

May 4, 1982.

U: not a requirement of collective agreement. what do you need them for?

A: you gave new sick leave proposal. we need stats to determine how it is being used.

How is the U. prejudiced against providing stats? These stats have been made available before.

U: may not be representative of the whole bargaining unit. Won't assist U. at all. no need to give stats - doesn't benefit. X

A: How does it prejudice U.?

U: I don't know.

A: we're prepared to attempt the disclosure of this info.

U: administration of the benefit is changing - not the benefit itself.

A: why change the administration of the benefit? how much is being used?

Article 19:06 - Retraining.

U: why change existing 19:05.

A: doesn't protect employee, not strong enough, too many if, and and but's.

all 19:05 does not protect against lay off.

U: eligible (in A). are you removing choice of accepting transfer.

A: ensures employees won't be demoted: protects from dismissal + lay off.

U: what is benefit to U.

A: we're not arguing for U. It's a benefit for our members.

people do work for it. People sell labour.

U: intent of U. to restrain people. Sees article as providing no way out. Impossible to administer.

- U: must benefit both parties.
- A: we're identifying the benefit — we work for the U.
- U: see proposal as stripping U. of all rights — U. becomes the liable party — see union as having all rights.
- A: It makes all concessions to U's right to manage. interest ~~to~~ ^{of} U. to keep existing employees.
- U: puts onus entirely on employer. welcome to counterproposal.
- A: if something can be suggested, where ~~are~~ ^{our} employees are not victims, open to discussion. obvious benefit to keep trained personnel.
- U: finds language too one-sided — feel they ^(the U.) could potentially be victim.
- A: we could look at time of training period.

19.07.

- U: Is there a problem in using objective tool to measure work performance.
- A: not conducive to good work performance. quality — not quantity that counts. Instance in Ontario where people fired if they do not meet key stroke quota. shouldn't be an assembly line measurement.
- U: don't you think quantity is a valid criterion to judge employee?
- A: constant monitoring objectionable — reduces quality of work.
- U: haven't seen stats.
- A: feel it benefits both sides to not have employees as appendages of machines.
- U: Can't see that occurring. As the U. in disagreement with job evaluation.
- A: no, only this facet.