



2022 Negotiations



A History of Job Security

Your IAM negotiating team has repeatedly told Pratt management that our Job Security contract provisions – Letter 22 & 22A – were the result of fierce struggles, complex negotiations and significant sacrifices by Pratt & Whitney workers.

But company negotiators were not here then, and act as though nothing occurred before they arrived. It's time they got a history lesson!

In 1993, Pratt & Whitney lost \$500 million, and decided to recoup the loss by attacking their own workforce. Management presented an ultimatum to the Machinists Union and the State of Connecticut: give us major concessions or we will lay off 2,300 hourly workers, and permanently move the work of the Southington & North Haven plants to Maine and Georgia.

It became clear that the real aim was to relocate the entire business.

The state agreed to give Pratt \$32 million in annual givebacks, including tax breaks on research and development that the company still collects.

But the fightback by Machinists Union members caught management by surprise.

What was supposed to be a quick shakedown turned into a firestorm.

Pratt wanted a \$2 an hour cut, huge insurance cost shifts, work rule changes and “trust me” language on jobs.

What came out of the talks was Letter 22, that committed the company to making “every reasonable effort” to keep work in Connecticut, and drastically reduced the use of subcontractors. It was the strongest Job Security protection in US aerospace at the time.

Workers paid dearly -- a two-year wage freeze, a one-year contract extension, higher insurance costs, work rule changes, and productivity goals that could result in \$2 an hour pay cuts. The total cost of concessions was estimated at \$47 million.

UTC ran full-page ads in local newspapers thanking workers for their vote, and declaring, *“Someday our business will grow again. When it does, it will grow in Connecticut.”*

The high-priced Job Security language proved its worth in 1999, when Pratt attempted to move parts repair work to Texas. In a struggle that lasted two years, IAM members again took to the streets, and took the company to court.

CONTINUED ON THE BACK:

The contract was tested in a civil suit and workers won. In 2001, in order to further secure those Job Security commitments, Pratt workers went out on strike for two weeks. In 2009, we went back to court following the company's announcement to close the Cheshire Overhaul and Repair plant and the CARO unit in East Hartford. Once again, Judge Janet Hall ruled in our favor and her decision was upheld by the 2nd circuit court of appeals in NYC. These victories gave your Union the time it needed to negotiate the placement of workers while offering more senior members the opportunity to receive a voluntary separation package.

The battle for jobs has been unrelenting. There have been ongoing efforts to work together to bring in new machines and new Engine Production Lines. **The flexibility management now says it needs has been in place for years.** The company can "change the mix" in the work that we currently perform in the shop if they agree to place new work under the protections of letter 22. They say for us to "trust them"well, it's a two way street. **They need to trust us and place new work under the protections of Letter 22 and 22A. We have proved time and time again that we are the best in the world at producing and assembling Jet Engines. It is time for this company to put their trust of us in writing.**

Pratt & Whitney workers have paid a high price for our Job Security protections. The company may try to ignore it, but they cannot erase history.

IN SOLIDARITY

From Local 1746 & 700 Negotiating Committee

