



**BUILDING OUR
TOMORROW
TODAY**

REPORT FROM

38TH CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION • JULY 25-28 DETROIT, MICHIGAN

By Scott Houldieson

The 38th UAW Constitutional Convention convened in Detroit, Michigan at noon on Monday July 25, 2022 and adjourned around 6PM Eastern Time on Thursday July 28. True democratic decision making was the rule rather than the exception during those four days.

I'd like to begin by saying Thank You for electing me to serve as your delegate for my fourth Constitutional Convention. This Convention was like none I have seen before. Some close friends of mine have been to UAW Conventions since the 1970's and they agreed that this one was different than any they have experienced. What was so different? Democracy is breaking out in the UAW!

This is the first UAW Constitutional Convention under the Consent Decree the International Union agreed to in December 2020. That Consent Decree led to the referendum where UAW members overwhelmingly voted to change the way our International Executive Board is elected.

This fall every UAW member, both active and retired, will have a vote to decide who will be the UAW International President, International Secretary-Treasurer, International Vice Presidents (3) and Regional Directors. Nominations took place on the third day of the Convention.

One change requested through our resolutions was to include the proposed Constitutional Amendments in the registration kit delegates receive. That change was implemented with a couple of notable exceptions.

DAY 1



UAW Conventions always start with the presentation of the colors. The color guard, with great ceremony, brings our nations flags forward where they will remain until the

close of the Convention. National Anthems from Canada, Puerto Rico and the United States were sung. Then we got down to business. The Credentials Committee reported that there were 866 delegates from 309 Local Unions.

The rules report was read. There are 21 special Convention Rules in the report. We had discussion of the rules report. A delegate motioned to amend the rule that sets the number of delegates required to bring resolutions passed by Local Unions up for debate. The rules required the agreement of 136 delegates to bring a resolution out of the Submitted Resolutions book up for debate and a vote. Her motion was to lower that number to 45, the same amount required to end debate. Her motion had support so it was set aside for the moment.

Another delegate requested to amend the rule that says Committee Reports are subject to an up or down vote. Amendments to committee reports are only allowed if the report is voted down twice. Her motion was to allow amendments to committee reports if 45 delegates are in agreement to amend the report. This includes amending resolutions from the Resolutions Committee and amending Constitutional amendments proposed by the Constitution Committee. These committees are hand picked by the Regional Directors.

Yet another delegate requested a change to the rule on voting. It says all voting shall be by voice or a show of hands, but the Chairperson of the Convention may call for a standing vote when in doubt. She requested that votes be by secret ballot instead to avoid intimidation of delegates voting "the wrong way".

The delegates debated all of these proposed rule changes but decided to leave the rules intact.

The next order of business was to place the language reflecting the results of the referendum for One Member One Vote into our Constitution. I was recognized to speak for the amendment. Here is what I had to say: "I want to speak in favor of this resolution. The members have spoken. With regards to the referendum, this is a way to bring accountability to our great union. Part of this is to make sure that what happened doesn't happen again. I think that's what we all want. That part of the resolution I stand in full support of."

DAY 1 (Continued)

Also nobody has spoken yet about the Article 19 changes.” (Make all contracts available online.) “I’d like to say that this is a long time coming. It should be passed unanimously. To have the ability to see your contract agreement is a way to help the members enforce their own agreements in the plants. While we have that luxury in auto, many of our other units don’t have that luxury and I think it is a great amendment to our Constitution and I fully support it.” These amendments passed nearly unanimously.

Next we needed to decide how runoff elections would work in our new direct election system. The proposal was one of the exceptions that was not included in our registration kit. It read: Article 10 of the UAW Constitution be amended to include the use of Ranked Choice Voting for International Executive Board offices, which allows for an instant runoff if no candidate achieves a majority of votes. The court appointed Monitor provided an explanation of Ranked Choice Voting. It is an election method that allows voters the option to rank candidates in order of preference. Instead of choosing just one candidate, voters may rank the candidates on the ballot by indicating their first choice, second choice, third choice, and so on. The process allows for an instant runoff to take place in the event that one candidate does not receive a majority of the first place votes, without the need for there to be a second election.

The incumbent International Executive Board had flyers on our tables asking delegates to reject this proposal from the Monitor. Some delegates who spoke against Ranked Choice Voting argued that it is too complicated. Here is what I had to say about Ranked Choice Voting. “I stand to speak in favor of Ranked Choice Voting. The reasons are multiple. Ranked Choice Voting gives a better indication of the intentions of the voters in a runoff system. It’s an Instant Runoff rather than a Delayed Runoff. So we get the results right away rather than having to wait and wait and wait for the runoff to take place. Let’s say for instance we have our election this fall, which we are going to do. The ballots go out in October. They get returned by the end of November. It takes a week or so to count the ballots. You’re into December. Then within seven days the Monitor comes back and says ‘well we have a runoff for President and two Vice Presidents.’

Now we’ve got to put those ballots together. We’ve got to mail those ballots out in late December, early January. Then sometime in February people are returning their ballots and in March we are getting the results.

What’s happening next March? We are all meeting here again aren’t we! **We have auto negotiations next year!** Do we want to wait that long to know who is going to be negotiating our contracts?

It’s important that we get the results for these elections as quickly as possible. That’s one of the best arguments for Ranked Choice Voting that I can think of, but also you get better voter turnout. You were concerned about the voter turnout in the referendum. Well with the runoff

election I know in our Local Union runoff elections always have lower voter turnout. So if you want the sense of voters, Ranked Choice Voting gives those voters the opportunity to make that choice right away when they are filling out their ballot.

So I think we need to have an Instant Runoff rather than a Delayed Runoff so we can be prepared for taking on the corporations. That’s our real job here is taking on the corporations. So let’s be prepared for that.”

The vote on Ranked Choice Voting failed so we moved on to the language to include a traditional runoff election system. That language passed. The end result of all this discussion is that if a runoff is required it will be done by mail with the top two candidates for single position offices in a runoff. With Vice President candidates, if there are less than 7 candidates the three receiving the most votes will be declared the winners. If there are 7 or more candidates the majority point is determined by taking the total votes cast for the office of Vice President and dividing by the number of positions to be filled (3), and dividing that by 2; which determines the 50% mark that must be exceeded to be elected on the first ballot. If there are more than 3 candidates that receive a majority the candidates with the highest vote totals will be considered elected. If no candidate receives a majority there will be a runoff confined to the 6 candidates receiving the highest vote totals. The new Constitution also defines other scenarios for Vice President runoff elections.

DAY 2

Tuesday at the Convention was an incredible day!

There was more democratic procedure on this day than in every Convention combined over the past 50 years. We started with an update to the Preamble of the Constitution. The addition that was passed says: “The UAW’s elected leaders must demonstrate a commitment to transparency, democratic participation, and communication, to ensure the voices of rank-and-file UAW members are heard at all levels of our union’s governance.”

I was recognized to speak against this proposal. “The reason I rise to speak against this proposal is not because of the content. I speak against this proposal because of the placement. By putting it in the Preamble we are saying this is a sentiment of what we want to achieve. It properly belongs in Article 32 or in the Ethical Practices Codes. If we put it in either of those places it has teeth. We can file complaints and appeals if placed properly. Putting it in the Preamble makes it more of a suggestion than a requirement. After all we have been through, transparency and democratic participation must be more than a sentiment. It needs to be enforceable policy.”

In Article 5 we added to the jurisdictions of our union. In addition to the more common thought of workplaces the UAW has jurisdiction over such as auto, parts, gaming, technical and office professionals etc. **we added higher education.** This sector of our union is growing rapidly. We added 17,000 researchers in the University of California

DAY 2 (Continued)

system last year. Once they get a first contract they will get either assigned to a local or get a charter of their own. This is in addition to graduate student workers in the same University system, grad workers at California State University, the Universities of Washington, Massachusetts, Harvard, Columbia, The New School, New York University etc. This amendment just reflects the reality of our union.

Next a delegate requested to bring a resolution out of the Submitted Resolutions book that, if passed, would have allowed retirees the right to run for UAW International Executive Board Offices. This resolution became necessary because our Constitution doesn't explicitly state that retired members cannot run for International Executive Board positions. At least two retired UAW members, both former International Staff, announced their intention to run for President. The Monitor found our Constitution to be ambiguous on the question, so President Curry issued an interpretation of the Constitution that eliminated two of his most experienced potential opponents.

The motion to bring a resolution out of the Submitted Resolutions book required 136 delegates to support bringing it out for debate and a vote. This has not been accomplished at any Convention since 1985. Over 200 delegates voted to bring this resolution up for debate and a vote. **THIS WAS HISTORIC!**

There were several impassioned speeches on this topic. A point of glaring irony was pointed out by the delegate who requested the resolution. John Weyer of Local 869 pointed out that "Our President and the International Executive Board decided that retirees can't run. Yet throughout this week we are watching a retiree run this meeting. Let me explain, there's a man by the name of Rick Isaacson who comes out from the back every time somebody is lost or confused and he gives direction to the chair of what's going to happen. **THAT'S A RETIREE RUNNING THIS MEETING!**"

The resolution that would have amended the Constitution to allow retirees the right to run for International Executive Board was ultimately voted down. Our Constitution remains ambiguous on the issue.

Next came an unheard of display of power from the delegate body. The Constitution Committee proposed an amendment that would restrict campaign contributions for candidates to UAW members only but with no maximum contribution limit. Delegate after delegate got up to demand a cap on campaign contributions. One of the most heartfelt was from Bill Bagwell who is from the home Local of iconic UAW President Walter Reuther Local 174. Here's what brother Bagwell had to say:

"I stand against this motion. We have to vote this down so that we can have a cap on how much money can be spent by an individual person. It's ridiculous for us to think that people aren't going to get outside money and have their buddy give it to them. It's ridiculous for us to think that leaders that can steal money aren't going to steal money and give it to the candidates that they support. I can't believe

that we are not discussing a motion to have a cap and then to have people not want to have a cap. I cannot believe that you have brought to us a motion to have no cap on how much money we can donate to a candidate running for office when some people have unlimited capital! It's defying the meaning of One Member One Vote that an average worker could rise to the position of UAW President when you put restrictions when it comes to money on the campaign. If you guys can spend whatever you want then you might as well not even have One Member One Vote. We might as well go back to where we are. Because we are not changing anything unless we **ACTUALLY CHANGE THINGS!** To change things we must put limits. We can't say things like our leaders would never accept dirty money. Our leaders have already shown us that they are human beings. And human beings succumb to greed. And greed puts us where we are now.

When I was eight years old I went to Local 22 with my Dad to get a firetruck because auto workers didn't make good money back then, and my Dad couldn't afford to buy us Christmas gifts, but the Union gave us a firetruck. That little boy is crying because the organization that he fell in love with at eight years old has turned into an organization that tries to deny retirees, tries to cheat and steal from the membership. It does everything it can do to keep the ruling class the ruling class!

If you want to open it up, and I know you don't, but the government is sayin that we have to. If you want to open it up we have to turn this down and make a reasonable proposal that there be a cap on. I can't give as much money as I want to Barack Obama! But I can give as much money as I want to Gary Jones! I don't think it's right. I think we need to vote it down and give a motion that is reasonable so that number 1 our members think we are trying to do the right thing and number 2 the world thinks we are trying to do the right thing. Because right now we look terrible!"

Under the approved rules to the Convention we would have to vote the resolution down twice before delegates could propose amendments to the resolution because it is a committee report.

Delegate Tim Boyd, seeing the urgency to have the delegates correct this, motioned to suspend the rules. According to Convention rule number 21 the rules may be amended or suspended only by a two-thirds vote of the delegates present.

In the judgement of the chair (Frank Stuglin) there were not two-thirds of the delegates in favor of suspending the rules. Sister Lee Diaz appealed from the decision of the chair. Her appeal overturned brother Stuglin's decision. When a standing vote was called for by the chair, he recognized that the two-thirds vote was achieved without the need to count the votes. The delegates overwhelmingly supported suspending the rules to put a cap on campaign contributions.

Brother Bob Reynolds from Local 897 proposed placing a cap of \$2,000 on campaign contributions to candidates. That amendment passed. Then the amended resolution passed.

DAY 2 (Continued)

Next came a vote on an amendment to the Constitution creating a new Region 6 on the West Coast. When the International Executive Board disbanded Region 5 the states making up Region 5 were reallocated to Regions 4 and 8. This created two incredibly large Regions. Region 4, where Local 551 is located, stretched from Illinois to Washington State in the contiguous U.S. and also includes Hawaii and Alaska. Region 8 starts in the Southeastern U.S. and then spans the entire Southern half of the U.S. to California.

The new Region 6 includes Washington, Oregon, Idaho, California, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, Hawaii and Alaska.

Next Local 1700 delegate, Bill Parker, was recognized to speak and **requested that the resolution on rejecting tiers and adding that language to Article 19 of the UAW Constitution be brought up for debate.** This resolution was passed by 24 local unions representing approximately 40% of the UAW membership, yet it did not appear in the Submitted Resolutions booklet. The motion to bring this resolution out of committee for debate required the support of 136 delegates. There were 282 delegates voting to bring it up for debate. Since it was not in the Submitted Resolutions Booklet, the chair (Vice President Cindy Estrada) asked that it be tabled until copies of the resolution could be printed and distributed to the delegates.

When debate started UAW delegates from many of the different sectors of the UAW spoke in favor of this amendment. Those who spoke against the amendment said that elimination of tiers was important but belonged in the Special Bargaining Convention rather than the Constitutional Convention. Brother Parker had the last word on the resolution. Here is what he had to say:

“Thank you sister Estrada. We thank you for your years of service to our union.

I rise on this because the question of tiers has so decimated our union. It has undermined our ability to get unity within our ranks. It has undermined our ability to project ourselves in a positive manner when organizing. The question of tiers has been a disaster for us. Now we can just throw it all out to the individual bargaining committees but I don't think that's right. Look, at one time in our industry there were jobs that were designated for people of color. There were jobs that were designated for women. They received less money. This union took a stand against that and fought to bring everyone up to the same pay. Because that's the kind of principal we believe in. We believe in the principal of Equal Pay for Equal Work. It's not right that auto workers today or workers in other sectors there are people who work side by side but get different compensation for it. Different compensation now and different compensation post employment. We have to take a strong stand on this as a union! This is a life and death question for this union!

We already have language in Article 19 Section 6 – The International Executive Board shall protect all local unions who have succeeded in establishing higher wages

and favorable conditions and have superior agreements, so that no infringement by Local Unions with inferior agreements in workplaces doing similar work may be committed against the Local Union with advanced agreements.

That's in here because we recognize that we cannot allow locals to bid against each other. That we will all go down if we allow a race to the bottom. The question of tiers is very much the same thing. Our principal is Equal Pay for Equal Work and this amendment seeks to put that concept into our Constitution. It seeks to put into our Constitution a commitment that we will no longer accept tiers as a basis for future collective bargaining. We will find other ways to reach an agreement with management. I have no doubt about that. But we won't do it by dividing our own members or mortgaging future members who we haven't even met yet.

This resolution was written carefully to be firm on the question of future contracts and to give direction on current contracts. It doesn't say every contract has to eliminate tiers today or tomorrow. It says we have to move in that direction by bringing up the lower compensated workers up to the highest levels. People are making straw men or straw women arguments. That's not what this is about. This is about – Do we put into our Constitution a principal that I believe every person in this room holds to and that is Equal Pay for Equal Work and I believe that we should put that in the Constitution. I believe we should eliminate tiers. It is so destructive to our union that I believe this body today should put that policy into our Constitution.

Thank you very much.”



Delegate Bill Parker has the last word on the reject tiers resolution before we went to a vote on the motion.

Ultimately the resolution was not passed. We were successful in injecting a heartfelt discussion of the scourge of tiered wage and benefit structures in UAW contracts. Look for more discussion on this topic at the Bargaining Convention expected to take place next spring, as we head into contract negotiations with Ford, GM and Stellantis.

After the discussion of the Reject Tiers resolution we turned to the Constitution Committee report on salaries. Our

DAY 2 (Continued)

Local passed a resolution that called for International Executive Board (IEB) salary transparency. It called for IEB salaries to be stated explicitly in the Constitution. It also called for a roll back of the 30% salary increases approved by the Williams/Jones UAW Convention in 2018. The Committee report included the transparency aspect. It also built a 3% increase on top of the increase from the 2018 Convention and added another 3% increase next year. Debate was lively.

Those who spoke in favor supported the IEB salary increases because they feel the salaries are still too low despite the increases from four years ago.

Delegates speaking in opposition noted the increases from four years ago at a Convention where the outgoing President and the incoming President have since plead guilty to misappropriations and were sentenced to Federal Prison. They also noted that the membership has not had raises that were reflective of the last increases. One sister pointed out that the Monitor's latest report indicated there are pending investigations and we could be giving raises to folks who will subsequently be indicted. She hoped qualifications for appointment to staff would have been included but weren't.

A delegate called for a roll call vote where each delegate would cast their vote individually and have that vote recorded so everyone, including their members, could see how the votes were cast. Roll call voting also gives the proper weighted votes to each delegate. Delegates voting strength varies from 1 to 8 depending on the number of members they represent. Taking a roll call vote requires 318 delegates to agree. Only 150 delegates, including me, were in favor of a roll call vote.

On a voice vote it was clear the salary amendment was rejected. Chair of the Convention during this vote was Vice President Terry Dittes. He stated **THE NAYS HAVE IT.**

At this point the proper thing to do, under the Convention Rules would have been to send the amendment back to the Constitution Committee to evaluate why the amendment was rejected and have the Committee bring back changes to suit the sense of the delegates. Instead he did what we have seen too often – vote until you get it right.

VP Dittes consulted with President Curry then came back to the podium to say we are going to take a hand count. Multiple delegates raised points of order to state that the vote was lost and there may be a procedure for an appeal or a reconsideration. The points of order and points of information consumed the next 35 minutes. Ultimately the Article 11 amendments on salaries were passed.

That was the last item we covered before recessing.

DAY 3

This was Nominations Day for International Executive Board candidates. It was also Nominations and Election Day for Trustee. At past conventions this would have been election day for both. The convention center would have been decked out with balloons and glossy campaign lit-

erature from the Administration Caucus candidates. Other candidates had simple leaflets or campaign literature.

Wednesday began with delegate Nolan Tabb from Local 281 requesting the resolution to have strike pay begin on day one rather than day eight of a strike and strike pay be at least \$400 per week be brought out of committee for debate and a vote. Nolan is a John Deere worker who was part of a 33 day strike last year. It required 136 delegates to approve bringing the resolution up for debate and a vote. UAW President Ray Curry observed that there were easily more than the 136 delegates required.

When the International Executive Board began receiving resolutions to increase strike pay from multiple local unions, they preemptively made a policy decision to increase strike pay from \$275 per week to \$400 per week on June 7, 2022. The resolution submitted by many of these locals included having strike pay begin on day 1 instead of day 8 of a strike and include it in Article 50 of the UAW Constitution.

This resolution would improve the bargaining power of UAW workers during contract negotiations. There were no delegates to speak against the resolution. It passed with nearly unanimous consent of the Convention!

Next a casino worker from Local 1005 in Cleveland asked for a resolution to allow absentee voting in union elections be brought to the floor for debate and a vote. It garnered the support of 160 delegates and was debated.

Supporters noted that some workers were denied the ballot because they were required to quarantine because of covid-19. Other supporters felt it could give retirees, with mobility problems or who no longer live near the union hall, the ability to vote. Opponents thought mailed ballots or electronic voting could result in election fraud. The motion failed to pass.

After this vote, the Resolutions Committee presented the Resolution on Women's Issues. The resolution points to four broad conclusions. The UAW commits to: 1) Advocating for women's equality in wages and infrastructure, 2) Protection of voter rights and support of pro-labor women candidates, 3) Advocacy for gender justice, 4) Combating gender based harassment and violence in the workplace.

Delegate from Local 5118, Rachel Petherbridge, said: "As a young woman of reproductive age, I am very scared and I appreciate your support." She was disappointed to see one word missing from the resolution. She said: "This resolution alludes to reproductive care, but it does not say abortion. Abortion is healthcare and it should have been in this resolution. A majority of UAW members will soon live in a State where abortion is no longer a right. We need to use strong language to fight against that on a national stage."

Next the President of Local 600 asked for a point of information. He wanted to know how much the Monitor and other costs associated with the corruption scandal cost? Secretary Treasurer Stuglin had some of the information from the start of the consent decree. He presented a list of costs that were hard to keep up with.



DAY 3 (Continued)

Local 140 delegate, Rich Boyer, asked for the total amounts the corruption has cost our union. Stuglin estimated \$13 million.

Another delegate asked how much was stolen from us? All of this information was promised to delegates before adjournment.

Delegate Bob Reynolds made a motion to use every legal resource available to recover these costs from the criminals who betrayed our union. That decision was put off pending the written amounts promised to delegates by Secretary Treasurer Stuglin.

The next order of business was nominations. This fall will be the first ever direct election for UAW International Executive Board Positions. The nominees for UAW International Executive Board positions that accepted and are eligible to run will appear on your ballot this fall. Candidates will have advertisements in the next issue of Solidarity Magazine. Watch your mailbox in September for this issue of Solidarity. Also this September the court appointed Monitor will conduct an online Candidate Forum. Many candidates have created websites and Facebook pages to get their platform to the membership. Use these to make an informed decision about the leaders who will be leading our union and negotiating our contracts.

Ballots for the election of International Executive Board officers will be mailed to the address on record with the UAW of every member in good standing on October 17, 2022. They will be due back (NOT POSTMARKED) by the end of business on November 28, 2022.

Here are the nominees for UAW International Executive Board positions: *Because of the interpretation of the UAW Constitution issued by UAW President Ray Curry on March 24, 2022 retirees are not eligible to run for International Executive Board Positions.*

President

Shawn Fain

Mark Gibson

Ray Curry

Brian Keller

Will Leahman

Jim Coakley (ineligible)

John Guinan (ineligible)

Secretary Treasurer

Margaret Mock

Frank Stuglin

Tom Favazza (ineligible)

Vice President (you will get to vote for up to three)

Mike Booth

Ronald "Rich" Boyer

Michael Turner

Sharon Bell

Chuck Browning

Rich LeTourneau

Brian Czape

Tim Bressler

Tony Candela (ineligible)

Brian Price (ineligible)

Next was nomination and election for an International Trustee positions. We normally elect one Trustee at each Convention. The trustees serve three convention terms and do not sit on the International Executive Board, but report to the IEB twice per year and are supposed to report to the Convention. This Convention included a snap election for the unexpired term of Trustee Heather Keag. I call it a snap election because there was no notice to the delegates that Trustee Keag stepped down. We should have been notified of the election of an additional Trustee at this Convention. In 2018 we elected two Trustees also. The Convention Rules in 2018 stipulated that we would be nominating and electing two Trustees.

This was the first contested election for International Trustee in at least 50 years. Nominees for International Trustee were:

Emilio Ramirez

Dana Davidson

Brian McClurg

Roberta Gainer

Patrick Radke

Dana Davidson declined her nomination because she intended to run for the full term. Voting was done by roll call. Emilio Ramirez, who was supported by the Administration Caucus, was elected.

DAY 4

I had hoped the delegates would be in the mood to instill some accountability into our union. That is why I decided to run for the full term International Trustee position. The Administration Caucus had other things in mind.

The fourth day of the Convention harkened back to previous conventions where boos, cat calls and noisemakers were employed to drown out debate from delegates who they didn't agree with. While the noisemakers were absent from this convention. Rude and boisterous behavior made a return on day four.

First they issued a new rule prohibiting live streaming of the Convention. Live streaming allows the membership and the public to see events as they unfold on Facebook

DAY 4 (Continued)

posts. Thursday the Administration Caucus wanted to hide their planned disruptions from the membership.

The special Convention Rules approved for nominations allowed candidates to receive two nominations. The delegate doing the nomination would be allowed up to five minutes to give a nomination speech. Anyone giving a nomination speech after a candidate had received two nominations would be ruled out of order. After whipping votes overnight the Administration Caucus put on a display of their continued control over many of the Convention delegates. My opponent quickly received her two nominations. After that delegate after delegate rose to place her name into nomination, many using up the majority of their allotted five minutes before mentioning her name and being ruled out of order. When one of the delegates called a point of order requesting the chair to bring the Convention to order and demand the nomination circus be halted, Vice President Terry Dittes said delegates had a right to be recognized to make nominations. He then continued with the out of order nominations parade.

One delegate, who was frustrated with the nomination circus, gave a speech about the absurdity of letting the nominations turn into a cartoon and proceeded to nominate Daffy Duck. Local 551 delegate Chris Pena got into the circus. He rose to nominate my opponent for somewhere around the 50th nomination and was called out of order.

Since there was so much gamesmanship going on I got into the fray as well. I was recognized to give a nomination. I began by pointing out how much fun it must have been to violate the rules for nominations so many times. I then started explaining the role of International Trustee. Administration Caucus delegates quickly caused a ruckus. I asked for the chair to call the delegates to order and reclaim my time. As I continued the chair, Terry Dittes, began interrupting my speech asking me if I had a nomination. When I finally got around to stating the name of my nominee he couldn't hear that I had nominated another outspoken delegate from Local 174 – Bill Bagwell. Had brother Dittes been listening rather than talking over me he would have heard my nomination the first time.

After the nomination circus had concluded we went to a roll call vote, where each delegate is supposed to cast their vote individually. One of the rules that had been approved was block voting. Essentially if the delegates from any particular local were in agreement on a candidate, they could vote as a block with one member of their delegation casting the votes for all of their delegates. This practice is open to fraud and should be discontinued.

When Local 551 was up to cast our votes, both Terri Roy (Who had been advanced to the roll of delegate when one of our delegates became sick and the first alternate left for vacation.) and I cast our votes for me. Delegate Chris Pena then went to the microphone to announce that the remaining votes from Local 551 would go to my opponent.

I noticed that not all of our delegates were present so I rose for a point of order. I asked if a delegate had to be

present to vote. I was told they did have to be present. I then asked that our delegates cast their votes individually. Instead the chair requested the name of the delegate who was missing, which I provided. This raises the question of how many absentee votes had been cast but not corrected.

Once a majority had been reached by one of the candidates the election was called. Any delegates wishing to have their votes counted for the record could go to the microphone and cast their votes. Dozens more did vote. The nominations and roll call vote ate up two and a half hours at the beginning of the final day of the convention. Dana Davidson of Local 249 was elected as your International Trustee for a twelve year term.

After the Trustee election we went into Regional break outs for the purpose of nominating Regional Director candidates. The results that came out of the nominations for Regional directors are as follows:

Region 1

LaShawn English

James Harris

Region 1A

Laura Dickerson (unopposed)

Region 1D

Steve Dawes (unopposed)

Region 2B

David Green

Wayne Blanchard

Region 4 (Our Region)

Brandon Campbell (unopposed)

Region 6

Mike Miller (unopposed)

Region 8

Tim Smith (unopposed)

Region 9

Daniel Vicente

Jim Lakeman

Lauren Farrell

Region 9A

Brandon Mancilla

Beverly Brakeman

After the Regional break outs we reconvened to hear from the Ethics Officer Wilma Liebman. She gave a report that detailed how the Ethics apparatus works, including her role, the role of Exiger (the company hosting and making determinations from the Ethics hotline) and the role of the Member Advisory Committee on Ethics.

Under retired UAW President Rory Gamble, Ethics Reforms were established in response to the scandal that rocked our union and led to his appointment after the resignation of disgraced UAW President Gary Jones. The Ethics Reforms included the Member Advisory Committee on Ethics selected by a random drawing of active UAW members who signed up to be on the Committee.

A resolution that was not included in the original package that delegates received upon registration, would

DAY 4 (Continued)

extend the Ethics Reforms another four years. One BIG difference is the members of the Member Advisory Committee on Ethics would be reconstituted but instead of a random selection of interested members the Committee members would be selected by the Regional Directors.

Since the Member Advisory Committee on Ethics is supposed to offer advice to the International Executive Board on improving their ethical practices it would be a conflict of interest to have the members of that Committee appointed by International Executive Board members. Yet that is exactly what was proposed with their resolution.

Debate was brief. The question was called before many objections to the hand picking of the Member Advisory Committee on Ethics could be lodged. A quick vote passed the resolution. The fox is now in charge of the hen house.

By now it was well into the afternoon. On the last day of the Convention many delegates had flights home scheduled for the late afternoon or early evening. A delegate rose to make a motion to reconsider the increase to weekly strike pay that had passed the previous day. Before a vote could take place I rose for a point of order. I informed the chair that under Roberts Rules of Order a motion to reconsider must be made by a delegate who had voted with the majority on the previous motion. Since the vote on the strike pay increase was not done by roll call, we have no idea who voted with the majority. Therefore the motion to reconsider should be ruled out of order. President Curry noted my objection.

The delegate who made the motion to reconsider then got up to claim that he had voted with the majority on the previous motion. Despite his claim the motion should have been ruled out of order. A roll call vote was requested on the motion to reconsider. According to the Convention Rules a roll call vote requires the support of 318 delegates. The motion for a roll call vote failed to get the required number of delegates. Instead the vote to reconsider the \$500 strike pay was taken as a standing count. It passed.

Next we were supplied with part of the information requested on the previous day. The information requested was how much has the Monitor cost the union and how much did the embezzlement and misappropriations cost the union. We received the costs of the Monitor and related costs but not the costs of the embezzlement and misappropriations. Here are the figures we were supplied.

Monitor and his team.	\$6,987,985
Vendor for Referendum.	\$2,237,075
Ethics Officer and Hotline	\$850,272
Fees for Adjudications Officer	\$165,297
Estimated cost for IEB election	\$2,600,000
Total to date	\$12,840,629

A motion was made to have the UAW International Executive Board and the UAW Legal Department go after those who were convicted of wrongdoing to recover as much of these costs as we can from the criminals. That motion

passed nearly unanimously.

There still remained four Constitutional Amendments and most of the proposed resolutions book. It was getting near 5 PM on the final day of the Convention. The remaining Constitutional Amendments were:

Article 41 Section 4 It shall be the duty of each member to participate in Local and International union elections; and to become educated and active in policy discussions of the Union.

Article 44 Add Organizing Committee to the list of Standing Committees that each Local Union shall have.

Ethical Practices Codes add a Section 5. Each member has the right and responsibility to report activities or practices that they reasonably and in good faith believe are in violation of the Ethical Practices Codes; such reports should be provided to the UAW Ethics Officer. There shall be no discrimination or retaliation of any kind against a member who has exercised this right and responsibility.

Article 2 Section 2 This Constitution shall use gender neutral language and pronouns throughout whenever feasible.

All four of these amendments along with most of the proposed resolutions were passed in mass as the final action of the Convention before adjournment.

President Curry failed to give a "State of the UAW" speech. Apparently it was more important to roll back strike pay and make a circus out of nominations for International Trustee than it was to have time for the President report on the state of our union. We also never received the required report from the International Board of Trustees.

A Convention that was by far the most democratic in decades devolved on the last day so that the Administration Caucus could reclaim control. There are elections for the UAW International Executive Board coming up this fall. Please remember this when you cast your ballot.

The good things that came out of this convention: Strike Pay from day 1, a thorough discussion of the scourge of tiers, capping campaign contributions in union elections, nominating reform candidates for International Executive Board, etc. happened because of the organizing work of Unite All Workers for Democracy (UAWD). Thank you to everyone who passed resolutions, helped recruit candidates, made phone calls and donated to the cause of reform in the UAW!

There remains plenty of work to do. Visit uawd.org to join the movement to build a better UAW together. Visit uawmembers.org to learn more about the UAW Members United team of candidates for UAW International Executive Board. These are the only candidates endorsed by UAWD.

In solidarity,
Scott Houldieson

