

The way it is . . .

BY FORREST "FROSTY" NEWMAN
Director of Industrial Relations



APWU Will Not Tolerate Jurisdictional Trespasses On Clerk Craft By Others

Your Industrial Relations Department is now very deeply involved in seeking solutions to matters of major importance to members of this union.

The first of these is continuation of our attempt to resolve the jurisdictional dispute which has long existed with the Mail Handler Craft in a number of post office and Bulk Mail Center functions. The second involves hassles over the no layoff provisions.

The Postal Service and the Mail Handler Craft negotiated a bilateral agreement that the Postal Service would issue its position on the assignment of work functions to the Mail Handler Craft 60 days after the close of the 1978 negotiations.

General President Emmet Andrews steadfastly refused to agree to any extension of Mail Handler assignments into areas where the Clerk Craft is now assigned when jurisdiction was put on the National Negotiating Table by the National Director of the Mail Handler Craft last summer.

The American Postal Workers Union has taken strong objection to the fact that two parties to the Tripartite Agreement assume they have the right to make a bilateral decision without approval of the APWU.

DELAYS AS USUAL

Although the expiration of the 60-day period was Tuesday, November 14th, the Postal Service chose to

delay its final submission for review by this Union until the last minute.

The issuance has since been made. Copies of the decision and attached implementing instructions have now been sent to all National APWU officers and to the Presidents of the 300 largest locals.

In this regard we have found approximately 60 changes or additions to the original document proposed by the Postal Service some two months ago. We are pressing for the disputed items to be taken to arbitration at the very earliest moment.

The American Postal Workers Union, which has among its membership many Mail Handler Craft members, has made no effort to raid the functions of the Mail Handler Craft but the Mail Handler Craft has not acted in the same good faith. It is striving to obtain assignment as the primary craft for many areas of work which have historically been performed by Clerk Craft members. We will keep you advised of developments in this area.

I can assure you that we shall not stand by passively while management attempts to make such a unilateral determination.

HASSLE OVER LAYOFFS

The second matter of great concern which we are now considering is the discussion ordered by Mediator Healey

involving details relating to the new provisions of Article VI which give the Postal Service the opportunity to lay off new-hired employees until they have acquired six years service with a minimum of 20 pay periods of work each year.

Although the language of Mediator Healey's decision appears to us to be quite clear in that there was to be permanent lifetime protection for members of the bargaining unit as of September 15, 1978, the Postal Service is trying to impose stringent regulations which would in effect cause a few members of the present workforce to lose their permanent protection rights.

A typical example is the employee who desires to transfer and is forced by management administrative instructions to have a one-day break in service. The Postal Service would like such employees to be subject to the same layoff provisions as provided for new hires.

We were also in violent disagreement with the Postal Service as to how the twenty weeks work per year required for six years is to be established.

The Postal Service has posed the proposition that sick leave and annual leave do not count towards this accrual of 20 weeks of work. For us to agree to such a ridiculous position would mean that we would agree to penalize our future members for sick and annual leave which they have earned. This posture by the Postal Service could force employees to forego annual leave so as not to interrupt their required six continuous years of service.

Needless to say, we intend to fight these issues to the very best of our ability. It may be that the entire matter will go back to the mediator for clarification and issuance of instructions. We are preparing our position on the issues involved in the Healey decision.