



Continuous Shift & Company Threat

Finning has proposed a continuous shift as one of their 2 proposals they tabled. Both parties exchanged language from the original proposal. The majority of the language that has been provided to the membership by the Company are the changes the Union Bargaining Committee had made, not the Company. Currently, there has been no agreement by either party on any language for a continuous shift.

Due to the fact that the Company has not been able to achieve what they have been looking for in their proposal at the bargaining table, they now have gone directly to the membership. Management at most facilities have been having captive audience meetings with the membership in hoping to achieve buy-in from the members. This is an attempt to undermine the Bargaining Unit Committee. The Union Bargaining Committee has been very outspoken from the start that bargaining directly with the membership, is bargaining in bad faith. Also to be clear, this type of action by the Company has never been done before in the history of the Collective Bargaining process.

The Company's original proposal was very vague with little context other than this proposed shift would be at all locations and could be implemented at anytime and for any duration. This original language means that members could be forced to work the continuous shift without any input. The forced aspect of their language was not removed by the Company until much later in the bargaining process. The Union was consistent in the messaging, forcing members onto a continuous shift, at any time, for any reasons and any duration would not be acceptable. This proposal would allow the Company not having to pay overtime, shift premiums and schedule hours of work at their convenience. These terms and condition could not be acceptable by the Bargaining Committee. Current members did not sign onto any continuous shift unless it has been negotiated within the CBA. Our position is they should not be forced to go on any continuous shift.

The Committee is not against continuous shifts, our position has always been that there is a LOU in place that lays out the ground work for a continuous shift for those impacted. Also, the ability for those affected employees to vote for a continuous shift based on the business plan and justifiable reasons for such request by the Company

For example, someone that works in Victoria does not vote on any changes that may happen at Red Chris. If a change or a LOU needs to happen at Red Chris the members that fall under the LOU are the only ones that have a say of what happens. The membership as a whole should not have the decision-making power that affects what happens to another member at a specific location, site or LOU. Once we go down this road even guys working on a continuous shift now could have their working conditions changed by the entire membership if it was voted on.

Finally, the Union could not agree to the Company's continuous shift as proposed as it fell short in many areas that the Union tried to address to no avail.

Because of the Union's rejection of this proposal the company stated, if the Union can not agree they would start to make arrangements to move work out of the province. The Union took this comment as a threat to try in our view, to coerce your committee to agree to this proposal.