

Local 896 Meeting Report

James Santangelo came to our January union meeting trying to sell a merger with Local 848.

Here are the highlights and lowlights:

▶ **Santangelo said we would vote on the merger at a union meeting—not through the mail.** He didn't say anything about how our northern California members would vote.

He called that "the democratic way." Does that sound democratic to you?

▶ **Santangelo said our locals would be stronger if we merged—but not how.** He never mentioned the weaker contracts he's bargained in our industry.

▶ **Santangelo spent a lot of our time in the Branch 3 (beer) meeting complaining about literature from Save Local 896.** Does he really want members to hear from both sides?

▶ **The chair violated basic rules of fair play.** He ignored a motion to hold a mail ballot vote for the merger. Is that how the merger vote would be handled, too?

▶ **Santangelo was not well received at the Branch 4 (soft drink) meeting.** Soft drink members have seen first-hand Santangelo's poor performance at the bargaining table. Santangelo left the meeting early, visibly upset.

Our Campaign Is Working

The campaign to save our local is working—because of the support of working members like you.

We can't stop now. Santangelo wants to ram a vote down our throats. We are going to keep demanding a mail ballot vote so that all of our members can participate.

If we stick together, we can save our local.



Who said this?

"I want the voices of all Branch 3 members to be heard on this issue."

Answer: Rene Medrano.

That's what our own Secretary-Treasurer had to say in 2008, when we voted on whether or not to let Local 896 officials tap into the Branch 3 Strike Fund.¹

Medrano insisted on a mail ballot vote instead of a vote at the local union meeting after members voted down his plan unanimously.

Then members voted it down a second time.

If a mail ballot was so important then—why not now?

¹Rene Medrano. Letter to Branch 3 Local 896 members. Oct. 26, 2008.