the plant on company time, and, as a result, within 26 hours approximately 360 employees signed up during working time. The foremen could not have been so uniformly lenient as to allow this mass solicitation without being given orders to do so, and it is also difficult to believe that 360 employees would have decided to join the Employees Association on such short notice unless they had been given to understand that the company was in favor of it. We may infer that the drive had the respondent's sanction. The employees sponsoring the organization left the plant several times to make arrangements in connection with it, without incurring reprimand. The remarks made by the foremen, McNabb and Quilkey, indicate the continuing favoritism of the respondent shown toward the organization.

Accordingly, we find that the respondent has dominated and interfered with the formation and administration of the Beloit Iron Works Employees Association, and contributed support to it.

B. The discharges

John H. Jones had been employed by the respondent for 10 years and was receiving .68 cents per hour prior to his discharge. His ability and efficiency have not been disputed. He became a member of the Machinists on June 2, 1937, and later was elected vice president of the local. At the Moose Hall meeting he spoke enthusiastically in favor of an American Federation of Labor affiliation. He was active in soliciting membership for the Machinists in the plant.

The respondent claims that Jones was discharged primarily because he threatened another employee with the loss of his job if he did not join the Machinists and secondarily because he interfered with the work of others by spending a great deal of time soliciting membership for his union.

The alleged threat was made by Jones to Townsley, tool crib attendant, and consisted of the following remarks:

If you don't join up with the organization, you will be sorry later on. We will surely get in. We are getting stronger every day . . . You can do us a good turn if you come in. You can give the tools to the A. F. of L. men and hold the others back.

Townsley did not claim that these statements were made in a threatening manner, and when the principles of a closed-shop agreement were explained to him, he testified that Jones' remarks may have referred to it. After Townsley complained to one of the foremen, he was called into the office to be questioned by Wood.

After informing Jones that five charges were made against him, Wood discharged him on July 8, 1937. The only charge described was the one made by Townsley, and even with respect to that he was not told who had made the complaint. After Jones' request to be allowed to face his accuser was denied, he offered no explanation but accepted his discharge as final.

McNabb, a foreman, told several employees that Jones lost his job because of his union activities and intimated that it should serve as a warning to others. The requests for reinstatement made by Jones and by the union committee, in his behalf, were refused.

Jones has been employed, since July 24, 1937, at the Matson Machine Company at Rockford, Illinois, earning approximately \$30 per week, but he wishes to be reinstated to his job with the respondent.

Upon all the evidence in this case, we find that the respondent discharged John H. Jones because of his activities in behalf of the Machinists.

Forrest C. Boulby had been employed by the respondent since August 1936. On June 2, 1937, he joined the Machinists and was

responsible for signing up 20-25 members for the organization. He was discharged on July 24, 1937.

The respondent claims that Boulby was discharged by his foreman for inefficiency. The fact that Boulby received four raises in less than a year's time from 50 cents per hour to 62½ cents in the respondent's employ seems to disprove the charge that he was an inefficient workman. We can give little credence to the explanation offered on behalf of the respondent that raises were given to Boulby because he started at a low rate and because it was hoped that an increase of his earnings would "pep him up."

Boulby criticized the tactics of the Employees Association several times before its officers. They knew that he was a member of the Machinists. On July 23, 1937, Brant, treasurer of the Employees Association, was cursing "the high salaried organizers whom the workers support to create trouble." Boulby's answer defending them infuriated Brant, and the latter immediately left in the direction of the office. The same day Boulby was told by his foreman, McNabb, that his services could not be used after July 24, 1937. Boulby was one of the employees whom McNabb advised that if he joined a union he should be sure to join the right one.

Up to the time of the hearing, Boulby had earned approximately \$215 in the employ of W. T. and John Barnes, Rockford, Illinois.

Upon all the evidence in this case, we find that the respondent discharged Forrest C. Boulby because of his activities in behalf of the Machinists.

Stanlie Swinconos and George Tucker. Swinconos had been employed by the respondent in its shipping department for approximately one year, earning 55 cents per hour. He became a member of the Machinists early in June 1937 and was active in trying to sign up members in his department. He was discharged on July 12, 1937.

George Tucker had been employed by the respondent for 9 weeks in the shipping department up to the time of his discharge, on July 12, 1937. He received two raises, only one of which was a general raise. He earned 50 cents per hour. He joined the Employees Association on May 28, 1937, but withdrew from it a month later, and on July 1 he became a member of the Machinists. Thereafter he solicited members for the Machinists. His foreman testified that Tucker was a good workman but that outside activities and his association with Swinconos diminished his enthusiasm for his job.

On Friday evening, July 11, Swinconos, Tucker, and Milton Burger, who also works in the shipping department and is a member of the Employees Association, went to a party together. The next morning Burger was sick and did not come to work. Swinconos and Tucker worked all morning but during the noon hour, when they tried to eat their lunch, both became sick and went home. They

testified that since they did not see their foreman on the floor, they left word for him with Sowl. Sowl denied that they spoke to him. The following Monday when Swinonos and Tucker came to work, they were told that since they had left the plant without permission, they were discharged. The only reprimand Burger received was his foreman's statement that he should do his celebrating on Saturday night, instead of Friday. Attempts of the Machinists to have Swinonos and Tucker reinstated were without success.

Swinonos was employed at the International Harvester Company, Rock Island, Illinois, beginning a month after his discharge and earned about \$30 per week.

At the time of the hearing Tucker was employed by Lutey Brothers Construction Company and had earned \$115 up to that time.

Upon all the evidence, we find that Stanlie Swinonos and George Tucker were discharged by the respondent because of their activities in behalf of the Machinists.

IV. THE QUESTION CONCERNING REPRESENTATION

We find that a question has arisen concerning the representation of employees of the Beloit Iron Works.

V. THE EFFECT OF THE UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES AND THE QUESTION CONCERNING REPRESENTATION UPON COMMERCE

We find that the activities of the respondent set forth in Section III above and the question concerning representation which has arisen, 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.

VI. THE APPROPRIATE UNIT

The P. M. L. claims that all of the employees engaged in pattern making constitute a unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining. This claim was not disputed either by the other bona fide union involved in the case or by the respondent. The pattern shop is in a separate building by itself. The pattern makers are highly skilled employees. In addition, 32 out of 34 men in this group designated the Pattern Makers as their representative for the purposes of collective bargaining.

We, therefore, find that the pattern makers employed by the respondent constitute a unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining and that said unit will insure to the respondent's employees the full benefit of their right to self-organization and to collective bargaining and otherwise effectuate the policies of the Act.

VII. THE DETERMINATION OF REPRESENTATIVES

The P. M. L., in support of its claim to represent a majority of the pattern makers employed by the Company, submitted a list of its membership which, checked against the respondent's pay roll of October 28, 1937, showed that 33 of the 34 pattern makers are members of the P. M. L. The respondent has disproved the claim of membership as to only one, Park March, who testified that he withdrew from the P. M. L. and joined the Employees Association.

We find that the P. M. L. has been designated and selected by a majority of the pattern makers for the purposes of collective bargaining and we will so certify.

THE REMEDY

Inasmuch as we have found that the respondent has dominated and interfered with the formation and administration of the Employees Association and contributed support to it, the respondent must withdraw all recognition from the Employees Association as an organization representative of its employees for the purposes of dealing with the respondent concerning wages, hours of employment, and other conditions of employment. We will, therefore, order the immediate disestablishment of the Employees Association as such representatives.

Since John H. Jones, Forrest C. Boulby, Stanlie Swinonos, and George Tucker were dismissed as the result of unfair labor practices, we shall order their reinstatement to their former positions with the back pay in the amounts they would normally have earned less any amounts earned in the meantime.

Upon the basis of the foregoing findings of fact, and upon the entire record in the case, the Board makes the following:

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. International Association of Machinists, and Pattern Makers League of North America, both affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and Beloit Iron Works Employees Association, are labor organizations within the meaning of Section 2 (5) of the Act.

2. The respondent, by dominating and interfering with the formation and administration of the Beloit Iron Works Employees Association and by contributing support to said organization, has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices, within the meaning of Section 8 (2) of the Act.

3. The respondent, by discriminating against John H. Jones, Forrest C. Boulby, Stanlie Swinonos, and George Tucker, in regard to hire and tenure of employment, thereby discouraging membership in

the International Association of Machinists, has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices, within the meaning of Section 8 (3) of the Act.

4. The respondent, by interfering with, restraining, and coercing its employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed by Section 7 of the Act, has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices, within the meaning of Section 8 (1) of the Act.

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

6. A question affecting commerce has arisen concerning the representation of employees of the respondent, within the meaning of Section 9 (c) and Section 2 (6) and (7) of the Act.

7. The pattern makers employed by the respondent constitute a unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining, within the meaning of Section 9 (b) of the Act.

ORDER

Upon the basis of the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, and pursuant to Section 10 (c) of the National Labor Relations Act, the National Labor Relations Board hereby orders that the respondent, Beloit Iron Works, Beloit, Wisconsin, and its officers, agents, successors, and assigns shall:

1. Cease and desist:

(a) From dominating or interfering with the administration of the Beloit Iron Works Employees Association, or with the formation or administration of any other labor organization of its employees, and from contributing support thereto;

(b) From discouraging membership in the International Association of Machinists or any other labor organization of its employees by discriminating in regard to hire or tenure of employment or any term or condition of employment;

(c) From in any other manner interfering with, restraining, or coercing its employees in the exercise of their rights to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities for the purposes of collective bargaining and other mutual aid or protection, as guaranteed by Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act.

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

(a) Withdraw all recognition from Beloit Iron Employees Association as a representative of any of its employees for the purpose of dealing with the respondent concerning grievances, labor disputes,

wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work, and completely disestablish said organization as such representative;

(b) Offer John H. Jones, Forrest C. Boulby, Stanlie Swinonos, and George Tucker immediate and full reinstatement to their former positions, without prejudice to their seniority or other rights and privileges;

(c) Make whole said John H. Jones, Forrest C. Boulby, Stanlie Swinonos, and George Tucker for any loss of pay they have suffered by reason of their discharge by payment to each of them of a sum of money equal to that which he normally would have earned as wages during the period from the date of his discharge to the date of such offer of reinstatement, less the amount he has earned during such period;

(d) Post immediately notices to its employees in conspicuous places throughout its plant and maintain such notices for a period of thirty (30) consecutive days from the date of posting stating (1) that the respondent will cease and desist as aforesaid, and (2) that Beloit Iron Works Employees Association is disestablished as the representative of any of its employees for the purpose of dealing with the respondent concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or other conditions of employment, and that the respondent will refrain from any recognition thereof;

(e) Notify the Regional Director for the Twelfth Region in writing within ten (10) days from the date of this order what steps the respondent has taken to comply therewith.

CERTIFICATION OF REPRESENTATIVES

By virtue of and pursuant to the power vested in the National Labor Relations Board by Section 9 (c) of the National Labor Relations Act, and pursuant to Article III, Section 8, of National Labor Relations Board Rules and Regulations—Series 1, as amended,

IT IS HEREBY CERTIFIED that Pattern Makers League of North America has been designated and selected by a majority of the pattern makers employed by Beloit Iron Works, Beloit, Wisconsin, as their representative for the purposes of collective bargaining and that, pursuant to the provisions of Section 9 (a) of the Act, Pattern Makers League of North America is the exclusive representative of all such employees for the purposes of collective bargaining in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment and other conditions of employment.