

# Minutes

## Union Management Consultation (UMC)

June 21, 2004

9:30 AM

6th floor large boardroom

**Attendees:** Yves Ducharme , Gord Miles, Diane Shapiro, Jim Stuart, Bill Scowcroft, Regis Gosselin, Sharon McShane, Ken Nash, Randy Dennis, Rod Oliver, Alex Crane, Barb Nicol, Wolfgang Hackenbroch, Dawn Aisenstat, Francine Taillon, Sylvie Rochon, Sean Kitchener, Richard Fortin, Rick Bevilacqua

**Regrets:** Jim Lowe

### 1. Opening Remarks Yves Ducharme/Gord Miles

Discussion: Gord Miles, Yves Ducharme, Jim Stuart, Francine Taillon

Gord Miles chaired this meeting.

Members were welcomed to the meeting and provided with an update on Government initiatives such as the wage cap and how the CGC is dealing with this. It was noted that the CGC is presently working on a Memorandum to Cabinet as part of addressing the future direction of our organization and that this process is being pushed forward as expeditiously as possible.

Government has introduced a number of questions that departments are being challenged on or are requested to report on. Performance Measures is something we are also focusing on, also in line with the requirement of being accountable to government. Members were informed that a CGC leadership session was held last week at which we were pleased to have members of the Employment Equity committee do a presentation on their initiatives.

PSAC members noted that they are pleased with some of the things that have been done in some of the regions but are somewhat concerned with certain things that are occurring in other regions. The desire would be to have issues and concerns dealt with at the regional level in order to avoid having them dealt with at the National level and the hope is that in the near future we can see regions being more accountable with respect to certain issues. PSAC members recognize that there is uncertainty with respect to government and funding, however one also has to realize that there is a lack of staffing everywhere and that overtime is increasing and causing stress. Staff are committed to their positions and feel that the CGC should plan human resource requirements better.

Management shares this concern and noted that staffing in the regions is being done according to the organizations needs.

<b>2. Review December 10, 2003 UMC minutes</b>		<b>Chairperson</b>
<p>Discussion: Gord Miles, Yves Ducharme, Francine Taillon, Jim Stuart</p> <p>December 10, 2003 UMC minutes and action items were reviewed and approved. It was noted that the joint message to CGC staff with respect to email use still needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Question was raised with respect to the WTO in order to determine if a decision has been made in this regard and members were informed that we cannot give any less favorable treatment to foreign grains coming in, for example, from US.</p>		
<b>Action items:</b>	<b>Person responsible:</b>	<b>Deadline:</b>
Send joint message to CGC staff regarding use of email.	Gord Miles & Yves Ducharme	Prior to next UMC meeting
<b>3. Grain Volumes</b>		<b>Management</b>
<p>Discussion: Sharon McShane</p> <p>Members were provided with a copy of the fiscal year 2003/2004 grain volumes handled as at February 29, 2004. It was noted that the grain volumes were as per forecast numbers.</p>		
<b>4. Financial Statements</b>		<b>Management</b>
<p>Discussion: Sharon McShane, Dawn Aisenstat, Rod Oliver, Yves Ducharme, Gord Miles</p> <p>Members were provided with the financial statements for fiscal year 2003-04 for the eleven-month period ending February 29, 2004. It was noted that more fees were collected in 2003-04 due to slightly increased volumes.</p> <p>Some clarification was requested with respect to a few points and comments were raised with respect to why the Federal Government does not provide permanent funding to the CGC given that they recognize that there is a need for the CGC to exist. The work that the CGC does is mandated therefore why is it that there is no permanent funding for the CGC? Question was raised in order to determine what could be done to try and stabilize this.</p> <p>It was noted that the Commissioners have been requesting longer term funding and they are continually trying to put this story in front of the Minister. PSAC members questioned if there is anything they can do in order to assist the Commission to be a more stable organization when presenting something to the Minister. It was noted that continued discussions with joint collaboration where possible is appreciated.</p>		

5.	Timeliness of Grievance Repliees	PSAC
<p>Discussion: Barb Nicol, Jim Stuart, Yves Ducharme, Gord Miles</p> <p>PSAC members noted that the CGC is not respecting the timelines outlined in the collective agreement for responding to grievances and they would like to know why this is occurring. They noted that there is a 2 to 3 months gap prior to a response being received with respect to grievances and this is not acceptable. Staff does not know where they are with respect to their grievances and they feel that there is lack of respect as a result of this.</p> <p>Management acknowledged that there have been a few grievances that have not been dealt with in a timely fashion, however assured that this is not for lack of respect but more a time management issue. The CGC has made a lot of progress with respect to trying to address grievances in a timely manner and assured PSAC members that the intent is to continue to work on making this better for all parties.</p> <p>PSAC members noted that this is an issue that surfaces at most of our meetings and they would like to see that in general that the Union representative and the grievor are informed of why the delays are occurring. Management reiterated that they are committed to address grievances in a timely manner.</p>		
6.	Timeliness of Human Resources Services	PSAC
<p>Discussion: Rod Oliver, Diane Shapiro, Jim Stuart</p> <p>PSAC members raised the issue of contract interpretations that are raised at Local UMC's and have to go to Winnipeg for interpretation. It was noted that this results in either a very lengthy delay in receiving a response or none is forthcoming resulting in grievances being filed. PSAC members are reluctant to give specific examples because these are presently in grievances. There is a dispute resolution position in Vancouver, which has not been classified for the last 4 – 5 years. An employee has been acting in this position and this is not reasonable.</p> <p>Management noted that until National positions have been classified they are not in a position to classify local positions. Many of the issues raised are the reason why they are coming to Winnipeg. In the past, there were a number of differences in how regions interpreted an article in the collective agreements, bringing certain issues that have a National scope to it to HR in Wpg; we are able to achieve more consistency. Lots of work is being done at the regional directors table to have decisions made on the national front, which does create some delays.</p> <p>Management agreed that two years is unreasonable, however other factors come into play such as limited resources through Human Resources and delay in getting interpretations from Ottawa. Management noted that they are working hard in order to get consistent National response and to be more effective.</p>		

**7. Proposed Vancouver Term Positions**

**PSAC**

Discussion: Rod Oliver, Ken Nash, Yves Ducharme, Rick Bevilacqua, Alex Crane, Gord Miles, Barb Nicol, Jim Stuart

Members were informed that there are nine positions that were budgeted for Vancouver to provide relief for vacation and training purposes. PSAC members requested an update on the status of those positions. Management noted that as of a week ago, the budget has been approved although staffing is still subject to EMC review. With respect to the nine positions in Vancouver, the process will be started in order to get relief for inspection and weighing staff and they will be seeking approval to maximize vacation requests that are outstanding.

Question was raised regarding the situation in other regions with respect to holidays. It was noted that in TBay they are short of staff and there is a need for relief and a reduction in the stress load. Management noted that in TBay everyone on the inspection side is getting holiday time this year. However, they are faced with doing an audit at Sask Wheat Pool that is taking up some staff time that was not anticipated and this is causing some stress on operations, although there has not been a need to request that employees work overtime. On the weighing side, staff is pleased with the process that has been adopted for holiday time. It was noted that based on the volume forecast for the summer, we will also be looking at casual help to provide some relief.

PSAC inquired as to the number of casuals the CGC would be bringing in and it was noted that this will be based on operational requirements. Question was raised in order to determine if the CGC could not look at having a more proactive approach to this type of situation. Management noted that there is a term list that will be used on the inspection side and the intent is to also be working on this for the weighing side. Members were informed that the Sask Wheat Pool audit really tested the capacity we have to conduct such audits. It used over 60 percent of our weighers, however management did meet with staff and discussed amount of time required for the overtime and staff agreed on this.

PSAC members inquired about the process on EMC approval for staffing. Members were informed that EMC meets weekly and make decisions at that time with respect to staffing for the whole organization.

PSAC members noted that staff are presently working on the audit and this does not even take into account holiday time and concern is what will happen when we are faced with having to bring in bottom level to provide relief. Management noted that this is a concern in all the regions and with the delay in getting this year's budget approved it put some pressure on managers on how this could be dealt with. However, now that the budget has been approved, the intention is to move forward with looking at having terms at entry level.

**8.****Update on Proposed Classification Committee PSAC**

Discussion: Diane Shapiro, Yves Duhcarne, Rod Oliver, Rick Bevilacqua, Jim Stuart, Bill Scowcroft, Francine Taillon

Members were informed that following the last UMC meeting, Sylvia Prowse and Diane Shapiro agreed to meet to discuss the issue of classification standards. This meeting did occur and it was discussed that some classification standards are not current. There are also a number of positions where the job descriptions are not current.

Discussion took place with respect to having a joint effort to work on this initiative. It was noted that further discussion in this regard has to take place at the Executive Management Committee level in order to determine where we are heading with respect to classification and that PSAC members would be informed accordingly.

PSAC members noted that they are requesting that a joint committee work on job descriptions. If there is a way that PSAC can assist in reviewing classification system then they are open to provide that assistance. Members all know that the standards have to be revamped and revised and it is important for both parties and especially employees to have current work descriptions. It is time for CGC to work on more uniform structure. We have worked together on cross-training issue; perhaps we can look at working together on the job description and classification issue. PSAC noted that they realize that this will mean much of our resources time but are willing to do this and looking forward to being able to do this by early September if possible.

Members raised the issue of the reclassification of Grain Weighers in TBay and the understanding is that in the past the CGC had tried to get the GL's and PI's into one group and this was rejected. Management noted that the CGC did a study 4 to 5 years ago to bring the GL & PI into one group; the decision at time was not to move forward with this due to costs involved. From an organizational point of view, management would like to see one operational group and they are looking at working towards this in the near future (early September). Given PSAC's willingness to work together with the CGC on this, the next step would be to look at the possibility of having this committee get together in September and discuss this issue.

Members were reminded that to develop a new group is a huge undertaking and a long resource and time wise process. This process requires specialist expertise and would also require contracted in help, as well Treasury Board would also have to be involved in this process.

PSAC noted that it is important that we take the opportunity of using the Public Service Modernization Act in order to have this worked on. There would be a possibility of having some money to do this survey review via this initiative.

PSAC members requested that a joint message (Yves Ducharme & Gord Miles) be sent to members informing them that we will be putting together a joint committee to discuss classification. It was noted that there is some work to be done with respect to ensuring that both parties are clear on the terms of reference on how such a committee would be working together on this initiative and that it is premature to send a message to members.

**9.****Training Policy****PSAC**

Discussion: Francine Taillon, Jim Stuart, Alex Crane, Rod Oliver, Ken Nash

PSAC members would like to know if the CGC has a National Training Policy and, if yes, can members be provided with a copy. Management requested clarification in order to determine if reference was being made to PI training or if reference was in regards to weighing and inspection training. It was noted that through the national training process a matrix has been established which identifies the type, interval and how we are assessing the training that is being done in the regions. Question was raised in order to determine if it would be possible to get a copy of the type of training staff would be getting. Members were informed that the understanding was that the PI1 training list has already been made available and that the weighing matrix will be provided once available.

PSAC members inquired about when the T.A.T. refresher course would be scheduled in the Eastern Region. It was noted that the intent is to have this refresher training take place sometime this fall. Members questioned the relevance of T.A.T teams and management noted that it is important that we continue to have that knowledge and expertise in the regions and therefore T.A.T members are still relevant for our organization.

Health & Safety Training – Members were informed that in Montreal a joint initiative was undertaken with respect to Health & Safety training for all employees. This initiative was very successful and was greatly appreciated by all employees. PSAC members noted that they are of the opinion that it appears that Health & Safety matters are a low priority and feeling is that we should be making this a high priority for our organization. Wondering whether we need to have some accountability to this and would like the NOSHP committee to monitor the regions to see if modules are being completed. A member of the National Occupational Safety and Health Committee noted that as a member of NOSHP this was identified as a priority and that Graham Casey will be looking into this.

<b>Action items:</b>	<b>Person responsible:</b>	<b>Deadline:</b>
Provide matrix re training to national office	Jim Stuart	When available
Provide UMC members with date of TAT refresher course and take a look at what training has been done with respect Health & Safety (due diligence etc.)	Jim Stuart	a.s.a.p.

<b>10.</b>	<b>Public Service Modernization Act</b>	<b>PSAC</b>
<p>Discussion: Francine Taillon, Diane Shapiro, Yves Ducharme,</p> <p>PSAC members requested an update on where the CGC is in their preparation to implement aspects of the Act such as Internal Conflict Resolution, co-development with Union. Management noted that from a Human Resources (HR) point of view we are trying to keep up to date on this whole issue and what will be required in the CGC. With respect to having union management consultations, these have been occurring and members were assured that this is a priority for HR in the fall. Members were informed that PSAC initially had some concern when the Act was promoted but agreed to participate in the implementation. Two PSAC staff have been appointed to the committee working on the Public Service Modernization Act and they we will discussing all things such as essential service, labour relations, etc. The Treasury Board secretariat started working on the implementation 18 months before PSAC were involved in this committee therefore there is quite a bit of catch up to do.</p>		
<b>11.</b>	<b>Round Up Ready Wheat</b>	<b>Management</b>
<p>Discussion: Bill Scowcroft, Kens Nash, Yves Ducharme, Dawn Aisenstat, Barb Nicol, Jim Stuart</p> <p>Members were provided with an update on this issue of Round Up Ready Wheat (RRW) There has been some controversy with respect to RRW and has been resolved in the short term by Monsanto's decision not to go forward with commercializing RRW in Canada &amp; USA</p> <p>PSAC members inquired if this decision would have any impact on the Grain Commission staff and the research section. Management noted that it would, in the sense that the GRL will have to become more familiar of what is going on in other importing countries. PSAC members noted that the question is more in line of knowing if there would be any repercussions on GRL staff levels. It was noted that if we don't get more staff then we would have to reprofile them to meet new priorities.</p> <p>PSAC members would like to know if it is not feasible to see testing being done at all the sites in the regions. Management noted that once we get technology that is cost effective we would look at having this rolled out into the regions. Members were also informed that CIPRS is another area where there is potential increased involvement for the CGC in process verification.</p>		
<b>12.</b>	<b>Succession Planning</b>	<b>PSAC</b>
<p>Discussion: Francine Taillon, Gord Miles, Jim Stuart,</p> <p>PSAC members inquired about the CGC's plan, both with respect to recruitment and retention, to address the large number of CGC employees who may be planning to leave their employment in the next few years? Management noted that this issue varies by regions and areas and that they are very aware of this. At present in the GRL they are working on anticipating those changes and as people are making their decisions clearer the CGC is then in a position to plan. Many employees may be eligible however may not be leaving all at the same time. What is important here is that people make their plans known to the CGC in order to allow for planning ahead.</p> <p>It was also noted that over the past year with no decision with respect to Business Plan and the Memorandum to Cabinet, Industry Services are aware of the need to develop staff if we are going to be continuing in the line of work we are doing. We will be looking into succession planning in this regard.</p>		

**13.**

**Terminable Allowance**

**Management**

Discussion: Jim Stuart, Yves Ducharme, Dawn Aisenstat, Rod Oliver, Ken Nash,

Management provided members an update with respect to terminable allowance. Members were informed that the CGC position at this time is that there has been a change in the environment therefore the tabled position on terminable allowance is that effective September 2004 payments will cease.

PSAC members noted that this terminable allowance was negotiated by both parties and supported by both parties, therefore how is it that the employer can now terminate something that was negotiated before. The union believes that the provision in the collective agreement is in effect until a new collective is ratified. Therefore, the terminable allowance should remain in effect until the ratification of the new collective agreement.

PSAC members inquired about why the decision was to have a September cut-off and why is it that things are not staying in place until a new contract is negotiated? Question was also raised in order to determine what has changed from 1996, the wage discrepancy is still there and it appears that the logic of this does not make any sense, let alone the reaction of the local. This leaves the impression that the CGC is not supporting their employees.

Management noted that it is important for members to recall the history regarding this issue and ensure that the facts are correct. In the late 1990's, industry decided to go to continuous operations and as a consequence we lost a total of 21 staff members. A passionate plea was made to the CGC to stop the flow of personnel; it had to be supported by both sides because of the disparity due to salaries.. When this was negotiated staff were consulted and it was made very clear to staff that this was a terminable allowance and that it would come to an end some day.

PSAC members noted that the CGC has to be aware that this will have an adverse affect on morale at the CGC. PSAC members are of the opinion that this decision is unsuitable and it is bad faith to ask for a wage decrease and they will have to look into this further. Management noted that PSAC members have to keep in mind that Treasury Board is the employer and that the CGC is working with them in this regard.

<b>14.</b>	<b>Email Use</b>	<b>PSAC</b>	
<p>Discussion: Alex Crane, Rick Bevilacqua, Dawn Aisenstat, Sylvie Rochon, Barb Nicol, Gord Miles, Yves Ducharme</p> <p>PSAC members would like to discuss the issue of Union's ability to use email for routine matters such as meetings, etc. Members noted that they would like to have more flexibility for use of email in TBay and requested possibility of having a template for such purposes. Management brought forward a point of clarification and noted that staff is not required to request permission to send email notification for meetings. It was noted however that certain staff members do have some restrictions on their email use and that conducting Union business via email is not permitted. PSAC members noted that it is unrealistic to expect committee members to have their emails screened prior to it being released and feeling is that everyone should be entitled to a sense of trust. The logistics of where staff work is an issue for certain members when it comes to getting the information out to members and trying to save time email is a logical vehicle. Members are of the opinion that everyone should be held accountable for what they say in their emails. Would like to see more openness and accountability with respect to this issue. Management noted once again that staff is not required to request permission to send email notification for meetings. The UMC chairs agreed that they would have to come to a common term of understanding with respect to email use and this will be communicated to staff.</p>			
<b>Action items:</b>		<b>Person responsible:</b>	<b>Deadline:</b>
Prepare joint email message to CGC staff regarding email use		Yves Ducharme & Gord Miles	a.s.a.p.
<b>15.</b>	<b>Employment Equity Update</b>	<b>Management</b>	
<p>Discussion: Gord Miles, Yves Ducharme, Sean Kitchner, Ken Nash</p> <p>Management provided members with and update on Employment Equity (EE) and noted that the Canadian Human Rights Commission (CHRC) have concluded that the CGC is compliant with the Employment Equity Act. There is one exception and that is that the CGC has to have a representative of the excluded staff as a member on the EE committee. It was noted that the block of excluded employees will be contacted in order to determine if anyone is willing to sit on the EE committee. Members were informed that even though the follow up audit says the CGC is compliant, this is ongoing process and we will have to continue to be representative, especially with regard to the number of the visible minority members.</p> <p>PSAC members noted that we recently hired 5 people in Prince Rupert and the internet was used for advertising of these positions. Feeling is that the CGC should explore other means of communicating these openings since the email is not necessarily accessible to all. Most of the aboriginal peoples in the Prince Rupert area do not have access to the internet. Members were reminded that when such concerns arise, it is important that one does not hesitate to contact the regional director to voice these concerns.</p>			
<b>16.</b>	<b>Date of next meeting (Oct or Nov)</b>	<b>Management</b>	
<p>UMC members agreed on the date of Thursday October 28 for the next UMC meeting at 9:30am.</p>			