

**Standing Committee Meeting #448  
Administration Board Room  
November 25, 2010**

Present: D McRae, T Christy, J Bourguignon, D Needham, C Esplen,  
D Carey, J Grant, D Laird, B Ruether, G Barker, D Nelson

**1. No Relief Grievance 10- 22**

Union: The union stated that the employee who was called into work for relief should not work over 18 hours. This is not a safe practice.

Company: The Company was under the impression that this was resolved at step 1. An employee who is not relieved is required to stay until relief is secured. The employee who was called in to work volunteered to stay to cover both shifts. This is not the normal relief procedure.

**2. Flex Call in List 10- 17**

Union: The union is filed this grievance as the Company did not agree to discuss a flex call in list as proposed by the union. Employees are interested in doing the work done by contractors in the mill. A mill wide method to call in employees who are interested in this overtime is necessary.

Company: The Company is not required to discuss the proposal as submitted by the union. This issue has already been discussed at standing committee and should not be sent back to this committee.

**3. Master Blasters Grievance 10 – 23 - 26**

Union: Why is the Company not using CPP employees to do the work that is done by master blasters. The snake pit clean up was contracted to be cleaned out September 17 2010, the grates were cleaned on September 21. There were several employees at home who could have been called to do this work.

Company: The clean up work on the snake pit and other areas was contracted to master blasters in conjunction with the power boiler shutdown. There were several maintenance issues that caused a spill or extra clean up. It made the most sense to call the contractor in these cases.

**4. Staff Working Grievance 10 - 27**

Union: The union stated that a staff employee used the controls in assisting the start up of the machine on 2 occasions. The senior machine tender should be paid a call in for this work.

Company: The Staff employee was onsite as the machine was having difficulty in starting up. This happened on two occasions and on one occasion there were already 2 machine tenders on site. The staff employee did minor troubleshooting work involving the slack draw. This is not a violation of the agreement and a call will not be paid.

**5. Flex call in list Grievance 10- 28**

Union: The grievance is filed as the Company is not reducing the contracting in the mill. This list would help in reducing contracting.

Company: This issue was never discussed or agreed by the Company when flexibility was negotiated in the first place. The Company is not interested in having another type of list for call ins. Each department makes a decision to call in employees or contractors using common business sense.

**6. Jack Grant Grievance 10 - 29**

Union: The union stated that Jack Grant was assigned oiling duties and it is a demotion for a millwright. This is a violation of his seniority. The Company stated that this work was important when the lube mechanics were eliminated. Now we have millwrights assigned to this work that do not want this assignment. This does not seem to make sense.

Company: The millwrights are assigned to do the routes for lubrication as required in the fibreline. The department decided to rotate the crew through this work assignment so that all would get this task. It is now Jack Grants turn. There is no violation of seniority.

**7. Seniority move grievance S Yaffe 10 - 30**

Union: The seniority move should be completed as per the agreement when the department was reorganized several years ago. The crews should be moved to level out seniority on any given crew even on a temporary seniority move.

Company: The Company has agreed to make a temporary seniority move when a vacancy over 4 tours is known to occur. This is a temporary move and the Company is not required to make several more seniority moves to

readjust seniority on a crew basis for each temporary move. This would just mean more employees would be inconvenienced for time off etc. The seniority move was correct in this case.

#### **8. Temporary Employees Grievance 10 - 31**

Union: This grievance was submitted to the Company by the union at step 1. There is no provision to hire temporary employees in the labour agreement.

Company: The Company replied to the union letter by letter from Bob Norman. The answer here is the same as that letter. We hire employees according to the labour agreement.

#### **9. Vacation Grievance 10 - 38**

Union: The employees that submit short term vacation should not have priority over employees who submit 40 hour vacation requests even if they are submitted later in the year. In this case an employee has applied for 40 hours vacation when there are several short term vacations approved already during Christmas and New Years. There are now too many employees off and this vacation was not approved.

Company: The Company language developed back in the 1970's outlines which employees gets priority for vacation requests. This has not been an issue in the past. The Company is not bumping an employee with approved vacations under the guidelines. The employee in question could have had this time off if they applied prior to May 1. After May 1 the vacations are on a first come first served basis. If the union feels that this is an issue then this should be discussed after consultation with the crews and Supervisors.

Signatures on file

---

Ben Ruether  
Union Representative

Signatures on file

---

Jason Bourguignon  
Company Representative