



Contract Proposal Exposed; Tell Your Delegates to Vote No On Extension

The LWC has uncovered information that confirms a backroom deal, despite claims by ILA President Richard Hughes that no secret discussions have taken place, that no agreements have been reached with management and that there is nothing in writing to send to the Wage Scale Committee delegates--our elected bargaining committee--or members.

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR OUTLINE & ANALYSIS OF A POSSIBLE CONTRACT DEAL

Hughes and the USMX want a deal desperately. USMX top negotiators will likely present this deal to the Wage Scale Committee, which is meeting in Orlando, Florida, on September 1. They will likely have the authority to put more money on the table.

Hughes may pretend not to know the details of this proposal. They may go through a well-rehearsed song and dance to get USMX to improve the deal minimally and Hughes may call for a vote in Orlando to get an extension passed. He'll hope to convince delegates that they have gotten all they can from the USMX and ask them to vote immediately.

WE WON'T FALL FOR A DOG & PONY SHOW

Without concrete information from the USMX about our industry, now is not the time to settle a contract. If we do not deal with technology, lost jurisdiction, and non-union work, we will lose job security. We must evaluate any proposal against our list of demands and information and research we have about the industry.

LWC Pickets ILA E-Board Meeting; Hughes Shuts It Down After 15 Mins.



Over 55 members from six ports, including Miami and Charleston, travelled to Washington D.C. on August 26 to protest a possible contract extension at an emergency ILA International Executive Board meeting called by President Richard Hughes.

A delegation of LWC members tried to get into the meeting to present a prepared statement against the extension that would give up our October wage increases. Hughes refused to let the rank-and-file members in.

As the picket grew in energy outside, inside the boardroom Executive VP Harold Daggett tried to speak about the contract. Hughes shut down the meeting in response.

Bobby Gleason, ILA Secretary-Treasurer and Jim McNamara, ILA Public Relations, came out to the picket to explain that they did not know about a contract deal and that the meeting had been shut down.

LWC members had an impact, showing that not involving the rank-and-file will come at a cost for the ILA leadership.

ILA Members Deserve a Contract That:

Ends wage tiers ● Ends the royalty cap ● Has job security against technology and lost jurisdiction ● Protects local benefits ● Improves safety ● Gets us our fair share



PIER PRESSURE

VOICE OF THE ILA RANK & FILE

104 Montgomery St, Brooklyn, NY 11225 • 718-865-8782 • www.lwcjustice.com • info@lwcjustice.com

Summary of Secret Contract Proposal

PLEASE POST & DISTRIBUTE—August 2009

The LWC has seen a USMX memo from early August confirming “quiet discussions with the ILA” for several months for a Master Contract extension and stating that “a tentative agreement had been reached on the deferral of the wage increase due on October 1st.” Following the memo was a three page counterproposal to the ILA. This indicates that there has been an exchange of proposals.

<p>Wages</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ October 2009 wage freeze. Workers give up approx. \$40 million in wages & ILA loses \$2 million in dues. We give up what we already have. USMX and ILA are calling this a wage deferral, but it is a freeze since there is no additional wage increase in 2010. ■ \$1 increase of top rate in 2012. This means that between 2008 and 2012 the top tier's wages will only increase \$2. ■ Increase start rate to \$20/hr (from \$16/hr). This will cost the employers next to nothing over the life of the contract given a likely hiring freeze due to the economy. The minimum should be raised to the ILWU standard of \$25/hr. ■ Wage increases in 2012 based on years in industry. USMX and ILA are calling this a “wage bridge.” But with the 2009 wage freeze and benefit freeze (see below), it is close to the same pattern of \$2 every other year and not much different than standard wage increases backloaded to the end of the contract.
<p>Benefits</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Freeze Container Royalty Fund #4 at \$1.20 per ton. We would give up \$0.25/ton increase to our health care plan, MILA. Based on USMX estimate of 100 million tons, the employers gain \$2.5 million. This is money we already negotiated. It could put MILA at jeopardy in future. ■ Lift the Container Royalty Cap & Cap on Supplemental Wage Benefit. The employers would give up their claim on 40% of the cap excess. But funding for MILA would be eliminated and funding for local benefits would be shifted to the Container Royalty Fund #5. With the decrease on tonnage many members will not see a significant increase in their royalty check. Many members may not even make their hours for the check. ■ Eliminate the Container Freight Station Fund (CFS). We would give up \$0.30/ton and based on USMX estimate of 100 million tons, this means losing \$3 million. ■ Create Container Royalty Fund #5. This would cost nothing to the employers since they are shifting the CFS fund money and frozen MILA money to this fund.
<p>Technology, Jurisdiction & Non-Union Work</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No language on technology. Without controlling the use of labor-saving technology, union jobs will be replaced and new work will not be done by ILA members. ■ No resolution of ILA jurisdiction. In many places management refuses to recognize the ILA. This means a loss of good union jobs, less job security and a weaker ILA. ■ No language on non-union work. More employers are outsourcing union work. Non-union longshore work is growing. We must deal with this threat.
<p>Safety</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No language on safety. This means that as productivity increases and work speeds-up, we have no coast-wide standards for safety or staffing minimums, making our jobs more dangerous.
<p>Local Negotiations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No local negotiations. There would be no local negotiations for pensions, local work rules and local benefits under the proposed extension. Many local ports have burning economic and non-economic issues to resolve and under this extension those would have to wait another 8 years, until 2012.