



OPEIU LOCAL #9 NEWSLETTER



Candy Johnson, President - local9candy@sbcglobal.net

For Bulletin Board Posting June 2014

1-800-870-9499

Dawn Martin, Business Manager - local9dawn@sbcglobal.net

414-771-9730, FAX: 414-771-9732

MEETING NOTICE

GENERAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING

Tuesday, June 17, 2014

6:00 p.m.

Firefighters Hall

5625 W. Wisconsin Avenue

Milwaukee, WI 53213

Enter through door in parking lot

REMINDER: June is the Last General Membership Meeting for Summer

The June 17th general membership meeting is the last meeting for the summer. There will be no general membership meetings in July or August.

General membership meetings will resume on Tuesday, September 16th.

Business Manager Dawn Martin Announces Retirement Plans

The following are excerpts/paraphrasing from a letter President Candy Johnson received from Business Manager Dawn Martin:

Dear Candy,

I have recently been thinking about my job and my future and have come to the decision that I would like to cease performing my duties as Business Manager as of July 25, 2014. At that time I will utilize my accumulated vacation time and cease employment at the end of September.

I am willing to come back as needed to complete open contracts and to assist my replacement as necessary. After more than 11 years of doing this job, it is time to stop full-time work and enjoy myself, family and friends. Please know this was not an easy decision for me to make as I have made many wonderful friends while working here and will miss them, but, as I said, it is time to change the direction of my life.

In Solidarity,

Dawn Martin

Plans for New Business Manager

A committee will do the initial search and interviews of candidates for the position. Once they have determined the finalists for the position the Board will then interview those candidates.

Anyone interested in submitting a resume for consideration should email President Johnson at local9candy@sbcglobal.net. Candidates shall direct the organizing, conduct negotiations, handle grievances, and be responsible for the management of the business office. Candidates should also be familiar with labor law and have some experience with labor unions. The open position will be posted on UnionJobs.com.

Money Talks—A Divided Supreme Court loosens the reins on campaign cash—again!

For years the best ticket in US politics cost about \$36,000, give or take a few grand. For that amount, you could sit down for a dinner with the President of the United States, usually in some VIP's ridiculously large house hung with tons of art. A similar check could allow you to break bread with the Speaker of the House, the Senate majority leaders or one of the sitting President's

general-election rivals. You might also get commemorative photos, private policy briefings, a handwritten note of thanks on fancy stationery, etc. Most important, your views would be heard.

The cost of this top-flight access, however, was never determined by the free market. Campaign finance laws dating back to the 1970's limited how much money an individual could give to candidates and/or political parties in a single election cycle, thereby restricting how much a politician could request. Congress put the rules in place to keep wealthy interests from buying official favors and from creating the appearance that the political process was corrupt.

This is now all changing as a result of an April 2nd landmark decision by the US Supreme Court, in which a sharply divided court decided that limits on aggregate donations violated the constitutional right to free speech. The 5-4 decision will likely transform the business of politics yet again, pushing even more money into elections. But the ruling's biggest impact may be on the national view of the conditions that make politics corrupt.

For decades, courts took rather a broad view of public interest, wary of anything that looked like pay-to-play for politics. For the Chief Justice, however, the legal scope is far more narrow, limited to cases of quid pro quo deals directly between a donor and a politician. "The government," he concluded in his majority opinion, "may not seek to limit the appearance of mere influence or access." Instead, Roberts writes that "general influence" over politicians by big donors, far from being improper, is protected speech.

This is the same logic that drove the court's 2010 *Citizens United* ruling, which created a new generation of so-called super PACs—outside groups that spend unlimited amounts of money to influence elections, usually by flooding TV screens with negative ads. In that decision,

the court found no risk of corruption from corporations, a multitude of special interest groups, millionaires and billionaires that bankroll a candidate's election through a third-party group, even if the candidate attends the group's fundraisers and allows loyal aides to run it and the group explicitly makes decisions based on the candidate's public statements.

It is in that same vein that this recent court decision finds that if a politician or a party leader raises millions from a single donor for multiple campaign entities, there is no risk of corruption, since the money is not going directly into the politician's own campaign account. The dissenting justices said this notion makes no sense and the decision eviscerates our nation's campaign laws.

In practice, the new rules could give monied interests a bigger say in politics, and those writing the checks can expect to pay higher prices for access to leading politicians. The question for historians will be whether this new freedom leads to an increase in the sort of quid pro quo deal making between politicians and donors that Roberts says Congress still has the right to discourage. In the meantime look out; money is going to start flying all over this country.

As always if you have any problems do not hesitate to call or email the office.

/gb, dalu 24111, afl-cio