

January 14, 2001

>
>
> Dear Mike Doyle:
>
>

> I suggest you review my letter. I acknowledged the existence of
> limited release assignments in the non-railroad industry. This included the
> information from the NLRB cases you referenced. One case concerned
> compensation for time spent away from the assembly line to attend
> negotiations for a union committee. Another case was for a grievance
> committee that was compensated to meet with company officers for several
> hours a month. The Duquesne University case contained no release time
> mention. The NLRB directed the University to cease funding a union
> newsletter. This was considered unfair labor practice. My statements are
> not misrepresentations. Instead, they are a product of research in response
> to your letter. How can you interpret quotes of Railway Labor Act and the
> NLRA statutes as misinformation? Do not attempt to twist my letter's content
> to your satisfaction. If you have difficulty understanding the letter,
> possibly the material is too esoteric for you; or maybe you think because my
> letter is almost two weeks old, people might have forgotten what I said.
>

> After trying for several weeks, I tracked down a PBA rep on January
> 10. Tommy Gleason had a brief conversation about this issue with him a few
> months ago. I called him to expand on his conversation with Tom. He had
> previously held a release position for the PBA. The MTA Police are not
> covered by the RLA. He informed me he received no union salary when he
> worked this position. He received only company salary. He did not received
> both salaries at the same time. I informed him this is a violation of the
> RLA. He said he was unaware of this and his lawyer negotiated the position.
> I expected no less a statement from your lawyer. I asked why he would want
> this position. He responded with one word: "money". He told me when he
> worked and performed union work part time, he only made \$20,000/year from the
> PBA in addition to his salary as an officer. If you are so sure nothing is
> improper with your agreement to be paid by the Company, produce this
> agreement as requested.
>

> The LIRR BLE General Chairman sent Tom McGrath a letter stating he is
> compensated solely by his members' dues dollars. The same holds true for the
> LIRR UTU General Committee.
>

> I fails to see how a situation concerning the state of Connecticut can
> be improved because union officers are compensated for full time positions
> and simultaneously drawing a salary from Acre. Foregoing any legal issue, I

> am not in favor of this form of payment. If you really wished to save the
> members money, you wouldn't draw a union salary.

>
> I appreciate you mentioning my right to express views and make points
> on issues. Actually, this is every member's guaranteed right under the
> provisions of the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959,
> Title I: Bill of Rights of Members of Labor Organizations. I ask you now,
> the question Tony has yet to answer: Why is MTA/Metro North willing to
> compensate four union officers full time salaries, lawful/unlawful, by
> agreement or otherwise? My opinion, shared by others, is that MTA/Metro
> North wants the RLA removed from the property with your assistance. Please
> guarantee the membership in writing that this is not the case. Make it a
> matter of record that your acquiescence will not be proffered for an
> exemption. And we will not have to worry about this issue in the next
> contract.

>
> Mike, unleash the hounds, I think a catharsis is in order. I left
> office on December 31, 1993, before the great "sellout" of 1994. My capacity
> as President of Local 77 involved operating the Local. I did not handle
> grievances, negotiations or administer the GCA office. To my knowledge, my
> veracity has not been an issue in the past. Generally, I'm so direct I'm
> considered condescending.

>
> Maybe a debate should be arranged. You bring your associates, I'll
> find some to accompany me and we'll discuss the issues in an open forum.

>
> Kudos to whomever performed the neat trick that had Tom Gleason
> temporarily removed from AOL. This inconvenienced his family and delayed my
> 1/12/01 e-mail. Obviously an attempt at censorship.