Dock comp bill finally passes

WASHINGTON, DC—After almost three years of deadlock, the House and the Senate reached agreement on a bill of amendments to the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act and sent the measure to the White House for the President's signature.

The bill was cleared for passage in a House-Senate conference committee only after all the requirements of the concerned unions, including ILWU, were met. The relatively minor concessions agreed to by labor are limited to those that were specified a long time ago.

The measure preserves all longshore jurisdiction—including grain elevators—protects the worker's free choice of physician, and retains basic benefit levels, including Social Security rights. Death benefits are capped at the same level as total disability, and are limited to cases of death directly related to occupational injury or disease. Annual benefit adjustments for death or—continued on page 12

SeaWay steps on a few toes

SEATTLE—ILWU Puget Sound and Alaska Locals, together with the International and the Coast Committee, are reporting some progress in their attempt to achieve west coast longshore labor standards at the maverick, anti-union SeaWay Express Corp.

SeaWay began operations last spring, hauling its two triple-decker roll-on roll-off barges between Seattle and Seward twice a week, paying its nonunion longshoremen substantially below scale. Large demonstrations of ILWU members and other unions greeted the inauguration of service on both ends of the run.

SeaWay has also made a few other enemies along the way. Other unions, disturbed by the threat to living standards on both ends of the route, are rallying to the support of the ILWU. Environmentalists, as discussed below, are distressed over the company's casual attitude toward the tidelands of Resurrection Bay. And other employers on the Seattle-Alaska shipping industry are also reportedly disturbed by the rate war which SeaWay has initiated in what had been a stable and profitable trade.

A DISASTER

The company attempted to initiate break bulk service to Anchorage and Kenai in mid-August, but the maiden voyage was so disastrous that such service has been suspended, at least temporarily.

Arriving in the Kenai area on Saturday, August 25, SeaWay's barge—hauling by non-union tugs—ran aground twice before it finally smashed into the dock. The barge was unloaded two days later under police guard, and under the watchful eye of an area standards picket line set up by the ILWU, with the help of other area unions.

SeaWay was only routed back to Seward when general manager Fred Peil decided in midvoyage that the Anchorage facility was "too muddy" for use. Peil—well known to Puget Sound ILWU and IBU members for his attempt to break the EBU's organization in the Washington State Ferry System in 1978— stoutly denied that the naming of ILWU, AFL-CIO—continued on page 12
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Tax Justice, a coalition of consumer organized tax refunds from previous years, according to the analysis by Citizens for a FairTax, has been "a single blow" against corporate profits found that more than half of them paid no federal income taxes for at least one year. The masthead notes that it's the labor movement, for example, working hard. They built up the political structure which allowed them to seize control of the first three years to an unprecedented degree. If inflation has been restrained, it has more to do with the decline of the oil price, a series of good harvests, and the continuation of tight money policies initiated by the Federal Reserve under Jimmy Carter. The combination of enormous unemployment and military spending almost without limit have created the largest federal deficit in history. The prospect of continued deficits of nearly $250 billion a year threatens to abort economic recovery, by sending interest rates skyrocketing again, renewing inflation, and bringing on an even more painful recession within months after the last vote is in.

A DRAG ON THE MARKET

ILWU members have fared far better than those past four years. Our waterfront division has been insulated by the nature of the industry. All of us have been protected in many ways by the very nature of the union itself. We're not a very large group as little more than a drag on the free market, and is determined to create jobs of every kind, rather than more profits. He will attack the rich and the poor. The combination of enormous unemployment and military spending almost without limit have created the largest federal deficit in history. The prospect of continued deficits of nearly $250 billion a year threatens to abort economic recovery, by sending interest rates skyrocketing again, renewing inflation, and bringing on an even more painful recession within months after the last vote is in.

5. The company—hailed as an example of enlightened management—has not been at peace with the union. Reagan's term began in 1981 with a deliberately engineered recession, the worst since the thirties, raising the official, understated, unemployment rate to above 10%. A wave of plant closings has been caused by a number of home offices, unions, and large corporations throughout the Bay Area. BOYcott Bob Nixon entitled "If we pull to negotiate with the union, $30,000 in back pay and interest to the men of the United Food and Love, Inc., has forced over 1,800 members to the picket line. We want our work back at our pay.

4. The union—under threat of lockout by a company which paid not more than $3 an hour—has been a disaster. Reagan's term began in 1981 with a deliberately engineered recession, the worst since the thirties, raising the official, understated, unemployment rate to above 10%. A wave of plant closings has been caused by a number of home offices, unions, and large corporations throughout the Bay Area. BOYcott Bob Nixon entitled "If we pull to negotiate with the union, $30,000 in back pay and interest to the men of the United Food and Love, Inc., has forced over 1,800 members to the picket line. We want our work back at our pay.

3. The policy—under threat of lockout by a company which paid not more than $3 an hour—has been a disaster. Reagan's term began in 1981 with a deliberately engineered recession, the worst since the thirties, raising the official, understated, unemployment rate to above 10%. A wave of plant closings has been caused by a number of home offices, unions, and large corporations throughout the Bay Area. BOYcott Bob Nixon entitled "If we pull to negotiate with the union, $30,000 in back pay and interest to the men of the United Food and Love, Inc., has forced over 1,800 members to the picket line. We want our work back at our pay.

2. The people—under threat of lockout by a company which paid not more than $3 an hour—has been a disaster. Reagan's term began in 1981 with a deliberately engineered recession, the worst since the thirties, raising the official, understated, unemployment rate to above 10%. A wave of plant closings has been caused by a number of home offices, unions, and large corporations throughout the Bay Area. BOYcott Bob Nixon entitled "If we pull to negotiate with the union, $30,000 in back pay and interest to the men of the United Food and Love, Inc., has forced over 1,800 members to the picket line. We want our work back at our pay.

1. The government—under threat of lockout by a company which paid not more than $3 an hour—has been a disaster. Reagan's term began in 1981 with a deliberately engineered recession, the worst since the thirties, raising the official, understated, unemployment rate to above 10%. A wave of plant closings has been caused by a number of home offices, unions, and large corporations throughout the Bay Area. BOYcott Bob Nixon entitled "If we pull to negotiate with the union, $30,000 in back pay and interest to the men of the United Food and Love, Inc., has forced over 1,800 members to the picket line. We want our work back at our pay.

For the average American working man or woman, the last four years have been at best, extremely difficult. At worst, they have been a disaster. Reagan's term began in 1981 with a deliberately engineered recession, the worst since the thirties, raising the official, understated, unemployment rate to above 10%. A wave of plant closings has been caused by a number of home offices, unions, and large corporations throughout the Bay Area. BOYcott Bob Nixon entitled "If we pull to negotiate with the union, $30,000 in back pay and interest to the men of the United Food and Love, Inc., has forced over 1,800 members to the picket line. We want our work back at our pay.
Reagan's record speaks for itself

If you are a union activist—if you remember PATCO—you know why you are voting against Reagan.

If you are fearful of Reagan's actions in Central America and the Mid-East, you are ready to vote the GOP out.

If you are concerned about minority rights, women's rights, and the ERA, you know where the present administration stands.

If you've been paying more for school lunches or trying fruitlessly to find a college loan for your kid, you are aware of what four Reagan years have done to education programs.

If you are retired, near retirement, or helping to support a retired person, you know how four years of Reagan have threatened older Americans.

If you have a family member or friend who lost a job, you don't need more reasons to vote Democrat November 6.

But if you still aren't sure about this administration—we hope the materials on this page will help you make up your mind.

What recovery?

Despite the current recovery, the last four years, considered as a whole, have been a period of weak economic gain for America—and real loss for the poorest.

With the significant exception of the inflation rate, measures of growth and well being—gross national product, industrial production, job creation, housing construction—have all performed better in the Carter years than during the Reagan presidency.

By the end of the year, real GNP will have risen about 2 percent during the Reagan presidency. During the Carter years, it grew by 13.6 percent; the average rate for the years 1978-1981 was 6.3 percent.

Even more worrisome to the public and economists are the enormous federal deficits created by the president's tax and spending policies.

The prospect of continuing deficits of $200 billion a year has created an unusual consensus across the political spectrum that significant changes must be made in Reagan fiscal policy if the economy is to avoid another bout with recession or inflation.

Some people look at an inflation rate of below 5 percent and say that the inflation is over. Former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers during the Nixon and Ford administrations.

But such talk has been heard before, several times in the past 20 years, and it always turned out to be wrong. Inflation accelerated again.

To think that there has been some radical change in the economy or in politics which is about to hand us a generation of price stability would be risky.

Poverty soars

According to the Census Bureau, six million more people have been pushed into poverty since 1980, bringing the total to 38 million. Nearly one million have been added since last year despite Administration claims.

Nearly 40 percent of this recent increase in poverty has been among children below the age of six, one-fourth of all children below age six now live in poverty (more than half of all young black and Hispanic children).

Since the number of elderly poor has declined in recent years, largely thanks to increasing Social Security payments that may be threatened in any future round of budget-cutting, the overall increase in poverty has been for families with children, especially those headed by women. Nearly 43 percent of all poor families are headed by women who are not elderly.

And, the Census used after-tax figures on income, another three million people a household would have shown up as becoming poor in 1981-83.

Mortgaging the future

The federal deficit may seem far removed from the daily concerns of most Americans. True, the numbers handed about in the press—annual deficits of $200 billion and more for the rest of the decade, a national debt of $2.7 trillion by 1989—seem staggering and offensive to fiscal conservatives.

But most of us bear the debate as a distant, if slightly disturbing, background noise.

That perception will quickly change as rising interest rates bring home to everyone the fact that failure to cut the deficit is an indirect and devastating hit on the consumer's pocketbook.

The collision is unavoidable. As late as the 1970s, the federal government took only one of seven dollars in the capital pool to meet its financing needs. Today that figure is one of every four, and rising.

The Treasury has stepped up its borrowing to fund this year's deficit just as commercial borrowers have reached the point in the business cycle at which their borrowing needs are greatest. For the consumer the "crowding out" process has begun. The prime lending rate has begun to rise, pushing rates on consumer credit upward. Interest rates on fixed-rate home mortgages are fast approaching 14 percent again, a point at which only one family in six can qualify for a loan.

It's not hard to predict what will follow: Rising interest rates make housing and other important goods far less affordable for increasing numbers of consumers. With an estimated 2.5 million would-be homebuyers driven out of the market by every point that interest rates rise, housing and related industries will be especially hard hit.

The young first-time homebuying segment of the population will find its hopes and dreams blocked once again.

This will cut the recovery short and plunge us right back into the recessionary conditions of 1981-82.

Illusions of security

(Continued from previous page)

The following is excerpted from a recent article by Averell Harriman, former ambassador to the Soviet Union; Clark Clifford, senior advisor to the Carter administration; and Marshall D. Shulman, professor of International Relations at Columbia University and former advisor to the Carter administration.)

Despite all the boasts from officials like President Reagan and the chief delegate to the White House for press relations, our national security policy now rests largely on myths, illusions and false judgments.

With insistence and zest, the administration has taken up the erroneous assumption that Moscow has acquired a nuclear advantage, and that huge programs of new nuclear weapons are needed not only to overcome our supposed inferiority but also to gain that advantage.

The prevailing judgment has been that our military buildup can compel the Kremlin to accept negotiations on our terms and that if it does not, it will break under the strain of trying to keep pace with us. Actually, the effect has been just the opposite: the sealed doors and the lack of communication have stiffened the Kremlin's determination to match our military efforts whatever the cost.

This administration has never treated arms limitation as a matter of national security, and in its latest candid moments has said so. Positions have been advanced in negotiations, not to find common ground but to create the appearance of flexibility as a mask to keep further buildup. Because the proposals have been so one-sided, they have turned the negotiations into an unproductive forum for in- sective. Moscow's walkout from the strategic arms talks cannot be excused—indeed, its policies bear a heavy share of the blame, but so must the administration.

The limited programs of cooperation set up by the Nixon administration have all been systematically dismantled. Restrictions on trade relations have tightened. The prudish rhetoric of hostility has reached a new crescendo, unprecedented in two decades, with angry exchanges only intermittently and tacitly constrained. Until this administration, both past and recent presidents—Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter—have sought to reduce the danger of nuclear war by limiting nuclear weapons through negotiations. They did so not because they liked the Soviet Union, nor out of any disregard for the military balance, but because they understood that our security requires more moderate and more stable levels of nuclear arms, not unregulated military competition. Our presidents did not all succeed—but, until now, they have tried.
Prop 36—Tax Injustice

Like Proposition 13, this new initiative restricts property taxes and reduces property taxes, but unlike Proposition 13, Proposition 36 restricts fees and bonds. If passed, this measure will have more far-reaching effects than Proposition 13, even though it will not be seen as such a drastic measure. The language of Proposition 36 is extremely complicated and very ambiguous, and will probably end up in court for years into the future.

**MAJOR POINTS**

Briefly, the six major components of Proposition 36 are:

1. An immediate $1.7 billion property tax rebate which gives tax relief disproportionately to corporations, landlords and the wealthiest property owners in California.
2. Property tax increases for many property owners who purchased their homes and businesses after 1978. This feature has the potential to cause some in creases in rents.
3. A requirement that all new tax increases—state and local—obtain a 2 3/4ths vote of the electorate.
4. Further restrictions on all taxes on property, especially special assessments, square footage taxes, parcel taxes and some voter approved bonds.
5. Restrictions on the use of fees and property tax overrides for pension programs, water projects, bust new coal projects.
6. A provision which purports to alter infamily transfers of corporate and personal property without any reassessment of the property, but which would also place a large loophole in the property tax.

The property tax rebate will result in a $1.7 billion recession loss. Of this amount, $1.1 billion is attributable to additional taxes collected during those years, and $600 million is attributable to interest on that amount. Administrative costs and other unknowns of carrying out the rebate program have not been computed. This amounts to a tax bonus for interest on 1/3 of the state's taxpayers.

**INEQUITIES**

This large revenue loss has obvious negative implications for vital public programs, but what is not apparent is the unfairness of the "benefits" conferred. The rebate will be given disproportionately to California's wealthiest corporations, landlords and wealthiest property owners. It will also be given to those property owners that retain the largest benefits from Proposition 13, because of the provisions of Proposition 13 mandating reassessment only on resale or on death. In fact, people who have moved since 1978 or bought new homes are paying two, three, and sometimes up to six times the amount of property taxes of their neighbors. Proposition 36 will further exacerbate this inequity by giving those with the lowest taxes a refund, and nothing to those paying higher taxes.

**INCREASED TAXES**

Proposition 36 would impose severe constraints on the use of fees by all levels of government. Any new fee, or any fee which is increased by more than the rise in consumer prices index, would be required to receive a 2 3/4ths vote of the legislature or local electorate. This means that government agencies would be effectively prevented from raising any change by more than the change in the CPI because a 2 3/4ths vote on a controversial issue is almost impossible to obtain.

Proposition 36 would make it almost impossible for California ports to charge fees adequate to support their operations. Proposition 36 also jeopardizes the sale of both local ports which depend on financial growth and needed improvements.

Proposition 36 is anti-progressive, anti-growth, and anti-wealth. It rewards a form of wealth at the expense of all the rest. It twists our democratic principles of law to let 1 3/4 of the voters dictate to 2 3/4ths by coincidence, this 1 3/4th minority happens to be the group which stands to be rewarded with tax breaks that the majority would lose.

VOTE NO ON 36

Prop 39—Power play

Proposition 39 is a political ploy by the Republican Party to reappropriate their tax base of advantage. If Prop 39 passes in November, the Democratic majority in the Legislature will be severely threatened as the interests of California's working men and women. Proposition 39 creates a reapportionment commission that:

- will cost taxpayers $3,500,000 and add an additional layer of bureaucracy that we don't need.
- is not accountable to the people and their elected representatives.
- has been designed and financed by big business and Republican Party supporters—the same people who elected Deukmejian.
- deprives working people, young people, women, blacks, Hispanics, and others of representation in the critical reapportionment decisions that will determine California's future.

WHO WILL SERVE?

The Commission's eight voting members will be selected, by lot, from a pool of retired Appellate and Supreme Court justices who have served more than seven years and not held legislative or party office. Four justices would be randomly selected from among the group of judges who had been appointed by Democratic Governors and four from the list of those appointed by Republican Governors. Here is what the pool of those eligible for appointment to the Commission will look like at any given time:

- 30 are men, only one is a woman (and she has said she will not serve)
- 29 are Anglos, 2 blacks, 1 Asian and no Hispanics
- The youngest eligible retired justice is 58 years old and the oldest is 95; with the average age being 73.2 years.

Because Democratic Governors have appointed more Republican judges than Republican Governors have appointed Democrats, the chances are that at least 5 or the 8 commissioners will be Republican.

WHAT'S AT STAKE?

Big business and the Republican Party have a new Trojan horse they want the working people to pull into the State Capitol. While cloaked in the rhetoric of "good government reform," Proposition 39 is, in fact, an attempt by Republican Party to do what they have not been able to do at the ballot box—to become the majority party in California and take control of the State Senate.

VOTE NO ON 39

Prop 41—Benefits slashed

Proposition 41 will make massive cuts in programs that serve senior citizens, the blind, the disabled and children. Proposition 41 cuts medical assistance to the elderly by more than half. The disabled who are currently entitled to grants providing health care to the poor in California, will be slashed by over a billion dollars.

Sons on fixed incomes who rely on Medi-Cal will have to choose between paying for basic health care or pet food, rent and heat.Visits to the doctor and hospital services will be cut back. Benefits now available—such as eyeglasses, wheelchair, prescription drugs and dental care—will be eliminated. And some needy seniors will be declared ineligible and will be denied services entirely.

The blind and the disabled will face the same cuts in medical care. Those who are supported by friends and families will continue to be victims of sexual or physical abuse because funding for these people will become available.

The huge Medi-Cal cuts will also hurt children in California. Poor children who need hospitalization, visits to the doctor or preventive health services, like inoculations, will do without. Children's hospitals may have difficulty maintaining open beds for the cuts. Medi-Cal is currently serving more than a million children in California who lack the family resources to pay for basic health care. From October 1, 1984, Medi-Cal will be cut 1/3. It will shut a major financial burden to local government which must increase local taxes, take money from programs for state and federal dollars. So, medical care for children will become unaffordable.

Foster Care

Prop 41 cuts funding for foster care programs for 29,000 abused, neglected and homeless children by one-third. Many children whose families cannot or will not take care of them will come to the notice of the State and will be sent to foster homes. Foster parents will be entitled to $195 per month for children of age 10 and over, $200 per month for children under 10 years of age. This measure will actually cost taxpayers 83,500,000 and add an additional $110,000,000 to the state's $130,000,000 foster care budget.

CINDY O'CONNER has received the endorsement of the ILWU Local 6, the ILWU Southern California District Council—and especially strong support from ILWU Local 30, Bakersfield, and ILWU Local 31, the State Assembly. She's running against incumbent Phil Wyman in the 34th Assembly District, representing a large desert, as well as the Bakersfield area.

The District is a family oriented area. She's a strong liberal Democrat, and we think she can make a difference in Sacramento, according to SDCC leg-islative representative Nate DiBiasi. "Aside from Local 30, the members of Local 26 in Bakersfield have also worked hard for her."
**ILWU voting recommendations for California**

Here are the endorsements of the ILWU Northern and Southern California District Councils and local legislative committees for the November 6, 1984 general election.

**President of the United States**
- **WALTER F. MONDALE (D)**

**Vice-President of the United States**
- **GERALDINE FERRARO (D)**

### State Propositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Bond issue of $325,000,000 for water pollution control, water conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Bond issue of $450,000,000 for construction/improvement of public schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Bond issue for hazardous substance cleanups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Bond issue for improvement of domestic water systems to meet drinking water standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Bond issue for farm and home aid for California agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Property tax; fire protection systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Supreme Court procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Authorizes establishment of a state lottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Provision for disabled person to postpone payment of property taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Adds exceptions to property tax on certified historic structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Amends Prop. 13 by adding restrictions on property tax and charging of fees. Provides for refunds of certain taxes already paid. Projected costs range from $2 to 3 billion over a 10-year period to local agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Authorizes establishment of a state lottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>NO ENDORSEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Ballot materials in English only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>NO ENDORSEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Board of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**City Propositions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st State Sen. Dist</td>
<td>NO ENDORSEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd State Sen. Dist</td>
<td>NO ENDORSEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd State Sen. Dist</td>
<td>NO ENDORSEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th State Sen. Dist</td>
<td>NO ENDORSEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th State Sen. Dist</td>
<td>NO ENDORSEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th State Sen. Dist</td>
<td>NO ENDORSEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th State Sen. Dist</td>
<td>NO ENDORSEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th State Sen. Dist</td>
<td>NO ENDORSEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th State Sen. Dist</td>
<td>NO ENDORSEMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Berkeley City Council**
- **Maudelle SHIRK**
- **Ann CHANDLER**

**Berkeley School Board**
- **Steve LUSTIG**
- **Oakland Measure N—Strong Mayor**

**Contra Costa County**
- **7th Cong. Dist**
- **8th Cong. Dist**
- **9th Cong. Dist**
- **9th State Sen. Dist**
- **10th Assembly Dist**
- **11th Assembly Dist**
- **12th Assembly Dist**
- **13th Assembly Dist**

**San Francisco County**
- **6th Cong. Dist**
- **7th Cong. Dist**
- **8th Cong. Dist**
- **9th Cong. Dist**
- **10th Cong. Dist**

**Santa Clara County**
- **10th Cong. Dist**
- **11th Cong. Dist**
- **12th Cong. Dist**
- **13th Cong. Dist**
- **14th Cong. Dist**

**Humboldt County**
- **1st Cong. Dist**
- **2nd Cong. Dist**

**Board of Supervisors**
- **7th State Sen. Dist**
- **8th State Sen. Dist**

**City of Sacramento**
- **6th Cong. Dist**
- **7th Cong. Dist**
- **8th Cong. Dist**
- **9th Cong. Dist**
- **10th Cong. Dist**

**San Joaquin County**
- **18th Cong. Dist**
- **19th Cong. Dist**
- **20th Cong. Dist**
- **21st Cong. Dist**

**San Mateo County**
- **11th Cong. Dist**
- **12th Cong. Dist**
- **13th Cong. Dist**
- **14th Cong. Dist**

**Santa Clara County**
- **10th Cong. Dist**
- **11th Cong. Dist**
- **12th Cong. Dist**
- **13th Cong. Dist**

**Board of Supervisors**
- **Tom LANTOS**
- **Tom LANTOS**
- **Norman MINETA**

**State Senate**
- **9th State Sen. Dist**
- **10th State Sen. Dist**
- **11th State Sen. Dist**

**State Assembly**
- **41st State Assembly Dist**
- **42nd State Assembly Dist**
- **43rd State Assembly Dist**
- **44th State Assembly Dist**

**Southern California**
- **US House of Representatives**
- **1st Cong. Dist**
- **2nd Cong. Dist**
- **3rd Cong. Dist**

**Clips and Save**
The charts on this page show the voting records on key issues of federal legislators from ILWU's jurisdiction. The votes are evaluated according to ILWU International policy. R indicates a "right" vote; W indicates a "wrong" vote; NV indicates no recorded vote or preference; A indicates not yet/still a member of Congress, or absent due to hospitalization.

**SENATE**

1. **Health Care for the Jobless, 1983.** The Senate defeated an amendment to adequately fund health insurance for unemployed workers who have exhausted their employer-paid health coverage. For—Right, Against—Wrong.

2. **Tax Cut for the Wealthy, 1983.** An attempt was made to cap part of the 1981 Reagan tax cut for wealthy individuals. For—Right, Against—Wrong.

3. **Natural Gas, 1983.** The Natural Gas Consumer Relief Act would have rolled back prices and kept consumer energy bills under control. For—Right, Against—Wrong.

4. **Education, Health, Jobs, and Energy Assistance, 1983.** An amendment was adopted to strike out additional funds for these badly needed programs. Against—Right, For—Wrong.

5. **MX Missile, 1984.** An amendment which would have cut all 1985 funding for production of the MX was tabled. Against—Right, For—Wrong.

**CALIFORNIA**

- **Alan Cranston**
  - R
  - W
  - NV
  - R
  - R
  - NV
  - R

- **Pete Wilson**
  - W
  - W
  - W
  - W
  - W
  - W
  - W

**HAWAII**

- **Daniel Inouye**
  - R
  - W
  - NV
  - R
  - R
  - NV
  - R

- **Spark Matsunaga**
  - W
  - W
  - R
  - R
  - W
  - R
  - R

**OREGON**

- **Mark Hatfield**
  - W
  - W
  - W
  - W
  - R
  - R
  - NV

- **Robert Packwood**
  - W
  - W
  - W
  - W
  - W
  - R
  - R

**WASHINGTON**

- **Henry Jackson**
  - R
  - R
  - A
  - A
  - R
  - R
  - R

- **Claude Gornt**
  - W
  - W
  - W
  - W

- **Dan Evans**
  - A
  - A
  - NV
  - W
  - A
  - A

**ALASKA**

- **Ted Stevens**
  - W
  - W
  - W
  - W
  - W
  - W
  - W

- **Frank Murkowski**
  - W
  - W
  - NV
  - W
  - W

---

** HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVE VOTES **


7. **Medicare, 1983.** The care, and defeated an amendment. For—Right, Against—Wrong.

8. **Military Spending, 1983.** An amendment to reduce the 1983 budget largely responsible for the arms race. Against—Right, For—Wrong.

9. **Central America, 1983.** An amendment which would have halted military shipments of arms to Nicaragua's belligerents.

1. **Bankruptcy, 1984.** An amendment to overturn the Supreme Court decision. Against—Right, For—Wrong.

---

**Buddies—Rep. Barbara Boxer (D-San Francisco) greets Democratic vice-presidential candidate Geraldine Ferraro at a recent political gathering.**

Washington Report

**Reaganism challenged, Demos wage campaigns across country**

by Mike Lewis

ILWU Washington Representative

As voters across the country prepare to go to the polls next month, they are confronted by one of the most deadly choices in American history.

The 1980 victory of Ronald Reagan and his Congressional supporters gave American corporations and the right wing a chance to reshape the federal government and its most basic policies. Untold damage has already been done to the economy, the environment, vital domestic programs, and the quality of life for working people—damage that will only become fully visible in the years to come.

The only question is: will the Reaganites succeed in diffusing most of the Mondale-Ferraro campaign's efforts to focus the nation's mind on Reagan's broken promises and the two challengers have far better name recognition and campaign organization than their opponents.

In the House, several races in ILWU states are attracting national attention. Though most of the California races appear clear-cut for incumbents, Rep. Jerry Pack, as liberal a representative as an Oregon Democrat, is in a tough race. George Brown, a good friend of labor, is clear-cut for incumbents, Rep. Jerry Paterson, as liberal a representative as an Oregon Democrat, is in a tough race. The Reagan campaign, in other words, is leveraging celebrity against incumbent Senator Pete Domenic over the short-term "recovery" to convince the gullible that they're right.

But only a star-quality actor could have carried the deception this far—and with more and more people starting to think hard about what's really going on, this fantasy will play thin by election day. The Democrats' voting registration drive and the mobilizing power of former presidential candidate Jesse Jackson and the Rainbow Coalition can also throw tremendous new weight into the scales.
representatives voted on key issues

---

1. Bankruptcy
2. Health Insurance for the Unemployed, 1983. A bill was passed by the House which would have funded health insurance for millions of unemployed workers who have exhausted their employer-paid health coverage. For—Right. Against—Wrong.
3. Tax Cut for the Wealthy, 1983. This bill would have capped part of the 1981 Reagan tax cut for wealthy individuals. For—Right. Against—Wrong.
4. Telephone Rates, 1983. An amendment to allow the phone companies to charge new and needed “access fees” to local consumers was defeated. Against—Right. For—Wrong.
7. MX Missile, 1984. An amendment delayed funding for MX missiles until next April and required another House vote at that time to release the funds. For—Right. Against—Wrong.
8. Nuclear Freeze, 1983. An amendment would have fatally weakened the House resolution calling for a mutual, verifiable, freeze on production and deployment of nuclear weapons. Against—Right. For—Wrong.
9. Equal Rights Amendment, 1983. The House narrowly failed to approve by a two-thirds majority the ERA constitutional amendment to guarantee women’s rights. For—Right. Against—Wrong.
10. Covert Operations Against Nicaragua, 1984. In an attempt to limit the war in Central America, the House passed an amendment denying funding for the CIA’s bloody invasions and military harassment across Nicaragua’s borders. For—Right. Against—Wrong.
11. Jobs/Public Works, 1983. The House attempted to launch a new program to create jobs for the unemployed and provide badly needed public works and services. For—Right. Against—Wrong.

---

**VOTES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Bankruptcy</th>
<th>Health Insurance for Unemployed</th>
<th>Tax Cut for Wealthy</th>
<th>Child Nutrition School Lunch</th>
<th>Immigration</th>
<th>MX Missile</th>
<th>Nuclear Freeze</th>
<th>Equal Rights</th>
<th>Central America</th>
<th>Jobs/Public Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>George Brown</td>
<td>R R R R R R R R R R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Jerry Patterson</td>
<td>R R R R R R R R R R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Betty Loudermilk</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Jim Bates</td>
<td>R R R R R R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R R R R</td>
<td>R R R R R R R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
<td>R R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HAWAII**
1. Cecil Halleck
2. Daniel Akaka

**OREGON**
1. Les AuCoin
2. Robert Smith
3. Ron Wyden
4. Jim Weaver
5. Denny Smith

**WASHINGTON**
1. Joel Pritchard (retiring)
2. Al Swift
3. Don Bonker
4. Sid Morrison
5. Thomas Foley
6. Norman Dickson
7. Michiel Lowry
8. Rod Chandler

**ALASKA**
Don Young

---

**Four more seats! Four more seats!**
Idalyn Rutter led ILWU auxiliaries, helped union during 1934 strike

by Wenonah Drasnin

Idalyn Rutter, whose roots in the ILWU go back to the 1934 strike, died of a heart ailment September 11 at the home of her sister, Lois Brollier, in Yuba City, California. She was a longtime member of the ILWU. Federated Auxiliary 17, Oakland, and the San Francisco Pensioners Club. She was 79.

Idalyn and her late husband Bill Rutter were both active in the 1934 strike. She joined Auxiliary 17 when it was reactivated in 1954, and received her 25-year pin in June, 1979. She and Bill who was also former president of the Bay Area Pension Club, observed their 50th anniversary on May 4, 1977 with a "splash" at club headquarters. Bill died a month later.

Idalyn was, over the years, a frequent delegate to state and federated auxiliaries conventions, and to the auxiliary district council.

SEAMSTRUST

She also had the distinction of having sewn the first Auxiliary 17 banner, designed by a committee. Then came her special creation—six aprons with the auxiliary name across the hems, which saw service at innumerable auxiliary meetings, conventions and coffee bars at longshore caucuses. She always saw to it that they were washed, crisply starched and ironed after each use.

She appeared on countless picket lines, and served early morning coffee and late lunches at ILWU election day mobilizations.

Idalyn was a "doer," gaily persistent in the sale of raffle tickets and gift items to raise the treasuries of the Auxiliary and the Pension Club.

Her love of this task brought her a special kind of joy, as she smiled, caled and took only "yes" for an answer.

She was a member of the Auxiliary, Pacific Coast Pensioners' Conventions, bustling about with the hands full of tickets.

SICK COMMITTEE

Perhaps her most outstanding contribution was to visit patients at the Oakland and Alameda hospitals. Her love of this task brought her a special kind of joy, as she smiled, caled and took only "yes" for an answer.

She was a member of the Auxiliary, Pacific Coast Pensioners' Conventions, bustling about with the hands full of tickets.

AUXILIARY SCHOLARSHIPS—Members of ILWU Auxiliary #3 have presented the 1984 scholarship awards of $400 each to James Maham and Marvia Spottsville, who attend Washington State University at Pullman, and David Cluphf, who attends Central College, McPherson, Kansas. President Miriam Moork presented the awards.

Local 27, Port Angeles


Local 50, Astoria

Longshore and warehouse members have recently elected the following new officers at their in-person election: president, Robert Bowles; vice president Bill Collins. New labor relations committee appointees are: a 6-month term (Bill Howard); a 6-month term (Jerry Adams). Nominations will be made at the regular stopwork meeting at 608 Marine Drive, Port Angeles on November 13, 1984.

Polling will be from 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. at the union hall, 608 Marine Drive.

Local 63, Wilmington

Local 63, ILWU, Wilmington, California, will hold mail ballot during November and December, 1984, with ballots mailed no later than November 25 and returned no later than December 9.

Nominations open October 15 through November 15, 1984, for the following offices: President—business agent, President—vice president, dispatchers and relief dispatchers (2); sergeant-at-arms, labor relations committee, convention/auxiliary delegates.

The following committee slots are also open: Promotions, (5); Grievance, (4); Membership, (7), Board of trustees, (3); and an 11-member executive board.

Nominations form will be available beginning October 15. Members running for office must have been a member for 18 months on a continual basis.

Choice Port plan provisions explained

SACRAMENTO—The ILWU-PMA Benefits Director, a retired longshoreman, holds the 48½ lb king salmon he and his wife Emma caught last month at Bell Island, a longshore fishing spot near Ketichikan, AK. It was the biggest salmon caught since 1971, according to Emma, who was kept busy cutting the fish, "but it took Bud to land it." They had it frozen and brought it home with them on the plane. Picture was taken in their Portland driveway.

Docksers, Widows on Pension List

SACRAMENTO—Following is the October, 1984 listing of dockworkers retired under various ILWU-PMA plans:

Local 4, Vancouver: Marion Blair; Local 7, Bellingham: Earl Thomas Sr.; Lyle L. Wallace; Local 8, Portland: James O. Barrie, Percy B. Harrison, Ernest C. Johnson, Roy B. Kowalske, John Ragni, Quinton Wright; Local 10, San Francisco: Carl Adorozito, Jr., Shirley Antony One, Jr., David R. Ellison, George Giordaniella, Gilbert Gonzales, Roy Guillery, Eddie H. McColbee, Jack Osborne, Albert Villa.

Local 12, North Bend: Faris C. Good, Theodorik Mikowski; Local 13, Wilmington: George Broadstone, William Bungarner, George Dillon, Nick Drugg Jr., Rodolfo E. Guerrero, A.L. McDonald, Paul M. McMahan, Dean W. Mattos, Frank D. Nael, Carlos Ponce, Juan C. Villa, Local 14, Eureka: John Anderson; Local 19, Seattle: Harold Bingham; Lauro Delos Santos, Harry Johnson.

Local 23, Tacoma: Richard Winter; Local 27, Port Angeles: Leroy H. Jagger; Elvin F. Smith; Local 34, San Francisco:

Docksers went on strike in San Francisco in October, 1984, over job security issues and wages. The strike lasted until November, 1984, when the dockworkers and the International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU) reached a new contract that included job security and wage increases.

Additional members of ILWU Auxiliary #3 have presented the 1984 scholarship awards of $400 each to James Maham and Marvia Spottsville, who attend Washington State University at Pullman, and David Cluphf, who attends Central College, McPherson, Kansas. President Miriam Moork presented the awards.
Locals, councils break new ground in voter registration activities

Joining with other unions and community groups, the ILWU has taken on the challenge and found that it’s membership is registered to vote.

“The figures are really sobering,” according to ILWU Northern California District Council Secretary Don Watson. “In California, for example, it’s estimated that as many as 60% of trade union members overall can’t vote because they haven’t registered. It’s ridiculous to think we can influence what happens November 6 if we don’t even show up.”

VOLUNTEERS

ILWU efforts have taken different forms. In Northern California, Watson embarked on the East Bay legislative ballot. Members of ILWU East Bay legislative committee interviewed candidates and coordinated voter registration drive.

A Southern California District Council registration committee, headed by Louis Wright, Local 33, has registered some 300 longshoremen by working the PMA pay window, and has also been working the lines at the Long Beach welfare office. Approximately another 100 voters were registered at the Local 13 casual hall. Committee members— including Wright, Dave Arria, Edna Daley and Fume Laverty, all of Local 13, have also been walking precincts in the San Pedro area urging voters to vote NO on Proposition 13 and to support the jobs with Peace initiative on the LA county ballots.

AMBITION PROGRAM

In the Northwest, the most ambitious program has been taken on by longshore Local 23, Tacoma. If all ILWU affiliates had a registration and get-out-the-vote campaigns like the one pioneered by Longshore Local 23 Tacoma, Ronald Reagan wouldn’t have a chance in the Northwest.

The dump Reagan crusade began last spring, "even before we knew who would be running against him," said Philip President Officers.

We had a political action committee involving other unions, and we went before them, urging them to help raise funds. A phone bank was set up in the Operating Engineers Hall to contact each and every one of the 26,000 union members in Pierce County. They were asked if you were registered and who you would vote for.

Those sympathetic to Mondale were asked to attend caucuses.

COMPUTER

“We kept records on the 26,000—asked each union to cross-reference its members. Then we ran all the names, active and retired, through a computer to see which ones weren’t registered. Now we’re working to get them registered.”

Steve Conway, an unemployed member of the Teachers Union, is the only one in the program who is paid. “It is coordinating the effort,” said Leil, who gave credit also to Bob Casteneda, a transfer from San Diego.

UNITED EFFORT

“We have 400 volunteers working on 20 phones 12 hours a day. All labor is involved in the effort, whether affiliated to the AFL-CIO or not,” Leil said. “Out of the 82 local unions in Pierce County 16 are not, and previously had no input into political activity. Now we have a central bank of names that we can call.”

We have also got a labor paper going, the Union Labor News—something that was sorely needed after the Tacoma Labor Action went under.

“Tell fellows even if Beagin takes Pierce County—and he won’t—that the politicians will realize, and that’s really why we started all this, that labor has clout. Labor will be encouraged to try it in other areas. Elsewhere in the Northwest, Auxiliary 14 members have coordinated Local 21’s efforts.”

Local 21’s area.

In Seattle, warehouse Local 9 Business Agent John McCraw has been calling his members at home to make sure they’re registered and is planning to call again just before November 6 “to make sure they vote.” International Representative John Bukovsky has also been coordinating a drive to get absentee ballot request forms out to old-timers who want to avoid going to the polls, and deer hunters.

In Aberdeen, Washington, Local 25 political action committee, headed by George Allen and Glen Ramisky has been coordinating voter registration activity. Dick Cunliff and Ron Bernhardt have been coordinating the things for Local 4, Vancouver.
ILWU voting recommendations for Oregon

Following are the recommendations of the ILWU Columbia River District Council for the State of Oregon general election on November 6, 1984.

National Office
President ............... Walter MONDALE (D)
Vice President .......... Geraldine FERRARO (D)
US Senate ....... Mark HATFIELD (R)

US House of Representatives:
First District ............... Les AuCOIN (D)
Second District ............. Larrynn WILLIS (D)
Third District ................ Ron WYDEN (D)
Fourth District ............. Jim WEAVER (D)
Fifth District ............. Ruth McFARLAND (D)

Oregon State Officials
Secretary of State ........ Barbara ROBERTS (D)
State Treasurer ........... Garritt KERANS (D)
Attorney General ............ Vern COOK (D)
State Supreme Court (Non-Partisan)
(Position 1) .............. Hans LINDE
Oregon State Senate
District 2 (Newport) ........ Del ISHAM (D)
District 4 (Beaverton-Tigard) ... John TYNER (D)

District 6 (Portland) ........ Jan WYERS (D)
District 7 (Portland) .......... Rod MONROE (D)
District 8 (Portland) ......... Bill MCCOY (D)
District 10 (Portland) ......... Jane CEASE (D)
District 11 (Gresham-Ttualalip) Glenn OTTO (D)
District 24 (Coos Bay Area) ... Bill BRADBURY (D)
District 27 (Klamath Falls) .... Judy CARNAHAN (D)

Oregon House of Representatives
District 1 (Scappoose) ....... Bruce HUGO (D)
District 2 (Astonia) ......... Tom HANLON (D)
District 3 (Forest Grove Area) No Recommendation
District 4 (Newport Area) ... Max HAYDEN (D)
District 5 (Hillsboro) ........ Al YOUNG (D)
District 6 (Newberg) .......... Mark DEMENT (D)
District 7 (Beaverton) ........ No Recommendation
District 8 (Beaverton) ....... Les FREAFER (D)
District 9 (Tigard) ............ Nancy CAMPBELL (D)
District 10 (Portland) ......... Vera KATS (D)
District 11 (Portland) ........ Tom MASON (D)
District 12 (Portland) .......... Dick SPRINGER (D)
District 13 (Portland) .......... Rick BAUMAN (D)
District 14 (Portland) ......... Shirley GOLD (D)
District 15 (Portland) .......... Cindy BANZER (D)
District 16 (Portland) .......... Ron McCARTY (D)
District 17 (Portland) .......... Mike BURTON (D)
District 18 (Portland) .......... Margaret CARTER (D)
District 19 (Portland) .......... Ron O'CEAS (D)
District 20 (Portland) .......... Annette FARMER (D)

District 21 (Portland) .......... Lonnie ROBERTS (D)
District 22 (Gresham) ......... Rick KOTULSKI (D)
District 23 (Oregon City) ..... Bob SHIPRACK (D)
District 24 (Milwaukie) ........ Charles HELM (D)
District 25 (Milwaukie) ....... Dave McTEAGUE (D)
District 26 (Glendale) ......... Robin LINDQUIST (D)
District 27 (West Linn) ......... Darlene HOOLEY (D)
District 28 (Woodburn) ......... Alan HAMILTON (D)
District 29 (Dayton) ........... No Recommendation
District 31 (Salem) ......... Jim HILL (D)
District 33 (Salem area) ... Mike KOPETSKI (D)
District 37 (Lebanon) ......... Toby CLAUSON (D)
District 38 (Lane) ............... Chuck BENNETT (D)
District 42 (Springfield) ...... Larry HILL (D)
District 44 (Lane-Douglas) .... Peg JOLIN (D)
District 45 (Roseburg) ......... Ron SCHOFIELD (D)
District 47 (Douglas-Curry) ... Jim WHITTY (D)
District 48 (Coos Bay Area) ... Mark WILLIAMS (D)
District 51 (Medford) ......... Ray BARNWELL (D)
District 56 (Hood River-Dales) Wayne FAWBUSH (D)
District 57 (Pendleton) ......... John KOPETSKI (D)
District 69 (Baker) ............. Jesse HIMMELBACH (D)

County of Multnomah
Board of County Commissioners (Non-partisan)
Pos. 1, West District ........ Pauline ANDERSON
Pos. 2, West District ......... Linda WILSON
Pos. 3, West District ......... Ray AYRES
Pos. 4, West District ......... John PERRY

A native Oregonian, Mark Hatfield is running for his fourth 6-year term in the Senate. He served in the South Pacific during World War II, taught political science at Willamette University (1949-1957), served as State Senator, Secretary of State and Governor (1959-1967) and was elected to the US Senate in 1974. On the platform with Hatfield was his father-in-law, '34 veteran Vince Kuzmanich, a retired longshoreman.

Ron Wyden, running for his third term in Congress, feels international trade is very important to his district "because Portland is a port city." For this reason he is also "inclined to resist protectionism and domestic content legislation." He sponsored a bill, which has passed the House and is pending in the Senate, authorizing construction of a new lock at Bonneville Dam on the Columbia, vital to barges bringing grain for export from the so-called Inland Empire. He is also co-sponsor with Congressman Les AuCoin of legislation to deepen the Columbia River bar so ships coming to Portland won't have to go elsewhere to "top off."

Campaigned for his sixth term in Congress from Oregon's fourth district, Jim Weaver charges that "high interest rates, huge budget deficits and one-sided economic policies have thrown thousands of Oregonians out of work, creating tragedy for countless families."

Weaver's supporters refer to an amendment he helped secure for the Coos Bay dredging project. Weaver's very outspoken, says Bailey. "We like his position against the proliferation of nuclear weapons and his stand on our getting out of El Salvador."

Les AuCoin has served five terms in Congress. He is running in the First District against Bill Moscholay, known to Oregon labor as "Mr. Georgia-Pacific."

AuCoin co-sponsored legislation to build a new lock at Bonneville, helped stop waterfront user fees that would have crippled the Port of Portland and bucked the leadership of his own party by voting against the domestic content bill, which would have cost jobs on Portland docks. He believes international trade offers Oregon and the nation the greatest opportunity for economic growth. Oregon, he points out, is one of a handful of states which enjoy trade surpluses.

Ruth McFarland is also making her second run against Denny Smith in the Fifth District. She is assistant majority leader in the Oregon State Senate where she has an excellent voting record. She's on leave from a position as Professor of Biology at Mt. Hood Community College.

"Oregon has not recovered. Interest rates have crippled the housing industry and thrown thousands of Oregon workers out of jobs. Farm foreclosures are at record highs. Revitalizing our economy and stopping the arms race are critical for our future."
All-Metals workers had to overcome many obstacles before getting their first Local 6 contract.

Local 6 handles old beefs at new plants

OAKLAND—Workers at two newly organized ILWU shops in the East Bay say their new contracts have given them the security to stop playing a shell game and to stabilize conditions and management insults. They don’t take everything that everyone dishes out anymore,” Johnny Lind, one of four new shop stewards at All Metals Service and Warehousing, Inc. in Union City, told The DISPATCHER. “I just used to go by whatever the man said, I always played by his rules. The owner gave out just enough that we all just said. ‘We have a voice in what happens to us no matter whether we’re working for him or not.’”

At Kin-Line, Inc. in Emeryville, “You can finally say something without somebody saying, ‘You do what I say or you’re fired,’” steward Alan Crisolo said during an interview at the plant.

The All Metals contract, signed September 27 and effective October 1, creates a new system for paid breaks and lunches, as well as a sick leave system. It also ensures safety at the plant which workers said was made unsafe because of faulty cranes and other machinery.

Puget Sound ISU ferry workers in arbitration, many issues at stake

SEATTLE—Efforts to reach a contract covering 750 employees of the Washington State Ferry System, members of the Inlandboatmen’s Union, have entered the arbitration phase as this issue of The Dispatcher goes to press.

There are 60 outstanding issues to go before the three-man arbitration committee.

The most difficult include:

- Manning: The employer proposes to cut the manning on the ferries down to the coast guard’s minimum requirement.

- Hiring procedures: The employer proposes to take over complete control of hiring “would get us back into the old system of using ferry jobs for political patronage,” according to IBU Puget Sound Regional Director Bill Ratch.

- Wages: Management proposes only a 3½% wage increase May 1, 1984, despite the fact that the union has not had a wage hike since April 1982. No retroactivity.

- The union is proposing a 4% wage increase each of two years, with adjustments for terminal agents and information supervisors.

- Overtime: Management proposes to reduce the overtime penalty from double time to time-and-a-half.

- Penalty time: The employer proposes to pay only for time worked, as opposed to the current practice of paying for specific increments of time.

- Seniority: Management proposes to allow people to stay home on sick leave to reclaim it if they return to the unit.

- Compensated holiday pay: “The problem in the negotiations so far,” said Hatch, “has been that the people who sit across the table from us haven’t had the power to really make decisions. Whoever is pulling the strings ought to be at the bargaining table. In their absence, we’re getting nowhere up there.”

The ferryboat workers negotiating committee members are Hank Rood, Larry Mitchell, Gordon Haynes, Mike Byrn, Catherine Symington, Dale Kramer, Louis Pappas and Gary Moen. The union is represented in the arbitration procedures by attorney Tony Burns. The member named by the IBU to the tripartite arbitration panel is Rick Kisseker.

REHIRE

As a result of negotiations four of the six workers who had been fired during the Local 6 organizing campaign got rehired with back pay (the other two kept their new jobs).

Lindsay and fellow stewards Rick Olsen, Pat McGill and Darrell Courtney were on the negotiating committee.

Lindsay approached the ILWU about a year ago because All Metals management “could just tell you whatever they wanted to: when to work, what to do, how much. If you didn’t like it you could just walk,” he said.

“It was a long fight, over a year,” Lindsay said. “I got fired, rehired. It’s a good feeling to know that you won after you had been struggling.”

NO EXCUSES

At Kin-Line, 46 workers are covered by a three-year pact, which has a six-month wage opener. The company is fulfilling a 1 million contract for the US Post Office. Crisolo said the workers are pushing production and “emphasizing quality now especially so they won’t have no excuses” when bargaining reopens.

When organizing started in November 1983, the company employed 25. They faced management that was “always talking down to people, trying to keep them all separate,” according to Crisolo.

Finally, they followed the advice of Crisolo’s brother, who works at Pfizer, Inc., a Local 6 shop in Emeryville, and met with an ILWU rep.

What we heard was sounding pretty good,” Crisolo said.

Local 6 BA Jim Byler led the negotiations at both plants. Ben Madrid assisted at All Metals, and Victor Paninoyan assisted at Kin-Line.

New pact at United Metals

LOS ANGELES—Members of Local 26 at United American Metals of California have overwhelmingly ratified a new three-year contract.

This contract affects nine (9) employees. The Negotiating Committee consisted of Chief Steward Roy Gibson and Business Representative John McKinney.
Seaway Express dispute

continued from page 1

and of longshoremen in Anchorage had anything to do with the sudden change of plans.

Once in Seward, Seaway refused to use proper facilities at the Alaska Railroad dock, where ILWU longshoremen are employed, and hauled the barge across Resurrection Bay to the City's Fourth of July beach.

ENVIRONMENT

Disregarding the environmental impact of their actions, Seaway personnel then beached the barge and began construction of a dirt access pad upon which a 30 foot ramp would be placed to provide access to the barge for offloading.

"This appeared to violate a number of environmental laws," said Local 200 President Larry Cotter, "and particularly the federal Clean Water Act which protects the tidelands. They were also building their operations to Anchorage or Kenai or Seward have been made.

The original Ro-Ro operation continues. Longshore Local 19, clerks local 52, and firemen's Local 8 are continuing to man an area standards picket line at Seaway's Seattle headquarters. "The barge committee, and the Coast Committee are pursuing other alternatives as well," said ILWU International President Jim Herman.

New contract for Hawaii dockers

HONOLULU—Local 142 has reached agreement on a three-year contract covering 447 longshoremen, wharf clerks and bulk sugar operation workers. The pact will run from July 1, 1984 to June 30, 1987. Longshoremen, as a result of parity gained in the historic 1949 strike, will receive the same pay raises extended their dock clerks and bulk sugar workers. Under the agreement, the dockmen received a 9% wage increase in each of the first two years of the contract, and a 6% increase in the last year of the contract. The settlement terms also cover: the members Bill Johns (4th from left) and Angel Mendoza (4th from right) join other crew members to celebrate.

RAISE UPFRONT—ILWU members at Ashworth in Salinas, makers of industrial steel belts, received a 9% wage increase up front after negotiations led by Local 6 Secretary-Treasurer Leon Harris. The pact provided a 16.9% hike—90 cents on June 29, 1985, and '96 cents on June 28, 1986. They work an eight-hour day, with time and a half for all hours worked in excess of eight. The basic straight-time daily rate, $9,500 in back pay for her wrongful discharge.

LONGSHOREMEN and members of other unions protest the arrival of Seaway Express freight-handling equipment in Seward on August 30.

No further efforts to initiate break bulk operations to Anchorage or Kewaunee or Seward have been made.

The original Ro-Ro operation continues. Longshore Local 19, clerks local 52, and firemen's Local 8 are continuing to man an area standards picket line at Seaway's Seattle headquarters. "The barge committee, and the Coast Committee are pursuing other alternatives as well," said ILWU International President Jim Herman.

TOTAL DISREGARD

"SeaWay has demonstrated nothing but total disregard for the needs of the communities it proposes to serve," Herman said. "They make no pretense of their desire to breach the ILWU, and to depress the living standards for which waterfront workers have fought and sacrificed for generations. Their actions in Resurrection Bay demean considerably their lack of concern for the Alaska environment; and their effect on the trade as a whole has been to set off a disastrous rate war, which can only have a most serious effect on the stability of the entire industry.

The barge committee, headed by North-West Regional Direction G. Johnny Parks, includes Ken Guseberg and Russ Alexander, Local 19, Seattle; Jim Norton, Local 23, Tacoma; Ron Thornberry, Local 32, Everett; Bob Vasquez, clerks Local 52, Seattle; and Don Miniken, foreman's Local 8, Seattle.

Longshore comp bill finally passes

—continued from page 1

permanent total disability are capped at 5 percent. Penalties for fraudulent claims—and for fraudulent employer denial of claims—are doubled.

In addition, benefits for funeral expenses and burial disbursements are increased, and workers disabled by occupational disease will more easily be covered under the Act. The third party liability process is also made more equitable for longshoremen.

MAJOR VICTORY

"Considering what we started out with three years ago—when we might have lost the battle, but made some gain—this is a major victory," said ILWU President Jim Herman after the measure completed passage. "The original bill would have gutted the Act beyond recognition, and it had plenty of right-wing muscle behind it—enough to force us to accept some minor changes.

"Of course, we are very pleased.

The settlement terms also cover: the members Bill Johns (4th from left) and Angel Mendoza (4th from right) join other crew members to celebrate.

In addition, benefits for funeral expenses and burial disbursements are increased, and workers disabled by occupational disease will more easily be covered under the Act. The third party liability process is also made more equitable for longshoremen.
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