



# CONTRACT 2016



DISTRICT LODGE 26 AND ITS AFFILIATED LOCAL LODGES 700 & 1746

## Wednesday & Counting

Reports from the shop indicate that members are on the move, voicing our collective demand for an historic contract that matches this unprecedented boom in orders for Pratt commercial and military engines.

These engines do not make themselves. Our skills are needed more than ever – especially as engineers work to get the kinks out of these state-of-the-art aerospace products. Right now Pratt has orders for more than 8,000 geared turbofans. We are also the sole source for the F-135, even as members of Congress allied with GE try to break into that franchise.

No matter how long you have worked at Pratt & Whitney, you have NEVER been in a better bargaining position than right now.

### ***Demand what you have earned!***

Negotiations on Tuesday concentrated on clearing off the table contract language on seniority, the grievance procedure, layoffs, promotions and other issues. Management says they want to work collaboratively with us – but their proposals do not reflect that.

The biggest conflict is a company proposal to rewrite job descriptions and implement them regardless of Union objections. IAM chief negotiator Mike Stone told the company they would end up with chaos in the shop. “You want to pay people less for doing the same work.”

Stone told the company’s chief negotiator, “You say you want a contract, Mr. Nolan. But I find that hard to believe.”

### ***Let’s Get Down to It***

IAM negotiators want clear contract language and improved rights for the members. That can be accomplished in a single session this morning, if management gets moving. It’s time.

Nickel and diming workers responsible for billion dollar contracts is totally irresponsible. As the IAM told management, “**You want to roll the dice that you’ll get the vote on Sunday. That’s a big gamble.**”

## Let Your Voice Be Heard

**CORRECTION:** In the previous flyer, we mistakenly stated under the insurance proposal, the max out-of-pocket in a worst-case scenario would cost \$16,000+. The correct figure is **\$13,200. The fact remains -- the corrected figure is still OUTRAGEOUS.**