

'ANGUS BARKS'

By Jeff Francis
AEG Executive Board

Grievance Update

Case 35752 from Plant II was presented by the Union to Corporate Relations representatives at Step III last month. This grievance began when an MQE hoisted a combustor liner on his shoulder and walked out the Bldg 40 airlock. In mid-stride, he was confronted by 2 union members who asked what he thought he was doing. The MQE explained that a vendor had been denied entrance to the plant, so he was taking it upon himself to carry the part out to the gate. The union members reminded the MQE that this was bargaining unit work and he should get the appropriate personnel to move the part. Instead, the MQE proceeded across the parking lot to Fairchild St and delivered the part to the vendor at the gatehouse.

At Step II the Union argued that this was a case of management doing bargaining unit work. We also questioned whether security guidelines were ignored when this hardware was delivered to a vendor who did not have clearance to enter the plant. The Company denied any security violations, saying that the proper paperwork had accompanied the part. After review, the Company stated that they could not dispute the facts that this was a case of management doing bargaining unit work, as the Union alleged.

In an effort to resolve this case locally, the Company stated that the offending MQE had been spoken to in the sternest manner by both his area business leader, and the Plant II manager. However, the Union was not impressed by this proposed resolve because the same MQE was again observed moving hardware *several hours after* the stern talk with his managers. Again he moved production hardware, this time from the aisle to the machines in the large combustor area of Bldg 40. This subsequent incident was properly documented by the Union steward at Step I.

It was obvious to the Union from this chain of events, that the MQE's behavior was deliberate and flagrant. He was willing to defy the union contract and also defy his own superiors, just to be a hero in his own mind. As a result, the Executive Board considered the case unresolved, and shipped it to Step III.

At Step III, the Company was again unable to resolve this case to the Union's satisfaction. However, Relations officials at both the local and Corporate level asked union officials to notify them immediately if this MQE has a future incident of performing bargaining unit work. The stewards in Plant II have been duly notified, and will be glad to keep the Company posted.

FUNDAMENTAL

Unfortunately, case 35752 is not an isolated grievance. It's just the first of several currently in process at Step I & II on the Aircraft agenda. Why this marked increase of managers doing bargaining unit work?

You might point to the influx of new frontline supervisors with no experience in union shops. But not all the culprits are new supervisors. You might blame the constant pounding supervisors get from their managers to meet productivity and delivery numbers. But that pressure is always present every year and every day. You might conclude that some managers cannot do their own jobs well, so they're doing ours, to make themselves look useful. Some individuals are like that, but not many.

Whatever the reason or justification, the Union has no sympathy for local management on these violations of the contract. Corporate is not sympathetic either. Why would Corporate want to pay an exempt salary to a manager to do R16 production follower work?

Case 35752 will return to the Executive Board with a recommendation to place it in the strike bank. That will give the Local the option to take membership action within the next 12 months, if these fundamental violations continue.

