As the economy goes down and waves of layoffs sweep workers overboard, President Bush gets set to propose new life preservers ... for the rich.

When the US Labor Department announced last month that nearly one-quarter million Americans lost their jobs during November, politicians scrambled to show their concern. Our elected leaders, including President George Bush, claimed to finally grasp what millions of Americans have known for many months: the US economy is not recovering.

By Eric Wolfe

PG&E worker learns:
Casual use of pot brings serious consequences

As a rule, Judy doesn't smoke pot. But when some weed came her way at a party in September of last year, Judy didn't pass it up. Judy (not her real name) didn't have much reason to connect her occasional use of marijuana with her job at PG&E. She didn't go to work high and her job performance had never been impaired by drug use. Like hundreds of thousands of Americans, she was a casual user of marijuana. By almost any measure, she did not have a drug problem.

Until the following Monday, that is. On that day Judy was tested for drugs as part of PG&E's random drug testing program. For Judy, it was the beginning of a very bad dream.

Shortly after her test, Judy received a call at work—on her boss's line. It was Human Resources, instructing her to call the Medical Review Officer (MRO) about her drug test. The MRO told Judy that she had tested positive for marijuana.

"He asked me if I was on any medication," said Judy. "I said 'No' and he said 'Thank you and goodbye.'"

Within five minutes she got another call from Human Resources informing her that she was relieved of her job duties.

Up to now Judy had not

Women's Conference

Local 1245's annual conference for union women will be held Feb. 22 and 23 in Concord, Ca. For information on how to register, contact your business representative.
Workers here and abroad

Rolling the union on...

Teamster turnaround: Reform candidate Ron Carey was elected president of the 1.6 million-member Teamsters union, upsetting two candidates tied to the old leadership. The democratic, rank and file vote was mandated by the federal government, which put the union under the federal administrator two years ago in an effort to rid the union of alleged ties to organized crime. Carey’s victory was hailed by members of the Teamsters for a Democratic Union, a dissident group that had organized against the old guard for over a decade.

Victory in Canada: The union-supported New Democratic Party won elections in two more Canadian provinces: British Columbia and Saskatchewan. The New Democrats now govern 52 percent of Canada’s population on the provincial level. The NDP won Ontario a year ago and the Yukon Territory the year before that.

Golden Turkey: The Longshoremans’ monthly newspaper The Dispatcher presented a 1991 Golden Turkey award to US Postal Service management for refusing to reimburse Gulf War reservists for the pay they lost when they exchanged their postal blues for desert camouflage. However, fiscal restraint did not prevent the Postal Service from shelling out $20 million in management bonuses over three years, the Dispatcher noted.

Hold, please: Another Golden Turkey was awarded to Whirlpool Corporation, which refused to let employee Hayden Hise receive four emergency calls at work while his house was burning down. Whirlpool later offered him a free refrigerator as a consolation, but Hise rejected it because he and other union members at the Fort Smith, Ark., plant had been working without a contract for over a year and were boycotting Whirlpool products. A union fundraiser was held to help Hise get a new fridge.

A good thing: Despite the loss of 4 million union members over the past 10 years, British trade unions still represent more than 40 percent of the national workforce in Britain. Seven in ten Britains view trade unions as “a good thing.”

Retirement insecurity: Soaring health care costs will destroy retirement security for many Americans retiring in the next century, according to a study by Northwestern National Life Insurance reported in the Wall Street Journal. A typical married couple retiring in 2001 and needing home care for one person will deplete assets by age 74, the study found. Some 53 percent of workers polled think employers will offer health insurance in retirement, but only 32 percent of employers offer such plans and a fourth of those expect to trim or drop them.

Heal: That’s the name chosen by a coalition of 300 businesses, insurance companies, and health care providers opposed to national health insurance, Labor Notes reports.

Outside Line Construction

Members of Local 1245 in Outside Line Construction were at work in Livermore, Ca. when these pictures were taken. Above, from left, are: Ed Brockman, steward, Todd Landolt and Craig Skelton. At left, from left are: Randy Bartlett, John Orsua, Rob Arnold, Todd Landolt, Todd Johnson, Craig Skelton, Ron Blair and Ed Brockman. (Photos: Art Murray)
SMUD workers reject ‘flex benefit’ plan

Members of Local 1245 employed by the Sacramento Municipal Utility District overwhelmingly rejected a District proposal for “flex” benefits.

SMUD had made the implementation of a flex benefits plan a high priority. Under the plan, all benefits would be lumped together and a dollar amount established. Individual employees would then be free to apply their benefit dollars to whichever benefit program they wished.

Despite the apparent advantages to giving employees an individual choice in allocating benefit dollars, the union believed the plan carried hidden dangers.

Who are these people? They are the business representatives, the Advisory Council members, the office staff, the unit chairpersons, the Executive Board members, the shop stewards, the assistant business managers and their staffs.

These people are the human glue that hold the organization of Local 1245 together. The majority of them do not know what a 40-hour week means because they work far in excess of those hours.

They are dedicated, believe in organized labor and are always ready to offer their services to the best of their abilities to the rank and file. So, please always keep a place in your heart for those sisters and brothers of ours who serve so devotedly.

They should not be forgotten.

Tom Riley is president of the Retirees Club.

By Tom Riley

The New Year: problems & promise

Jack McNally, IBEW 1245 Business Manager

In 1991 we reflected upon our first 30 years as a Local Union and the first 100 years of the IBEW. We enter 1992 with the hope that we can do as well in the decades to come.

Many of the issues of 1991 will continue to confront us in the New Year, such as electric and magnetic fields (EMF), drug testing, and health care.

We also will continue to confront the problem of anti-union employers, like Arbor Tree Co., the line clearing tree contractor which attacks the rights of its employees and depresses wages for the industry as a whole. Unfortunately, PG&E continues to consider this vile employer a viable contractor.

EMF is an issue of continuing concern to us. We will again support legislation mandating further study of this issue by the Department of Health Services and the Public Utilities Commission. The union will monitor all available scientific data until we have an answer to the question of whether EMF poses a hazard to our members.

Attempts to expand drug testing will be made by the US Department of Transportation and most likely by the State of California as well. Although the tide of federal law seems to be running against us, the union will continue to do all it can to protect our members against unreasonable invasions of their privacy.

Rapidly rising health care costs will continue to be a major issue in all of our contracts. We are doing all we can to protect our members from the erosion of their benefits, but it is becoming clear that major reform of the nation’s health care system is needed. Our union will continue to back the AFL-CIO’s efforts to bring about a more rational health care system.

But health care costs, in reality, are part of a larger problem. The California economy, like the US as a whole, is mired in a recession that is showing no signs of going away. The homeless population is growing, major layoffs are announced with depressing regularity, and the remaining jobs tend more and more to be low-paying or only part-time.

A new direction is needed if our economy is to regain its vitality. This year’s national elections will give our members and the American people a chance to evaluate where we are and where we want to go.

Californians will be in the unusual position of electing two US Senators this year. Our members should examine the candidates carefully. Despite what they may say, not all candidates have the best interests of working people at heart. It is worth taking the time to find out where candidates stand on the Workplace Fairness Bill (outlawing the use of scabs to permanently replace strikers), health care reform, and other key economic issues.

And so begins the New Year. As always, the future is in our hands. Let’s do everything we can to make it a happier and more prosperous one for ourselves and our children.
A view from the UK

Trade union leader Paul Gallagher offers his thoughts on politics, worker safety, and the need for global cooperation between unions.

Paul Gallagher is General-Secretary of the Electrical, Electronic, Telecommunications & Plumbing Union in the United Kingdom (UK). Like the IBEW, his union was first chartered a century ago. The EET&P represents skilled electricians in construction, manufacturing, power generation, and the telephone industry. The union also represents plumbers and has a white collar section that represents divers, engineers and chemists, among others.

Gallagher’s fall tour of the US included a visit to the IBEW Centennial convention in St. Louis in October. He spoke with the Utility Reporter during a visit to Local 1245 headquarters in Walnut Creek.

Utility Reporter: Has the Labor Party made a difference in the lives of working people in the UK, now or in the past?

Gallagher: In the past it’s meant we could influence legislation quite effectively. That’s the good news. The downside is the public perceived the Labor Party to be a puppet of the trade unions... The new leader, Kinnick, has made it clear that he and the Labor Party will determine policy. They will consult with the unions and they’ll deal fairly with the unions, but they won’t jump to our tune. And I think he’s right.

UR: Will that diminish your ability to wield influence on behalf of your members?

Gallagher: Yeah.

UR: Why is that a good thing?

Gallagher: The result of being able to wield all this influence has been to put the Labor Party in a position where it wasn’t capable of being elected. The public just wasn’t prepared to tolerate that sort of thing. I think it’s better to have a reasonable degree of political influence than what we’ve had for the last 14 years, which is none. The current Conservative government has no time whatsoever for trade unions.

In the UK the Labor Party will determine it’s policy and it will apply that policy in Parliament. The Labor whips will insure that the Labor Members of Parliament (MPs) vote in that way. If an MP consistently refuses, then he would have to become an independent. So when we talk to the Labor Party, it’s with the knowledge that they can deliver [votes].

In the UK the Labor Party will determine it’s policy and it will apply that policy in Parliament. The Labor whips will insure that the Labor Members of Parliament (MPs) vote in that way. If an MP consistently refuses, then he would have to become an independent. So when we talk to the Labor Party, it’s with the knowledge that they can deliver [votes].

UR: In this country the Democrats profess to support working people, but when it comes to crucial votes on labor issues they often abandon us.

Gallagher: The American system doesn’t have party discipline. I don’t see how you could say to the Democratic Party, “Look we’ll do a deal with you. This is what we want, and this is what we’ll do in return.” The Democratic Party can’t deliver anything because individual Senators and Congressmen can vote any way they want to. The party has no effective control. How you can do a deal in that scenario, I don’t know.

In the UK you can say to the party, “This is what we want, and this is what we’ll do in return.” The Labor Party can deliver.

UR: Some US union leaders are talking about creating a Labor Party in the United States.

Gallagher: I don’t think it’s realistic. I think you should concentrate on trying to defeat Bush before you create new parties. Anybody can establish a political party. But the only reason for forming a political party is to win power. If you’ve got a political party and you don’t have much power, then it’s a waste of time... I look at the relatively small number of people that are in trade unions [in the US]—that’s the constituency that you’re going to be talking about, who are going to support a Labor Party. I just don’t think it’s big enough to win many seats.

UR: Do you see the Labor Party in ascendancy in the UK?

Gallagher: Yes, I do. The latest we can have elections is by July [1992]. The Prime Minister is playing the game that Bush is playing, and that’s to dominate the world stage. But I don’t think British elections or US elections are won on the international stage. It’s whether you’ve got any employment, it’s how much you’re paying in taxes, it’s whether you’ve got decent housing, it’s about health care, it’s about the whole range of affairs that people in the country face every day.

In the national and economic sense, as far as the working man and woman is concerned, I think this Conservative government has been
an absolute disaster and I think people are sick and tired of it.

UR: Are there parallels with economic problems brought on by conservative presidents in the United States and the United Kingdom?

Gallagher: Unemployment's increased substantially. We've seen our manufacturing industry practically destroyed. We've seen research and training go through the window. Our national health service is badly underfunded.

UR: In the US, strikes often harm the workers more than help them because under current US law employers can just permanently replace the strikers. Is striking still a useful strategy in the UK?

Gallagher: Our union endorses between 25 and 30 strikes a month. I don't think there's any day in which there's not a group of sparks somewhere in the country on strike. By and large we haven't seen employers acting with the viciousness of the American employers for a hell of a long time... I really don't think the average British company within the boundaries of the UK would want to see these SWAT teams and all this kind of garbage outside his plant. He wants his plant to be a place of work, not a fortress.

UR: Could you comment on health and safety issues in your union?

Gallagher: I'm one of nine of her Majesty's health and safety commissioners. When any regulations are to be changed, it is the Health and Safety Commission which has formally agreed to those changes and to recommend legislation if necessary to the appropriate minister. A major task of the Health and Safety executive, as well as investigating complaints and problems, is to constantly troll over the whole of our safety legislation to make sure it's still relevant, and where in the view of the executive it's either dated or can be made simpler or to work better, then the obligation is to put before the commission the necessary changes that need to be made.

UR: Please characterize the negotiating process and the ways the rank and file are involved in presiding over your union's agenda.

Gallagher: We have two forms of negotiation: the national agreement, which applies throughout the whole of the UK and local agreements which may apply to a plant or series of plants in a given part of the country. For the national agreement, our union has a series of industrial conferences every year. For example, in the supply industry, lineemen and this kind of guy: every shop steward who works in the supply industry is invited to a one-day conference. That conference is chaired by the executive council member for that region. It is attended by the national officer of the industry. And the conference will put to the negotiators the priorities they want to see—both the local and the national. They will elect an area committee which meets four times a year under the chairmanship of the executive councilor, who is the equivalent of your business manager and he sits on the national body of the union.) So that will deal with the local priorities—how we apply the national agreement, etc., and they will take the local official to task if they don't feel he's performing properly and they will explain their priorities. For each of our 14 regions we elect a national committee, [which] meets with the national officers and the national negotiators and agrees to the priorities. During the negotiations the committees convene so that we can give a report back to them and explain the scene we're involved in in negotiations so that we can learn how they see it. At the end of the negotiations, the national officers, the executive members responsible for the conferences, will talk to the national committee and then will make a recommendation to our members. Every single member receives a ballot paper. The offer's explained in precise detail. He's asked does he accept the offer or reject the offer. If our members reject the offer, the question will be asked, are we prepared to strike? If our members say yes, then action will commence and we will support our members.

UR: Do you ever have a majority that says an agreement isn't acceptable but you don't have a majority for a strike?

Gallagher: Yes. If a majority says no, but at the same time says we don't want to strike, then the employer's got a really unhappy workforce. If he's not careful that aggravation can ferment. So I think it's in the interest of the employer to meet with the union, and say, why have we got this, what can we do?

UR: If the Labor Party takes power in the UK in 1992, what would you like to see as its priorities in terms of working people?

Gallagher: We've got to start turning the economy around. We've got to see interest rates beginning to come down. We've got to see a closer co-operation with Europe, acceptance of fairer laws as far as trade union people are concerned. The initial benefit will be a government that just really cares about working people. I don't believe the current one does, anymore than I believe the Bush administration cares about working people.

UR: One of the legacies of the right-wing administrations we've had in the US for the past decade is erosion of the infrastructure. Are there comparable problems in Britain?

Gallagher: Yes. We've had a cutback on our road-building programs. Our railways are not in particularly good shape. Public transport was deregulated some time ago. [That was] not particularly beneficial. The national health service is in need of massive investment. Many of the hospitals are in a very poor state. Our schools are in a poor state. We need more teachers, the books the kids use are dated.

UR: Sometimes when US unions try to persuade their members to support political candidates who are good on economic issues, many in the rank and file will refuse to support them because they disagree with the candidate's stand on an emotionally charged issue, such as abortion or gun control. Do you have these "one-issue" voters in Britain?

Gallagher: Certainly on a number of issues people have tried to make it the outstanding issue, but our experience is that it doesn't wash. People when they vote look at a whole range of issues. I think the most important one is the economic issue, how they are going to be affected. How they're going to fare, how their family's going to fare, how they're going to be cured properly in the national health insurance, how they're going to have a reasonable pension, how they're going to have a reasonable standard of life.

Paul Gallagher
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Possibility number one: Cut income taxes for the middle class on the assumption that they will go out and spend the money, which will stimulate more production.

The level of tax cuts being discussed would amount to about $300 per family, or $6 per week. While this might provide some mild stimulation to the economy by increasing demand for goods and services, it would also add to an already huge budget deficit and could drive interest rates back up. That would be likely to dampen any recovery.

Possibility number two: Cut taxes for the middle class and offset them with a corresponding tax hike on the rich.

From the standpoint of economic justice, there are strong arguments for making the rich pay more, considering the handsome profits they received from tax breaks under Reagan. But virtually no economists believe this sort of tax reform would help revive the staggeringly bad economy.

Then, what can we do? Must America sit back while millions suffer and "let the business cycle run its course" as some economists are recommending?

Or is there another way?

Going someplace

In all the debate over "stimulating" the economy, the so-called experts are failing to ask the most fundamental question: Is the economy worth saving, or do we just want the economy to run like mad—with speculation, corporate takeovers, runaway plants—as it did in the 1980s? Or do we want it to run someplace?

While tax cuts may provide small stimulative punch, there is far stronger and more effective medicine available for the American economy: public investment.

It has become all too clear in recent years that America's lack of public investment has done serious damage to our economy. Business cannot function properly when the highways are disintegrating, bridges collapse, and public water systems fall apart. Business cannot function properly when there is no affordable housing for its workers, when schools cease to educate, when its workers can't afford health care, when no programs exist to retrain adult workers for the jobs of tomorrow.

As Jeff Faux of the Economic Policy Institute noted in a just-published paper, recent research confirms that spending on public infrastructure and the growth of private investment are directly connected. The economist David Aschauer has calculated that in the long run each additional dollar of public infrastructure investment raises private investment by 45 cents.

President Bush's own budget director, Richard Darman, wrote last year that "it is intuitively apparent that some public investments, particularly those of infrastructure such as streets, highways, airports, and water and sewer systems—provide direct productive services and are complementary with private capital. Comparison over time and across countries seem to indicate that some relationship may exist between additions to such capital and growth."

The nation would receive substantial economic benefits as well from spending on education, training, early childhood programs and civil and military research and development. Faux writes:

"It has now become clear to most people that the neglect of public investment human capital, physical infrastructure, civil and military technology—in recent years is a significant drag on the nation's productivity and competitiveness. Whether compared with our own more prosperous past or with the investment performance of our major competitors, the rate at which we are investing in the future is inadequate."

Getting there

Is there a way to make a major investment in public infrastructure without making the federal deficit even worse than it is now? Faux argues convincingly that there is.

Virtually everyone agrees that significant savings can be made in the military budget now that the Cold War is over and Russia is petitioning to get into NATO, our former military alliance. President Bush apparently wants to see the next three to six months.

One-in-five pinched: Economist Audrey Freedman of the Conference Board, a business-research group, estimates that 25 million Americans—one of every five people in the workforce—were unemployed sometime during 1991.

Ha ha ha: "You didn't lose your job...you just joined the leisure class!" That's the message on one of 13 "humorous consolation" greeting cards designed by Pink Slip Productions of New York for people who've been laid off.

No return: In earlier recessions, factory or construction workers typically were sent home for several weeks or months. In this recession, many laid-off workers have little hope of ever being re-hired because the jobs have been wiped out permanently.

Aztecs revisited: In his book "White Knights and Poison Pills: A Cynic's Dictionary of Business Jargon" David Olive offers this definition of the term layoff: "An act of contrition in which senior management offers up the bodies of lesser employees as atonement for its misjudgments."

What a relief: The new wave of layoffs sweeping America is "bad news if you work for one of these companies, but it's probably good news if you are a stockholder," says George Perry of the Brookings Institution.
US Economy: sinking ship

From PAGE SEVEN

given a lot of thought to PG&E's drug testing program. She had been under the impression that you could get in trouble if you were a "regular" user of drugs, but that if you smoked a little pot once a month it was not a big deal.

She was also under the impression that "the MRO would determine if the person actually had a drug problem." But at PG&E, under federal mandate to perform random drug tests in certain job classifications, the positive test result was all it took to determine that Judy had a "drug problem." Judy was immediately directed to another PG&E office where she was told to read and sign a form.

What Judy was signing was a notice that she had been relieved of her duties, that she had one day to contact the MRO, that she had a right to see a shop steward prior to seeing a drug test, and that she had the "choice" to seek the assistance of a PG&E Employee Assistance Program (EAP) counselor or an alternative source of counseling.

Judy doesn't remember the part about her right to see a shop steward. "I was in a state of shock. Nothing went the way I thought it would go," she said. "I read the form but I wasn't absorbing what I read. You're extremely distraught at that time. You're in a state of shock."

Judy remembers then being sent to an EAP counselor, who seemed to give her a sympathetic hearing. At EAP, she said, "they listened to your side of the story." But quickly found out that "You can talk to them until you're blue in the face but it doesn't change a damn thing."

Through EAP, she was signed up for drug rehabilitation. Without benefit of seeing a shop steward, Judy had been tried, convicted and sentenced.

Some people, of course, will point out that Judy would not have been in this predicament if she hadn't used an illegal drug in the first place. However, cases like Judy's raise a larger issue: who do we want to police our lives? Invasion of privacy

As Americans, we have traditionally accepted that laws are enforced by the police, who in turn are answerable to democratically-elected public officials. With workplace drug-testing, this enforcement power is, in essence, handed over to the private sector. Even if an employer's on the job performance is above reproach, the employer can invade the employee's private life by means of a urine test.

The employer has become the cop. And once it is established that the employer has the right to police an employee's off-the-job behavior with respect to drugs, what will prevent employers from assuming even greater policing powers in the future?

If she had not thought about it before, Judy is certainly thinking about such things now. "I keep reflecting back to this George Orwell book [1984], where 'Big Brother' is watching you," said Judy. "Where does it end? What about my privacy rights? I don't feel somebody has the right to dictate your personal life. You do your job—what do you do in your private life is your own business."

As the courts show less and less interest in defending individual liberties, it has been up to unions to step into the breach, at least as far as drug testing goes. "I was in a state of shock. Nothing went the way I thought it would go."

After the federal drug testing regulations went into effect, Local 1245 negotiated a drug testing procedure with PG&E in order to protect individual rights as much as possible. The procedure requires that the testing be truly random so that it cannot be used to single out and harass particular individuals. It also requires that the testing remain a confidential matter and that a split sample be taken so that a second test can be conducted to verify the results of the first. The agreement also requires that an employee who tests positive be given a chance at rehabilitation rather than simply being fired.

Right to consult

Perhaps most important, the agreement requires that employees be notified of their right to consult with a union shop steward business representative who can advise them of their rights. "Unfortunately, employees may not be thinking clearly if they have just been told they are being relieved of their duties," said Local 1245 attorney Jane Brunner. "If you remember nothing else, you should remember you have a right to talk to a shop steward even before you talk to the Medical Review Officer. "And if you find out you are being relieved of your duties, you should definitely notify your shop steward."

Jane Brunner, Local 1245 attorney
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Bureau of Reclamation pact provides wage increases

A new one-year agreement with the US Bureau of Reclamation was ratified by members of Local 1245 on a 47-6 vote.

The new pact provides journeyman wage increases of 2.8 percent for most classifications. Wage increases for some classifications were higher based upon a wage survey.

The agreement took effect Jan. 1, 1992.

Serving on the union negotiating committee were Bill Chambers, Al Wright, Bob Scheide, Bob Gonzales and union Business Representative Gary Mai.

Healdsburg agreement ratified

Members of Local 1245 employed by the City of Healdsburg have ratified a new one-year Memorandum of Understanding.

The package, ratified on a 15-12 vote, includes a 9 percent wage hike for Public Works and the Parks Department and a 4.5 percent increase for clerical and electrical.

Serving on the bargaining committee for the union were Larry Giovannoni, Myra Young, Doug Boaz and Local 1245 staff attorney Tom Dalzell.

Underground agreement ratified

Local 1245 members in Outside Line Construction approved a new underground agreement by mailed ballot.

The package, affecting about 25 members working out of the Outside Line office in Sacramento, provides a 25-cent hourly increase by employers to the Lineco health plan. A retirement plan modeled on the District 10 plan was created, with the initial employer contribution pegged at 50-cents an hour.

Employer contributions to the National Electric Benefit Fund, the International retirement plan, were maintained at 3 percent.

The new agreement also contains a 4-10 clause, permitting the use of four ten-hour days in lieu of the traditional five 8-hour days.

British trade union leader

From PAGE FIVE can jobs for American workers. I can understand that. But it doesn't wash with the multinational corporations. They move about on a scale I find increasingly alarming and we have absolutely no way whatsoever of addressing them. If a multinational decides to take a decision in Los Angeles, I think the workers there are relatively powerless to do a great deal about it. But if the various unions in other parts of the world can cooperate we just may reverse the balance on that. I think we should start looking at a world federation of electrical trades unions.

UR: That's ambitious. Gallagher: I think we can do it. I think we've got to do it.

UR: Because of the internationalization of capital. Gallagher: Yeah. I'll give you an example. I was in Australia a couple of years ago and hooked on an agreement they had negotiated on multiskilling with a major British multi-national. (I say British, but when they're trans-national it doesn't really matter where they're from.) It was an agreement similar to one we had been negotiating in the UK. It was clear from reading the document in the UK that substantial chunks had been lifted from one to the other. Now that's management taking a look at the prevailing scene and doing the best deal it could. And I think we could have got a better deal in each of the countries if we had some closer coordination to see what was going on.

TCI-Reno pact wins approval

Cable TV workers employed by TCI in Reno approved a new three-year agreement 37-0.

Under the agreement negotiated by Local 1245, employees will receive annual wage increases of 5 to 8 percent depending on their classification. The agreement also provides more vacation time and institutes a new dental plan.

Although the agreement was approved by a unanimous vote, Local 1245 members remain in a dispute with TCI over a 401K plan which is available to other employees at TCI but not to Local 1245 members. Unfair labor practice charges have been filed against TCI over this matter.

The union represents clerical reps, installers and installer technicians, service technicians, system technicians, advanced technicians, converter prep workers and warehouse workers at TCI.

Serving on the negotiating committee were Nancy Miraglia, Craig Miraglia, Bill Wilkerson, Assistant Business Manager Orv Owen and Business Representative John Stralla.
On October 1, 1991, one day after it took over the South Lake Tahoe gas company formerly known as C.P. National, Washington Water and Power opened negotiations with the union.

On October 2 they had an agreement. "They wasted no time at all," said Harold Sheeran, shop steward and a member of the negotiating team. Sheeran decided he liked the new company's style. "Instead of sitting around the old hard table we had two nice suites at Harrahs," he noted.

WWP was prepared to offer substance along with the style. Although unionized employees had just received a 3 percent wage hike in July under their old contract—which still had two years left to run—they discovered that Washington Water and Power was prepared to put wages back up for discussion.

Under the new contract, wages went up 2.5 percent effective 10/1/91, to be followed by 5.5 percent increases on 10/1/92 and again on 10/1/93.

"I've done negotiations before and this was the smoothest I've ever seen," said Sheeran. "We got better benefits for about half the cost, plus we got a raise. That's something you just don't see these days."

"We did very well," said Local 1245 Business Representative John Stralla, who served on the negotiating team along with Sheeran, construction tech Bryan Wasson, and Local 1245 Assistant Business Manager Orv Owen.

One important feature in the new contract was the addition of a union security clause. The contract also made improvements to the group insurance plan, instituted a new retirement plan, and provided for seniority system-wide bidding that will include WWP facilities in Washington and Oregon. The company is headquartered in Seattle.

Other contract features include a "one-leave" policy that includes all types of leave, including sickness, accidents, and vacation, with a buy-back provision for unused leave. Leave will accrue at a rate of 18 days per year for one-year employees, going up to 38 days per year for employees with 29 years service or more.

Severance pay was also improved, Stralla noted. Under the old contract, employees on call-out duty got paid only for their actual time out. Now they will be paid a minimum of two hours on call-out duty.

In addition to offering a good contract, WWP has taken some other actions that please union members. Like providing car phones for the service trucks, something that the previous owner—Alltel—never did.

"Alltel was a telephone company but we never had telephones in our truck," noted Sheeran. "Figure that one out."

Gas serviceman Mike Rosenberg applauded the company's decision to provide servicemen with gas leak detectors.

"We've been trying to get leak detectors from day one," said Rosenberg. "They're willing to put money into [the operation] and give us what we need to do our job. We don't have to beg."

In addition to Sheeran, Wasson and Rosenberg, the new agreement will cover union members Dave Rust and Nick DeFrancisco, both gas servicemen, and Brian Piazzo, meter reader.

Although things were slow when the Utility Reporter visited WWP in December, things could soon get busy. According to Sheeran, WWP plans to expand its service areas to Christmas Valley and Upper Truckee next year.

"They've got propane now and they're going to switch to gas," said Sheeran. "If they have two or three appliances, it usually takes about 3-4 hours to convert the service to natural gas."
SCHOLARSHIP OPPORTUNITIES

IBEW members eligible for scholarships

The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers is now accepting applications from IBEW members for the IBEW Founders' Scholarship Program.

Each scholarship is worth up to a maximum of $12,000 for undergraduate study by IBEW members, (not their children).

Up to 12 scholarships may be awarded to IBEW members this year. A winner has up to eight years to complete his or her degree.

All applications forms, student records, and other required materials must be received by the Scholarship Administrator by Feb. 21, 1992.

Eligibility requirements, rules and other information are available from:

IBEW Scholarship
1125 - 15th Street NW
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 728-6090

State labor federation offers scholarships

The California Labor Federation has announced its 42nd Annual Scholarship Awards competition for graduating senior high school students.

Last year the federation awarded $500 scholarships to 62 graduating high school students. This year the federation will award 61 scholarships based on the candidate's score in a special examination and his or her four-year high school academic record. Applications are available through the high schools.

A two-hour examination will be held on Thursday, March 5, 1992, in each high school where applicants have filed. The federation must receive from the high school not later than Jan. 21, 1992, the applications and transcripts of students who will be participating.

For further information, write:
Education Committee
Calif. Labor Federation
417 Montgomery St.
Suite 300
San Francisco, CA 94104

Senate fellowships available to graduates

Eighteen college graduates will have an opportunity to become Senate staff members for 11 months beginning in October.

The 1992-93 California State Senate Fellow Program provides the fellows an opportunity to assist senators with a broad range of public policy issues. Their duties can include legislative research, bill analysis, constituent casework, and speech and press release drafting.

In addition, all fellows participate in seminars throughout the year with key people involved in the legislative process. Fellows will receive a stipend of $1560 per month in 1992-93, including health and dental benefits.

Filing deadline for applications is Feb. 19, 1992. For more information contact: Nettie Sabelhaus--(916) 278-6906

City College of San Francisco Labor Studies Program
Spring Semester, 1992
(415) 241-2219
Classes begin January 21, 1992

Health & Safety in the Workplace (3 units)
Mondays
Identifying workplace hazards and developing ways to control them. Instructor: Elaine Askari, UC Berkeley

Workplace Rights & Discrimination (3 units)
Mondays
Workers' legal and contractual rights. Instructor: Tanya Russell, labor attorney

Union Organizing (3 units)
Tuesdays

Steward Training (1 unit)
3 Saturdays:
2-29, 3/14, 3/28, 9-30 am-3:30 pm
Cloud Hall, 50 Phelan Ave.
Steward's role in grievance handling and building member solidarity. An introduction designed for new and aspiring stewards. Instructors: Tom Nesbitt, labor educator and Linda Gregory, AFSCME DC 57

Advanced Steward Training (1 unit)
3 Saturdays: 5-2, 5-9, 5-16, 9:30 am-3:30 pm
Arts Extension, 50 Phelan Ave.
For experienced stewards and representatives. How to handle more difficult situations with members and supervisors. Complex grievance issues. Instructor: Linda Gregory, AFSCME DC 57

Workplace Issues for Gay & Lesbian Workers (1 unit)
6 Wednesdays, Jan. 22-Feb. 26
Cloud Hall, 50 Phelan Ave.
Responding to job discrimination and using union protections. Instructor: Patti Roberts, labor attorney

WORKPLACE FAIRNESS BILL

* Five minutes is all it will take for one of the most important phone calls you'll ever make...for the future of your family and your job.

Call your Senator today. Urge them to vote yes on S.55. Then just to make sure, write them a short follow-up letter explaining how important the Workplace Fairness bill is to you and your family. That's what we did in the U.S.

City College of San Francisco
1855 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94110

House of Representatives last July. And we won by an overwhelming vote!

On Solidarity Day, we marched 325,000 strong in the streets of Washington. Let's keep the march going back home with our calls and letters.

Take Five* FOR THE WORKPLACE FAIRNESS BILL

Call your Senators today. Urge them to vote yes on S.55. Then just to make sure, write them a short follow-up letter explaining how important the Workplace Fairness bill is to you and your family.

That's what we did in the U.S.

Health & Safety in the Workplace (3 units)
Mondays
Identifying workplace hazards and developing ways to control them. Instructor: Elaine Askari, UC Berkeley

Workplace Rights & Discrimination (3 units)
Mondays
Workers' legal and contractual rights. Instructor: Tanya Russell, labor attorney

Union Organizing (3 units)
Tuesdays

Steward Training (1 unit)
3 Saturdays:
2-29, 3/14, 3/28, 9-30 am-3:30 pm
Cloud Hall, 50 Phelan Ave.
Steward's role in grievance handling and building member solidarity. An introduction designed for new and aspiring stewards. Instructors: Tom Nesbitt, labor educator and Linda Gregory, AFSCME DC 57

Advanced Steward Training (1 unit)
3 Saturdays: 5-2, 5-9, 5-16, 9:30 am-3:30 pm
Arts Extension, 50 Phelan Ave.
For experienced stewards and representatives. How to handle more difficult situations with members and supervisors. Complex grievance issues. Instructor: Linda Gregory, AFSCME DC 57

Workplace Issues for Gay & Lesbian Workers (1 unit)
6 Wednesdays, Jan. 22-Feb. 26
Cloud Hall, 50 Phelan Ave.
Responding to job discrimination and using union protections. Instructor: Patti Roberts, labor attorney

 Assertion Training (non-credit)
Friday, Feb. 21, 6-9 pm & Saturday, Feb. 22, 9 am-5 pm
OR Friday, April 24, 6-9 pm & Saturday, April 25, 9 am-5 pm
Location to be announced

Education = Power
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**SCHOLARSHIP OPPORTUNITIES**

**Local 1245 Trade and Vocational School Grant**

The purpose of these grants is to provide aid to the children of members to attain a trade or technical education.

1. The grants will be as follows: $500 per year, for up to two years for two candidates, as long as a passing grade is maintained, and a parent maintains membership in good standing in Local Union 1245.

2. In order to be a candidate in this contest, you must be a daughter or son, natural, legally adopted or a legal ward of a member of Local Union 1245. You must be a high school student who has graduated or is graduating in 1992. A copy of your diploma or a letter from your high school stating that you will graduate in 1992 must be attached to your application. Additionally, a letter of recommendation from your vocational teacher, department head, or school principal must accompany the application.

3. Applications may be secured by addressing the Recording Secretary of Local Union 1245, by calling the Union office, or by using the form printed in the Utility Reporter.

4. The grant will be made only to a candidate who intends to enroll full time in any industrial, technical or trade school, other than correspondence schools, which are accredited by the national Association of Trade and Technical Schools or the Association of Independent Colleges and Schools.

5. Applications must be mailed to IBEW Local Union 1245, PO Box 4790, Walnut Creek, CA 94596, by registered mail or certified mail only, and be postmarked no later than the first Monday of April each year (April 6, 1992).

6. Two names will be drawn by the Judge of the Competitive Scholarship Contest from those submitting applications. These two will be recipients of the grants.

7. Checks will be paid directly to the school upon presentation of tuition bills to the Local Union.

8. Presentation of awards will be made to recipients at the unit meeting nearest his/her residence following the drawing.

9. Each year the scholarship shall be presented at the Advisory Council meeting in May; the judge and a guest and the recipient and parents shall be invited, at Local Union expense, to present and receive the scholarship award.

10. A suitable trophy or plaque shall be purchased by the Local Union, at a cost not to exceed $75, to be presented to the scholarship recipient.

**Application for the Local 1245 Trade & Vocational School Grant for Members’ Children Enrolling in Technical, Industrial, or Trade Schools**

Sponsored by Local Union 1245
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO

PO Box 4790
Walnut Creek, CA 94596
(510) 933-6060

**Candidate Information**

Candidate’s Name __________________________ Birthdate __________________________
Address __________________________ City __________________________
State __________ Zip __________ Phone __________________________
High School __________________________ Graduation Date __________________________
Address of High School __________________________
What school do you expect to attend? __________________________
Where is it located? __________________________
What trade or craft will you be studying? __________________________
Why this particular skill? __________________________

Candidate’s signature __________________________ Date __________________________

**Statement of Member/Parent**

Name of Member/Parent __________________________
Employer __________________________ Location __________________________
I certify that I am a member in good standing of IBEW Local Union 1245, that the Candidate named above is my __________________________, and that the Candidate will graduate from high school during the term ending __________________________ 1992.
Signature of Member/Parent __________________________
Union Card No. __________________________
This is to certify that the above named Candidate is currently enrolled as a student at __________________________ and has or will be graduating in __________________________ 1992.

**Local 1245 Al Sandoval Memorial Competitive Scholarship**

The purpose of this contest is to provide a grant in aid for scholarships to colleges and junior colleges, thereby making financial assistance toward the attainment of a higher education.

1. The grant will be as follows: $500 per year, up to four (4) years, as long as a "C" (2.0) average is maintained, and a parent maintains membership in good standing in Local Union 1245.

2. In order to be a candidate in this contest, you must be a son or daughter, natural, legally adopted, or a legal ward of a member of Local Union 1245. You must also be a high school student who has graduated or is graduating in 1992. A copy of your diploma or a letter from your high school stating that you will graduate in 1992 must be attached to your scholarship application.

3. The scholarship grant will be made only to that candidate who intends to enroll full time in any college certified by their State Department of Education and accredited by the local accrediting association.

4. Application may be secured by addressing the Recording Secretary of Local Union 1245, by calling the Union office, or by using the form printed in the Utility Reporter.

5. Checks will be paid directly to the college upon presentation of tuition bills to the Local Union.

6. All applications shall be accompanied by a written essay, not to exceed five hundred (500) words, on the subject designated by the Executive Board.

7. Essays should be submitted on 8-1/2" by 11" paper, on one side, preferably typed and double spaced, with applicant's written signature at the conclusion of the essay.

8. Applications and essays must be mailed to IBEW, Local Union 1245, PO Box 4790, Walnut Creek, CA 94596, by registered or certified mail only, and be postmarked no later than the first Monday of each year (March 2, 1992).

9. Each year the scholarship shall be presented at the Advisory Council meeting in May; the judge and a guest and the recipient and parents shall be invited, at Local Union expense, to present and receive the scholarship award.

10. A suitable trophy or plaque shall be purchased by the Local Union, at a cost not to exceed $75, to be presented to the scholarship recipient.

**Application for the Al Sandoval Memorial Competitive Scholarship**

Sponsored by Local Union 1245
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO

PO Box 4790
Walnut Creek, CA 94596
(510) 933-6060

**Candidate’s Information**

Candidate’s Name __________________________ Birthdate __________________________
Address __________________________ City __________________________
State __________ Zip __________ Phone __________________________
High School __________________________ Graduation Date __________________________
Address of High School __________________________
What college or school do you expect to attend? __________________________
Where is it located? __________________________

Candidate’s Signature __________________________ Date __________________________

**Statement of Member/Parent**

Name of Member/Parent __________________________
Employer __________________________ Location __________________________
I certify that I am a member in good standing of IBEW Local Union 1245, that the Candidate named above is my __________________________, and that the Candidate will graduate from high school during the term ending __________________________ 1992.
Signature of Member/Parent __________________________
Union Card No. __________________________
This is to certify that the above named Candidate is currently enrolled as a student at __________________________ and has or will be graduating in __________________________ 1992.