

LOCAL

925

A Chapter of DISTRICT 925
Service Employees International Union, AFL-CIO, CLC
145 Tremont Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02111 (617)426-7075

C. Ullman

W

A RESOLUTION

CONCERNING LOCAL 925, A CHAPTER OF DISTRICT 925,

S.E.I.U., AFL-CIO

AND

CAMBRIDGE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COMMITTEE (C.E.O.C.)

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

Whereas Local 925 has had a collective bargaining agreement with CEOC for at least six years and has been in the process of negotiating a new contract since, December 1985. There are twelve workers in the bargaining unit, eight of which are union members.

Whereas CEOC does not have sufficient funds to give all workers wage increases has hired a lawyer from the Boston Law Firm of Peabody and Brown to do their negotiations and has proposed an anti-union open shop contract clause with a window period in which all union members may drop out of the union.

Whereas CEOC provides services for the City of Cambridge and should not be in the business of union busting. The workers at CEOC have requested that they have a democratic vote within the bargaining unit to determine whether all members, who the union must service and negotiate a contract for, become union members or pay an agency service fee, not to exceed the amount of union dues, to the union since all members benefit from the collective bargaining agreement. CEOC has failed to meet these demands.

Resolve: The Cambridge City Council go on record as being in sympathy with the demands of the union members at CEOC and urge CEOC to negotiate a Union Security Clause with an Agency Service Fee so that the bargaining unit may vote on it.

A 9

John: Mrs. Kane

A RESOLUTION

CONCERNING LOCAL 925, A CHAPTER OF DISTRICT 925,

S.E.I.U., AFL-CIO

AND

CAMBRIDGE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COMMITTEE (C.E.O.C.)

CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL

Whereas Local 925 has had a collective bargaining agreement with CEOC for at least six years and has been in the process of negotiating a new contract since, December 1985. There are twelve workers in the bargaining unit, eight of which are union members.

Whereas CEOC does not have sufficient funds to give all workers wage increases has hired a lawyer from the Boston Law Firm of Peabody and Brown to do their negotiations and has proposed an anti-union open shop contract clause with a window period in which all union members may drop out of the union.

Whereas CEOC provides services for the City of Cambridge and should not be in the business of union busting. The workers at CEOC have requested that they have a democratic vote within the bargaining unit to determine whether all members, who the union must service and negotiate a contract for, become union members or pay an agency service fee, not to exceed the amount of union dues, to the union since all members benefit from the collective bargaining agreement. CEOC has failed to meet these demands.

Resolve: The Cambridge City Council go on record as being in sympathy with the demands of the union members at CEOC and urge CEOC to negotiate a Union Security Clause with an Agency Service Fee so that the bargaining unit may vote on it.



City of Cambridge

22.

COUNCILLOR VELLUCCI

IN CITY COUNCIL

April 28, 1986

A RESOLUTION
 CONCERNING LOCAL 925, A CHAPTER OF DISTRICT 925,
 S.E.I.U., AFL-CIO
 AND
 CAMBRIDGE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COMMITTEE (C.E.O.C.)

- WHEREAS: Local 925 has had a collective bargaining agreement with CEOC for at least six years and has been in the process of negotiating a new contract since, December 1985. There are twelve workers in the bargaining unit, eight of which are union members; and
- WHEREAS: CEOC does not have sufficient funds to give all workers wage increases has hired a lawyer from the Boston Law Firm of Peabody and Brown to do their negotiations and has proposed an anti-union open shop contract clause with a window period in which all union members may drop out of the union; and
- WHEREAS: CEOC provides services for the City of Cambridge and should not be in the business of union busting. The workers at CEOC have requested that they have a democratic vote within the bargaining unit to determine whether all members, who the union must service and negotiate a contract for, become union members or pay an agency service fee, not to exceed the amount of union dues, to the union since all members benefit from the collective bargaining agreement. CEOC has failed to meet these demands; therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That the Cambridge City Council go on record as being in sympathy with the demands of the union members at CEOC and urge CEOC to negotiate a Union Security Clause with an Agency Service Fee so that the bargaining unit may vote on it.

In City Council April 28, 1986.

Adopted by the affirmative vote of 9 members.

Attest:- Joseph E. Connarton, Acting City Clerk.

A true copy;

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Joseph E. Connarton".

ATTEST:-

Joseph E. Connarton, Acting City Clerk.

Order No. 22 S-269

VM Vellucci re: resolutions in sympathy with
the demands of union members at CEOC & urging
CEOC to negotiate a Union Security Clause with
an Agency Service Fee so that the bargaining
unit may vote on it.

In City Council,

April 28, 1986

VMU
A V/U
9