

**A  
BETTER  
WORLD  
S  
POSSIBLE**  
re-energize | re-organize | re-think

**1<sup>st</sup> Constitutional and  
Collective Bargaining  
Convention**

August 20-24, 2012  
Toronto, Ontario

**Report of the  
Public Review  
Board**



## **FOREWARD**

Many years ago, our former union, under the leadership of the then UAW's long-time president Walter Reuther, established a Public Review Board allowing members to appeal certain internal decisions of the union.

When we formed our Canadian union, we were determined to have a Public Review Board as a part of the internal democracy process. We invited outside Canadian citizens who have no connection with our union to serve as board members.

This is the Eighth Report of the Public Review Board to the membership of our union and I want to thank Alan Borovoy, Chairperson, and the other board members, for their hard work and commitment to this process.

**KEN LEWENZA**  
**National President**

# **Eighth Report of the Public Review Board**

## **Table of Contents**

Forward - Ken Lewenza, President, CAW/TCA	
A. Alan Borovoy, Chairperson, Public Review Board	
Introduction.....	1
Members and Staff.....	1
Operation.....	2
Statistics.....	3
Appeals Considered, 2009 – 2011.....	3
Conclusion.....	18
Appendix A – Rules of Procedure.....	19
Appendix B – Annual Financial Statements, 2009 – 2011.....	24
Appendix C – Index of Appeals Considered, 2009 – 2011.....	30

August 2012

Ken Lewenza,  
National President CAW/TCA  
205 Placer Court  
Toronto, Ontario  
M2H 3H9

Dear President Lewenza,

I am pleased to present the latest report of the Public Review Board. Along with short biographies of the Board Members and some introductory remarks about operations, the report includes a summary of the 11 appeals decided between January 1, 2009 and December 31, 2011. The Board has already ruled on one appeal in 2012 and four appeals are currently pending.

As one who idolized Walter Reuther, in part because of the Public Review Board, I have been especially proud of my association with it. I know that this pride is shared by my colleagues.

We wish you a successful convention and look forward to seeing you and the delegates at that time.

Sincerely,



A. Alan Borovoy, Chairperson

## INTRODUCTION

This report is submitted to the membership pursuant to Article 25 of the CAW/TCA Constitution. The Public Review Board (PRB) is required to prepare and submit such a report of its activities, including a summary of all appeals it has considered.

The Public Review Board was created by the delegates to the Founding Convention of the CAW/TCA Canada, September 1985, in Toronto, Ontario. The Public Review Board was established "to safeguard the moral and ethical standards and practices within CAW-Canada and strengthen the union's democratic process and appeal procedures" (Article 25, Section 1 of the Constitution).

The Public Review Board is modelled after the UAW's Public Review Board which was created in 1957 on the urging of UAW President Walter Reuther. The creation of an independent body to monitor the UAW's internal practices was a bold idea at that time. It was still an innovative concept when the delegates to the CAW/TCA Canada's Founding Convention included the autonomous board in the National Union's Constitution.

## MEMBERS AND STAFF

The Public Review Board consists of five members, including the Chairperson. Their terms are for the period between National Constitutional Conventions. At the Convention, the National President, with the approval of the National Executive Board, proposes the names of the Chairperson and members for ratification by the delegates.

As of August, 2012, Chairperson: A. Alan Borovoy; Members: H  l  ne David, Pradeep Kumar, Marvin Schiff, and Lois M. Wilson. The following is a brief description of the experience each of the members brings to the Board:

A. Alan Borovoy, Chairperson: General Counsel Emeritus, Canadian Civil Liberties Association. Formerly: Associate Secretary, National Committee for Human Rights, Canadian Labour Congress; Secretary, Ontario Labour Committee for Human Rights; Director, Toronto and District Labour Committee for Human Rights; in the mid-1990's, Toronto Star columnist; Author of four published books dealing with human rights, civil liberties, and pressure tactics.

H  l  ne David: Invited Researcher, Sociology Department, Universit   de Montr  al; Researcher and Consultant on Aging and Work. Formerly: Researcher at the Institut de recherche appliqu  e sur le travail in Montr  al; Director, Groupe de recherche sur les aspects sociaux de la sant   et de la pr  vention, Universit   de Montr  al.

Pradeep Kumar: Professor Emeritus, School of Policy Studies, Queen's University; Formerly: Director of the MIR program and acting Director School Of Industrial Relations and Industrial Relations Centre; Has taught graduate and undergraduate courses and conducted research on North American unions, collective bargaining,

labour relations , labour market analysis and policy, globalization, and the automobile industry; Published several books and articles on a variety of issues relating to labour relations and human resource management; Current research focused on union revitalization approaches and strategies; Member of a number of research networks including CRIMT, located at the University of Montreal.

Marvin Schiff: Freelance Writer, Editor, Researcher, and Artist. Formerly: Journalist, Globe & Mail; Freelance Contributor, Middle East and Africa, for the Globe and Mail and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation; Founding Director, Nova Scotia Human Rights Commission; Associate Professor, School of Journalism, Carleton University; Consultant on Race Relations and Diversity Management; Board member, Canadian Civil Liberties Association.

Lois M. Wilson: Formerly: President, World Federalist Movement (International); Canada's Special Envoy to the Sudan; Chair, Canada-DPR Korea Association; Board Member, Canadian Civil Liberties Association. Independent Senator, the Senate of Canada; President, World Council of Churches; Moderator of the United Church of Canada; Chancellor, Lakehead University; Chair of Rights and Democracy.

The staff of the Public Review Board includes Ron Franklin (Executive Secretary); Danielle McLaughlin (Registrar), Donna Gilmour and Anne Lee (Administrative Assistants).

## **OPERATION**

The Public Review Board (along with the Convention Appeals Committee) is the final body to hear appeals of claims arising under the Constitution's internal remedy procedures. The Public Review Board is also the exclusive appellate authority for claims of violations of the Union's Ethical Practices Codes.

### **(a) Claims Arising Under the Constitution**

In general, the internal remedy provisions of the Constitution can encompass a wide variety of claims which arise as a result of the day-to-day operation of the Union. Union members or subordinate bodies have a wide right to appeal actions, decisions, failures or refusals to act on the part of the National Union, the National Executive Board (NEB), any administrative arm of the National Union, a Local Union, or any of its units, committees, officers, committeepersons or stewards, or any other subordinate body of the National Union. The normal route of appeal, except where the Constitution makes specific provision otherwise, is first to the membership or delegate body immediately responsible, second to the National Executive Board, unless the appeal begins there, and third to the Public Review Board or to the Convention Appeals Committee, whichever is appropriate.

It should be noted that on appeals concerning the handling of a grievance or other issue involving a collective bargaining agreement, the Public Review Board has no jurisdiction

unless the appellant has alleged before the National Executive Board that the matter was improperly handled because of fraud, discrimination, or collusion with management, or that the Union's decision had no rational basis.

Reference should be made to Article 24 of the Constitution for detailed information regarding appeals. In addition, reference may be made to the Public Review Board's Rules of Procedure as included as Appendix A to this Report.

**(b) Claims Arising Under the Ethical Practices Code**

The Ethical Practices Codes were adopted by the Founding Convention of the CAW/TCA Canada in Toronto, Ontario, September 1985. The Codes are reprinted in the Constitution immediately following the text of the Constitution itself. There are four Ethical Practices Codes: Democratic Practices; Financial Practices; Health, Welfare, and Retirement Funds; and, Business and Financial Activities of Union Officials. Claims involving allegations of violations of the Ethical Practices Codes are processed in much the same manner as claims arising under the Constitution.

For details about complaints involving the Ethical Practices Codes, reference should be made to Section 11 of Article 24 of the Constitution.

**(c) Procedural Advice**

Members may contact the staff of the Public Review Board for information regarding procedures available for relief under the Constitution in general or the Ethical Practices Codes in particular. The staff will not provide advice, however, with respect to the merits of a member's claim.

## **STATISTICS**

Between January 1, 2009 and December 31, 2011, the Public Review Board decided eleven appeals. The Public Review Board has already ruled on one appeal in 2012. There are currently four appeals pending.

### **APPEALS CONSIDERED - 2009-2011**

The following is a summary of each of the appeals considered by the Public Review Board from January 2009 to December 2011. (Please note that, for the purposes of this summary only, the names of parties to these appeals have been deleted. In their place we have substituted pseudonyms, such as "Mr. X" and "Local H".) Should the number of appeals decided by the Public Review Board increase in ensuing years, it may be necessary to provide a less detailed description of the cases. However, at this time, the Public Review Board believes the members would benefit from a detailed look at its decisions and the concerns raised by their brothers and sisters in the Union. Please also note that, while such summaries provide a good impression of the nature of a case, any member consulting such materials in preparation for an actual appeal would be

wise to review the full text version. (The full text of these decisions is available upon request without charge. Further, any member of the National Union or any of its local Unions may request to be placed on the mailing list which will ensure receipt of all published decisions and Reports of the Public Review Board.)

**Case No. 56/08 (Reconsideration)**

**Member, Local A v. President, CAW Local A and the CAW National Executive Board**

**Overview:**

In an earlier Appeal, the PRB ordered the NEB to reconsider its decision not to file a grievance on behalf of Mr. X. The Union reconsidered its decision and again decided not file a grievance. Mr. X appealed that decision to the PRB. The PRB dismissed Mr. X's Appeal.

**Facts:**

In an earlier Appeal, the PRB had remitted Mr. X's case back to the Union with instructions that it reconsider the prospects for success at grievance arbitration. Prior to that decision, the Union had declined to take the case to arbitration on the basis that a grievance would be unsuccessful because Mr. X violated the terms of a "last chance agreement" with his employer. However, it was also clear that Mr. X had claimed that he had been suffering from a disability that affected his ability to comply with the "last chance agreement" and that his employer may not have accommodated him as required by the *Human Rights Code*. When Mr. X initially appealed the Union's decision not to file a grievance, the PRB was not satisfied that the Union had established a rational basis for its belief that his grievance would be unsuccessful and ordered the NEB to reconsider its decision.

In October of 2010, the Union advised the PRB that it had reconsidered its decision with respect to filing a grievance on Mr. X's behalf and its decision remained unchanged. In coming to this conclusion, the Union relied on a legal opinion it had secured from its legal department and additional medical documentation that it had received. The Union took the position that the medical documentation did not provide the information necessary to determine whether or not there was a connection between Mr. X's misconduct and his disability. The PRB subsequently requested that the parties provide submissions regarding the reason why the medical documentation did not include such information.

**Arguments:**

Mr. X argued that he had made attempts to provide the medical professional with the necessary medical documentation but was either told that it was not required or did not



receive a response. He also claimed that it was the Union's responsibility to follow-up with the medical professional if the information it needed had not been provided.

Mr. X also raised a new allegation. He claimed that his employer had discriminated against him by treating him differently from other employees with disabilities (i.e., it had accommodated them but not him).

The Union argued that it had sent Mr. X a copy of the legal opinion it had obtained and the opinion indicated that in order for the grievance to succeed at arbitration, the medical documentation must demonstrate a connection between his misconduct and disability. It claimed that it made several attempts to contact Mr. X to obtain this information but did not receive a response.

**Decision:**

The PRB was not convinced by Mr. X's argument that the Union had the sole responsibility of obtaining the medical documentation in dispute. The PRB noted that where grievances are concerned, it has a limited role to play and its function in this Appeal was simply to determine whether there was "a rational basis" for the Union's decision not to take the grievance to arbitration.

The PRB held that it could offer no opinion about Mr. X's new allegation. It further held that even if Mr. X had alleged that the Union was complicit in such discrimination, the appeals procedure would have required that he raise this allegation first to the NEB before appealing it to the PRB but it was too late to do so.

In the end, the PRB concluded that the Union had a rational basis to believe that the grievance would not succeed at arbitration and dismissed Mr. X's Appeal.

**Case No. 59/09**

**Member, CAW Local B v. CAW Local B and the CAW National Executive Board**

**Overview:**

Mr. X was disciplined on the basis of allegations that two female teenagers made against him in the context of his duties as a bus driver. He appealed the Union's decision not to file a grievance to the PRB. The PRB found that the Union's decision not file a grievance had a rational basis and dismissed Mr. X's Appeal without a hearing.

**Facts:**

Mr. X was a School Bus Driver. He was suspended for 10 days and disqualified indefinitely from performing similar work assignments when a high school principal and counselor complained to his employer about his inappropriate interaction with the

teenagers he had driven. When Mr. X asked the Union to file a grievance, the Union declined.

**Arguments:**

Mr. X argued that the Union acted “arbitrarily” and “with prejudice and bias” in its failure to conduct a more thorough investigation of the matter and in its decision not to file a grievance.

The Union argued that the PRB did not have jurisdiction to hear this Appeal because the *CAW Constitution* (“*Constitution*”) limits the PRB’s jurisdiction over grievance appeals to those in which the member has first made allegations of fraud, discrimination, or collusion with management or the lack of a rational basis before the NEB. It also argued that an arbitrator would likely conclude that at least some of Mr. X’s impugned conduct was inappropriate and deserving of discipline.

**Decision:**

In deciding that it had jurisdiction to hear Mr. X’s Appeal, the PRB noted that even though he did not use the precise words set out in the *Constitution* when he appealed to the NEB, what he said amounted to an allegation that the Union’s decision lacked a rational basis.

With regard to the merits of the Appeal, the PRB pointed out that the issue is not whether or not it agrees with the Union but rather whether or not the Union had a “rational basis” for its decision. In deciding that the Union had a rational basis for its decision, the PRB made note of two allegations of misconduct that Mr. X admitted he engaged in that the Union was justified in deeming inappropriate and worthy of some discipline. In dismissing the Appeal without a hearing, the PRB reasoned that even if the Union’s decision may have been unsatisfactory to some, the decision had a rational basis.

**Case No. 60/09**

**Member, CAW Local C v. CAW Local C and the CAW National Executive Board**

**Overview:**

Mr. X lost an election for the position of Skilled Trades Chairperson of his Local by 7 votes. In protesting the election and appealing to the NEB, Mr. X raised a number of concerns regarding the manner in which the election was conducted. In dismissing Mr. X’s Appeal, the NEB focused on the absence of any evidence of fraud or misconduct. The PRB allowed Mr. X’s Appeal. In so doing, it reiterated the principles and questions that are relevant in an appeal of this nature and remitted the case to the Union with specific instructions.

**Facts:**

In 2008, there was an election for the position of Skilled Trades Chairperson of a Local. Mr. X was a candidate in that election and lost by a margin of 7 votes. Citing a number of questionable practices in the election, he appealed to the PRB.

**Arguments:**

Mr. X argued that the Union's failure to have and keep a record of all skilled trades employees on a master list could have resulted in members voting multiple times. He also argued that his Local violated its By-Laws which stipulate that membership cards for skilled trades employees must contain the letter "T".

The Union, in turn, argued that there was no evidence of any type of fraudulent activity.

**Decision:**

The PRB clarified the principles and questions that are relevant to election appeals of this nature. It pointed out it was not enough for Mr. X to claim that there was fraudulent activity in the election, he had to demonstrate how those practices created a significant prospect that the election results could be skewed. Making reference to its 1992 decision in *Brian King*, it also pointed out that fraud need not be proven in order to set aside an election; it would suffice if the irregularities in an election were of such a character and magnitude that they could readily facilitate and conceal a significant level of fraud and deception. Finally, it pointed out that another question that should be asked is, "could mistakes have readily occurred to the extent that the results of this election would have been detrimentally affected?".

With regard to Mr. X's allegation regarding the master list, the PRB concluded that the process used by the Election Committee did not have a negative effect on the outcome of the election. Although the PRB expressed serious concerns about Mr. X's allegation regarding the Union's failure to identify skilled trades employees on their membership cards, the main issue in its view was the Union's handling of Mr. X's protest and appeal and in particular its failure to turn its mind to the principles and questions set out above and apply the appropriate test in deciding Mr. X's Appeal.

In the end, the PRB decided to remit the case back to the NEB with specific instructions as to the analytical principles that should be applied and questions that should be answered.

**Case No. 61/09**

**Member, CAW Local D v. President, CAW Local D and the CAW National Executive Board**

**Overview:**

Ms. X was an unsuccessful candidate in her Local's elections. She claimed that there were defects in the way the elections were conducted that justified holding a new election. The PRB dismissed her Appeal in part without a hearing.

**Facts:**

Ms. X was an unsuccessful candidate in her Local's elections. She claimed that there were defects in the way the elections were conducted that justified holding a new election. Ms. X also claimed that her Local failed to abide by a number of general practices required by the *Constitution*.

**Arguments:**

Ms. X advanced a number of arguments in support of her Appeal. With respect to the election, she argued that the election notices provided by her Local were not timely and the Local's Executive misinformed prospective candidates when it told them that the position of President would be unpaid. With respect to the allegation that her Local failed to comply with practices set out in the *Constitution*, she argued that it denied her request to see the minutes of certain executive and joint council meetings.

With respect to the election, the NEB argued that the dates that were selected for the election were chosen so as to ensure the maximum amount of member participation. With respect to the Local's decision to deny Ms. X access to the minutes, it pointed out that her Local withheld this information because of her close relationship with another individual who was involved in litigation against the Local. The NEB also took the position that Ms. X's interests in this Appeal were moot as her employment had been terminated after her Appeal was launched.

**Decision:**

With respect to the election, the PRB found that no one else had raised any complaints or claims alleging that they were disenfranchised as a result of the short notice, and while the misinformation regarding the manner in which the President was to be compensated may have discouraged potential candidates, there was no evidence before them that this belief was widespread.

The PRB did find that the Local failed to facilitate Joint Council Meetings as required by the *Constitution* and advised the Union that the Local must ensure that these meetings occur on an annual basis.

The PRB also addressed Ms. X's claim that the Local denied her request to see the minutes of certain executive and joint council meetings. The PRB held that,

...democratic practice requires that members enjoy at least a *presumptive* right to access such minutes. Executive and joint council members are chosen as representatives of the members; the members should have, therefore, a reasonable opportunity to scrutinize how those representatives perform. The PRB also acknowledges that there could be special circumstances that would justify *some* withholding of the contents of minutes such as, for example, privileged communications in contemplation of litigation. But the parts withheld must be narrowly confined to the prescribed exceptions.

Lastly, the PRB addressed the NEB's claim that Ms. X's interests in this Appeal were moot. The PRB held that the fact that Ms. X had been terminated was not determinative of its ability to decide her Appeal in general but did have implications for the type of remedies it could grant. In the end, the PRB dismissed Ms. X's Appeal in part without a hearing.

#### **Case No. 62/10**

#### **Member, CAW Local E v. CAW Local E and the CAW National Executive Board**

#### **Overview:**

Ms. X's grievance was settled by her Local. She appealed to the PRB seeking an order directing the Union to take her grievance to arbitration. The PRB concluded that the Union's decision not proceed to arbitration was a reasonable one and dismissed her Appeal without a hearing.

#### **Facts:**

When Ms. X commenced her employment, she entered into an arrangement with her employer whereby she was required to travel to a remote work site and in turn, she was allowed to accumulate banked hours for the return drive home. The employer unilaterally ended this arrangement in August of 2007. Under the new arrangement, Ms. X had to report to the remote site at 8:30 am and was no longer able to accumulate banked hours for the drive home. Shortly thereafter, Ms. X filed a grievance seeking compensation for the hours she spent travelling to the remote work site after August 2007.

In communications with the employer, the Union took the position that this travel arrangement did not appear in the Collective Agreement and it had not been aware of its existence. Although Ms. X claimed she was entitled to many more hours of compensation, the Union settled the matter with the employer for a smaller amount. Ms. X subsequently brought this Appeal seeking an order from the PRB directing the Union to take her grievance to arbitration.

### **Arguments:**

Ms. X argued that the PRB had jurisdiction to hear the merits of her Appeal based on the argument that the employer's claim that no one else had similar travel arrangements was inaccurate and proof of fraud, and her Local's acceptance of the employer's explanation was indicative of collusion on its part.

The Union argued that it denied Ms. X's request to take this matter to arbitration for two reasons. First, the Collective Agreement contained no reference to her original arrangement with the employer and as such was of no assistance to her. Second, the only other argument available to it was an estoppel argument, which would have required it to establish prior awareness of the travel arrangement; knowledge that it had already told the employer it did not have.

### **Decision:**

The PRB pointed out that in dealing with grievances, it is admonished not to substitute its opinion for that of the Union and to whatever extent there was a reasonable argument to support the Union's decision, it was bound to uphold that decision.

Applying these principles to the circumstances of Ms. X's Appeal, the PRB found that the key issue was the fact that Ms. X's travel arrangement was an individual agreement and was not found in the Collective Agreement. In support of its conclusion that the Union's position with respect to the likely outcome of the grievance was reasonable, the PRB cited the following passage in the text, *Canadian Labour Arbitration* (Brown and Beatty),

Not only have arbitrators declined to deal with grievances seeking to enforce individual agreements on the ground that their jurisdiction is limited to arbitrating disputes arising out of collective agreements, but they have also declared such individual agreements to be invalid....

With respect to Ms. X's jurisdictional arguments, the PRB found insufficient evidence to support these allegations. The PRB did, however, express its concern with the Local's failure to properly offer Ms. X an explanation for its unwillingness to take her grievance to arbitration. In the end, the PRB dismissed Ms. X's Appeal without a hearing.

### **Case No. 63/11**

**Member, CAW Local B v. CAW Local B and the CAW National Executive Board**

### **Overview:**

Mr. X claimed that he had decided to give up his job as a full-time Bus Driver and accept a part-time position based on misrepresentations that management and his Chief Shop Steward told him about his job security. When the same Chief Shop

Steward bumped Mr. X out of his part-time position and his Local and the NEB refused to file a grievance, he appealed to the PRB. As there was a reasonable basis for the Union's refusal to file a grievance, the PRB dismissed Mr. X's Appeal without a hearing.

**Facts:**

Mr. X was employed as a full-time Bus Driver. He subsequently accepted a position as a part-time Bus Driver. Mr. X claimed that he accepted the part-time position only after he was reassured by a member of management and Mr. Y, the Chief Shop Steward, that he could not be bumped from that position. Mr. Y was also a Bus Driver and shortly after Mr. X accepted the part-time position, Mr. Y allegedly bumped Mr. X out of his part-time position and forced him onto the casual driver list at considerable wage and benefit loss.

Both the Local and the NEB denied Mr. X's requests to file a grievance. They did so on the basis that Mr. Y had more seniority than Mr. X and he was therefore awarded the part-time position in accordance with the Collective Agreement. The NEB also concluded that Mr. X could not be red-circled for a position from which he was bumped.

**Decision:**

The PRB pointed out that the *Constitution* precludes it from determining whether it agrees or disagrees with the merits of any particular grievance and deprives it of jurisdiction to deal with a grievance unless the appellant has alleged before the NEB that the Union committed fraud, collusion with management, discrimination or its decision was devoid of a rational basis.

The PRB determined that Mr. X did not make any allegation that would fall under the categories of appeals concerning grievances in which the PRB had jurisdiction to hear. The allegations that held the most weight were those against Mr. Y. If these allegations were proven, they may have indicated that Mr. Y had behaved inappropriately but it would not have implicated the Union because the Appeal Record showed that the decision not to file the grievance was made by officials other than Mr. Y.

The PRB also had difficulty finding that the Union's failure to disqualify Mr. Y from the part-time driver position was devoid of any rational basis.

The difficulty with this approach is that it would effectively empower the Union to withhold its member's contractual benefits as a way of punishing misbehavior. At the very least, such a position would be controversial. Nevertheless, the failure to adopt it would hardly represent a departure from the "rational basis" required of the Union in the handling of grievances.

The PRB held that it was for the Union to "sort out all of the equities among competing employees" and not the PRB and that the remedies that Mr. X sought, such as his claim that he be red-circled, were not within the power of the PRB to award.

Having dismissed the Appeal, the PRB expressed discomfort over the potential wrong Mr. X suffered and recommended that the Union consider how to resolve the dispute between him and Mr. Y.

**Case No. 64/11**

**Member, CAW Local F v. CAW Local F and the CAW National Executive Board**

**Overview:**

Mr. X alleged that his Local was colluding with management and filed charges against several Union members for “conduct unbecoming” and for violations of the *CAW Ethical Practices Codes*. The PRB dismissed one of his allegations and remitted the others back to the NEB to be adjudicated on their merits.

**Facts:**

Mr. X’s Appeal encompassed three allegations. He alleged that the leadership of his Local engaged in fraud by posting a false seniority list that affected the outcome of a Local election that he ran in but lost. He also alleged that over a period of 10 years, the leadership of his Local had failed to hold quarterly Unit meetings as required by the *CAW Constitution* and the Local’s By-Laws, effectively curtailing membership participation. He also alleged that the leadership of his Local failed to process the charges that he filed against various Union members.

**Arguments:**

Mr. X claimed that there was a disparity between the seniority list that appeared on the corporate bulletin board and the Union’s bulletin board prior to the elections and the differences in these lists did not arise until after he had submitted a number of proposals seeking to improve the Union’s relationship with management. He also claimed that the company separated the day and afternoon shifts by an hour so that the employees on those shifts could not easily communicate with each other about the upcoming election. He also claimed that the company laid off about half a dozen employees that he expected to support him in the election. Mr. X argued that these actions reflected an attempt by the company and his Local to manipulate the outcome of the election that he participated in and ultimately lost by 5 votes. Mr. X also claimed that Unit meetings had not been held for 10 years. He argued that such misconduct was further evidence of collusion between his Local and his employer and was also evidence of corruption within the leadership of his Local. Mr. X argued that he filed a number of charges against numerous individuals at the Local and National level for conduct unbecoming a member and for violations of the *CAW Ethical Practices Codes* but those charges were never processed and/or acknowledged.



The NEB acknowledged the Local's failure to hold Unit meetings and ordered the Local to convene such meetings in the future. Mr. X, however, was of the view that such a direction in and of itself did not hold the members sufficiently accountable.

**Decision:**

In dismissing Mr. X's first allegation, the PRB held that he had provided insufficient evidence for it to conclude that anyone had acted fraudulently with respect to the election. His allegations could be readily explained as honest mistakes or coincidences and in and of themselves were insufficient to support a serious allegation such as election fraud.

The PRB pointed out that it was not in dispute that Unit meetings had not been held and concluded that Mr. X had a right to obtain decisions with respect to his charges of conduct unbecoming a member and allegations of Ethical Practices Codes violations. In doing so, the PRB made it clear that it had made no judgments with regard to the behavior of the accused Union Officials.

In the end, the PRB remitted Mr. X's second and third allegations back to the NEB to be dealt with on the merits.

**Interim Decision**

**Member, Local G v. CAW Local G and the CAW National Executive Board**

**Overview:**

Mr. X initiated an election-based appeal to the PRB. The NEB sought to dismiss his Appeal on the basis that Mr. X failed to comply with the time limits prescribed by the *Constitution*. The PRB found that Mr. X provided sufficient reasons for the delay and remitted the case back to the NEB with instructions.

**Facts:**

Mr. X's Appeal encompassed four issues. The first and second issues were related to Mr. X's claim that members on lay off and members on "grow-ins" had been deprived of their right to vote for certain positions during an election and a run-off election. The third issue was related to Mr. X's decision to challenge the outcome of the election and run-off election. The fourth issue was related to Mr. X's claim that a Local Union representative, Mr. Y, engaged in conduct that violated CAW-Canada's *Ethical Practices Codes*.

**Arguments:**

The NEB argued that Mr. X's Appeal should be dismissed because he failed to comply with the time limits set out in the *Constitution*.

Mr. X argued that he had raised all of his concerns in as timely a manner as possible and provided an explanation for the delay in filing his Appeal.

**Decision:**

The PRB concluded that Mr. X had provided a reasonable explanation for the delay in filing his Appeal. It also pointed out that the NEB had not explained why it continued to dispute the timeliness of Mr. X's Appeal despite having an opportunity to review and respond to his explanation.

In the end, the PRB held that Mr. X had complied with the time limits. It remitted the case back to the NEB to adjudicate the merits of his complaint and directed the NEB not to engage in further consideration of the issue of time limits.

The NEB subsequently decided to order a new election which was the remedy Mr. X had originally sought in his Appeal.

**Case No. 65/11**

**Member, Local H v. CAW Local H and the CAW National Executive Board**

**Overview:**

The CAW withdrew a grievance it had filed on behalf of Mr. X concerning his entitlement to vacation pay. Mr. X's Appeal challenged that withdrawal and also alleged that during an election, three CAW members disseminated material that injured his reputation and invaded his privacy. Mr. X sought an apology and monetary damages from the CAW. The PRB found no basis to order monetary damages from the Union and dismissed his Appeal.

**Facts:**

Prior to 2007, Mr. X was represented by another Union and served as President of that Union's Local. It remains unclear whether or not he was paid by the Union or by his employer when he was President. Shortly thereafter Mr. X suffered serious injuries in a car accident while on Union business. Upon his return to work in 2008, the CAW had acquired bargaining rights at the workplace and Mr. X became a member of the CAW. When Mr. X claimed that the employer owed him vacation pay, the employer paid some of his claim but withheld a significant amount. His employer took the position that it had satisfied its obligations under the Collective Agreement and did not owe him anymore. The CAW initially filed a grievance but later withdrew it. At some point during the appeals process before the PRB, the CAW lost its bargaining rights with the employer.

**Arguments:**

Mr. X argued that CAW Officers had promised him that the CAW would provide him with vacation pay if his employer did not, and since his employer had no intention of paying him additional vacation pay, the CAW had to pay it. He also argued that he by-passed his Local because he could not expect fair treatment from it and claimed that three of his fellow Union members disseminated material that injured his reputation and invaded his privacy during an election. He sought an apology and monetary damages from the CAW.

In support of its decision to withdraw Mr. X's grievance, the CAW argued that Mr. X had exceeded the time limits and failed to refer the matter to his Local. It also argued that Mr. X should claim compensation from the individual members not the CAW. After the CAW lost its bargaining rights with the employer, it argued that Mr. X was no longer a member of the CAW, had no standing in the Appeal and was not entitled to the remedies he requested.

**Decision:**

The PRB concluded that Mr. X had not provided sufficient information as to why he believed he would not receive fair treatment from his Local and also noted the absence of an explanation from the CAW as to why it was unable to provide Mr. X with an explanation regarding its decision to withdraw his grievance.

In the end, the PRB declined to rule on any of these issues. It did so based on the nature of the remedy sought in Mr. X's Appeal. The PRB noted that its power to award the kind of remedy Mr. X was looking for was ill defined and concluded that even if it had such a power, it would not exercise it in this case. Regarding vacation pay, the PRB concluded that, while Mr. X was President of the other Union's Local and was injured in the accident, he was an employee of the company or of the other Union. As he had no such relationship with the CAW, it did not owe him vacation pay.

The PRB also concluded that Mr. X had not provided sufficient information to persuade it that the Union had authorized the dissemination of any damaging material about him. In the end, the PRB found no basis upon which to order monetary damages from the CAW and dismissed Mr. X's Appeal.

**Case No. 66/11****Member, Local I v. CAW Local I and the CAW National Executive Board****Overview:**

Ms. X protested the outcome of an election for the position of President within her Local. The PRB dismissed Ms. X's Appeal.

**Facts:**

Ms. X was a candidate in an election for the position President of her Local. After she lost the election, she identified a number of practices that in her view fatally undermined the integrity of the election. She appealed to the PRB and requested an order to overturn the election.

**Arguments:**

Ms. X argued the election was flawed in many respects. She claimed *inter alia* that: there was lack of "care and control" in the way ballots were handled, the number of ballots that had been sent to or returned from specific polls had not been confirmed, the ballot boxes were not properly sealed, some 200 ballots had disappeared, her opponent was in the vicinity of a polling station when candidates were not supposed to be there and the Appeals Committee did not investigate her complaint in a fair manner. In the latter regard, she argued that when her employer refused to give her time off so that she could make an oral presentation to the Appeals Committee, it refused her request for an alternate date.

The NEB argued that the Appeals Committee had examined replicas of the ballot boxes and determined that ballots could not have been removed without damaging the boxes and it had also reviewed all of the ballots and checked them against the record of the votes cast. It asked the PRB to dismiss Ms. X's Appeal.

**Decision:**

The PRB cited the *Brian King* case where it had declared that,

Union elections should not be overturned in such circumstances unless the election irregularities were of such a character and magnitude that they could readily facilitate and conceal a significant level of fraud and deception.

It noted that while some of the election practices in this case left much to be desired, the irregularities that had been established did not justify overturning the election based on the criteria in the *King* case.

The PRB also concluded that in many respects, Ms. X's position was based upon unconfirmed suspicions and while these suspicions may have been understandable, more evidence was required to overturn an election. The PRB dismissed Ms. X's Appeal after a hearing.

**Case No. 67/11**

**Member, Local C v. CAW Local C and the CAW National Executive Board**

**Overview:**

Mr. H sought to file charges against an individual in the CAW's National Office, Mr. I, for conduct unbecoming a Union member. After failed attempts to resolve the matter with the National President, Mr. H filed charges with the NEB. The NEB dismissed the charges as being untimely. In the end, the PRB held that Mr. H's efforts to resolve the issues amicably should not bar him from formally charging Mr. I at this stage and remitted the case to the NEB for consideration on its merits.

**Facts:**

In 2010, Mr. H became involved in a dispute with Mr. I regarding the interpretation of a Collective Agreement. Mr. H claimed that Mr. I subsequently made comments about him in emails that were reproduced and left on the shop floor. In response, Mr. H wrote to the National President about Mr. I's conduct and alleged that his behaviour was unbecoming a person in his position. The National President recommended that Mr. H and Mr. I sit down and discuss the matter. Mr. H claimed that he subsequently contacted the National President to make arrangements to meet and when no such meeting occurred, he decided to charge Mr. I with conduct unbecoming a Union member.

**Arguments:**

The NEB argued that the PRB should dismiss Mr. H's Appeal because he failed to follow the process for charging a member under the *CAW Constitution*. It cited sections 11(c) and (d) of Article 24 of the *Constitution* and argued that Mr. H did not attempt to enlist the support of his Local's membership or set out the reasons for not doing so.

**Decision:**

While the PRB found that Mr. H did fail to comply with the *Constitution*, it also found that, it was not unreasonable for Mr. H to expect an informal resolution in light of his back and forth communications with the National President. Noting the preference for amicable resolutions over confrontational ones, the PRB ruled that the constitutionally prescribed time limits should not be allowed to frustrate Mr. H's complaint. In support of its decision, the PRB relied on an earlier decision by the American PRB in which that PRB held that an appeal filed beyond the time limits would not be considered untimely where an appellant has made good faith efforts to resolve the issue raised. The PRB held that if Mr. H chose to move forward with his Appeal, he could pursue his claims against Mr. I by complying with the appropriate provisions in the *Constitution*.

## **CONCLUSION**

Copies of the complete text of any of the appeals discussed in the foregoing are available on request to the Public Review Board at 506 – 360 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario, M5S 1X1; telephone and fax: 416-861-1291; email: [cawprb@web.net](mailto:cawprb@web.net).

**Respectfully submitted**

**THE PUBLIC REVIEW BOARD  
CAW/TCA CANADA**

**A. Alan Borovoy  
Chairperson**

**APPENDIX A**  
**RULES OF PROCEDURE**

## **RULES OF PROCEDURE**

Effective June 23, 2003

The following rules are promulgated by the Public Review Board, hereinafter the "PRB", pursuant to the authority contained in Article 25 of the Constitution of the National Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers Union of Canada (CAW-Canada). Their purpose is to make the services of the PRB available to those within its jurisdiction in a fashion which is orderly, as prompt as justice will permit, and fair to all. Any questions concerning these rules are cordially invited, by letter, telephone, or in person, at PRB headquarters, located at 394 Bloor Street, Suite 202, Toronto, Ontario, M5S 1X4, Telephone and Fax: 416-861-1291.

### **1. Appeals**

Every notice of Appeal to the PRB shall be signed by the member or members appealing, shall be filed with the National President at 205 Placer Court, North York, Ontario, M2H 3H9, and should be accompanied by a Statement of Reasons for Appeal (Article 24, Section 4(a) of the Constitution) which shall include a specific and detailed summary of the following:

- (1) The factual circumstances out of which the appeal has arisen;
- (2) The decision of the National Executive Board; and,
- (3) The arguments upon which reliance will be placed in opposition to the National Executive Board's decision.

### **2. Notification of Pending Appeal**

Upon receipt of the Notice and Statement of Reasons for Appeal in a particular case, the PRB will promptly forward a Notification of Pending Appeal and a copy of these Rules to all parties. Copies of the Notice and Statement of Reasons for Appeal will be forwarded with the Notification to all parties who have not previously received them.

Where it appears that the interests of other parties may be involved, the Local corresponding secretary will be requested to furnish to those parties copies of the Notification of Pending Appeal and Statement of Reasons so they may be aware of, and, if they wish, participate in, the appeal proceedings.

### **3. Answer to Statement of Reasons for Appeal**

An Answer to the Statement of Reasons for Appeal shall be filed by the National Union and may be filed by any other party. The Answer must be responsive to each argument advanced by the party or appellant in his or her Statement of Reasons for Appeal; provided however, where objection is to be made to PRB jurisdiction to consider the appeal, a Special Answer may be filed limited to a discussion of the jurisdictional issue; and provided further, upon the decision of the PRB to assume jurisdiction, or at its



specific request in lieu of such a decision, an Answer responsive to the arguments raised in the Statement of Reasons for Appeal shall be filed.

All Answers shall be filed with the PRB within 15 days after receipt of the Notification of Pending Appeal. Where an additional Answer may be required following the submission of a Special Answer this shall be filed within 15 days after receipt of PRB request. These time limits may be extended upon written request submitted prior to the deadline for filing.

The failure of the National Union timely to file its Answer may provide grounds for the granting of judgment in favour of the appellant, if, in the opinion of the PRB, the interests of justice so require.

4. The Record

At the time the National Union files its Answer it shall forward to the PRB its complete written record in the case, including all correspondence, briefs, or written arguments, minutes, transcripts, and exhibits submitted in connection with the local union and National Union proceedings. A copy of the Record will be supplied by the PRB to each party.

It shall be the duty of each party receiving the Record to notify the PRB in writing within ten days after receipt of any deficiency in the Record supplied and, when possible, to supply the missing documents.

5. Correspondence

In order that the parties may be fully informed as to developments concerning an appeal pending before the PRB, copies of any correspondence which pertains to matters of substance or procedure will be mailed by the PRB to all parties to the appeal who have not previously received it.

6. Change or Error of Address

During the pendency of the case, it shall be the responsibility of each party notified of a pending proceeding under Rule I to inform the PRB immediately in writing of any change or error in address.

7. Time, Place and Notice of Oral Argument

- (1) Any party may request oral argument before the PRB. Such request should be made by not later than ten days after receipt of the Record. It shall be within the PRB's discretion, in light of the circumstances, to grant or deny the request.

- (2) The Chair of the PRB shall designate the time and place of hearing of any matter meriting a hearing under the standards set forth in Article 24, Subparagraph 4(f), and Article 25, Section 4 of the Constitution.
- (3) Written notice of such time and place shall be transmitted to all parties at least ten days in advance of the hearing, except where such notice is waived by the parties.

8. Designation of Public Review Board Panel

The Chair of the PRB shall designate a panel of PRB members to consider each case, numbering from three members to the full PRB, and shall designate a chair of the panel.

9. Decision of Public Review Board Panel

The decision of the PRB panel in a particular case shall be by majority vote of the members thereof and shall constitute the decision of the PRB. The decision shall be reduced to writing and copies sent to all parties. In addition, copies will be sent to various colleges and universities, libraries, news media, private publishing services, and individual subscribers to the decisions of the PRB unless prior objection is received from any party.

10. Motions

Any party during the pendency of the appeal before the PRB may file a motion to require a specified action. Copies shall be transmitted to the other parties who may, but shall not be required to, file a response. Motions shall be decided by the Board without oral argument, unless otherwise indicated.

11. Additional Evidence

- (1) Additional evidence - that is, evidence in addition to that in the Record transmitted to the PRB - may be presented only in the following situations:
  - (a) Where authorized by the Chair of the panel of the PRB or offered and received without objection by any other party on the basis of a written request filed with the PRB within 20 days after the transmittal of the Answer submitted by the National Union. The request to present additional evidence shall set forth:
    - (i) Persuasive reasons for presenting such evidence and for not having presented it at prior hearings in the case;
    - (ii) The names of all witnesses whose testimony is desired to be presented;
    - (iii) The relevance of the anticipated testimony of each of these witnesses to the issues before the PRB; and,

- (iv) A description of any documentary evidence to be offered.
- (b) Where required by the PRB in order to inform itself adequately to reach a just decision.
- (2) Whenever such presentation of evidence is authorized, it may be received by the PRB in the form of a record made before a PRB-appointed hearing officer, or otherwise, upon such terms as are prescribed for the particular case and are consistent with the principles of notice, confrontation, cross-examination and opportunity for rebuttal.

12. Rules to be Liberally Construed and May be Modified

These rules shall be liberally construed to effectuate the purposes of the PRB and, in any event, the PRB may in its discretion modify, waive, or supplement any of these rules in any particular case, but only to the extent necessary to accomplish the purposes for which the PRB was established.

**APPENDIX B**  
**ANNUAL FINANCIAL INFORMATION**  
**2009 – 2011**

**THE CANADIAN AUTOWORKERS PUBLIC REVIEW BOARD**  
**STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS AND CHANGES IN NET ASSETS**  
 Year ended December 31

2009 2008

Revenue		
Grant from The Canadian Autoworkers Union	\$ 50,000	\$ 100,000
<b>Expenses</b>		
Rent		
Meeting fees	25,377	23,865
Executive secretary fees	16,300	16,800
Administrative and secretariat	8,955	9,124
Board member fees	5,542	5,625
Audit fees	4,900	4,900
Printing	4,758	7,673
Office and miscellaneous	1,625	1,770
Travel	1,147	2,092
Telephone	1,067	1,824
Meeting room rental	943	2,145
Computer services	431	809
Hearing fees	430	430
Amortization	-	10,200
	1,681	1,348
	73,156	88,605
<b>Excess (deficiency) of revenue over expenses</b>	<b>(23,156)</b>	<b>11,395</b>
<b>Net assets, beginning of year</b>	<b>42,376</b>	<b>30,981</b>
<b>Net assets, end of year</b>	<b>\$ 19,220</b>	<b>\$ 42,376</b>

*The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements*

**THE CANADIAN AUTOWORKERS PUBLIC REVIEW BOARD**  
**STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN NET ASSETS**  
**Year ended December 31**

	Net assets invested in equipment	Unrestricted net assets	Total 2010
Net assets, beginning of year	\$ 7,757	\$ 11,463	\$ 19,220
Excess (deficiency) of revenues over expenses	\$ (1,539)	36,472	34,933
Net assets, end of year	\$ 6,218	\$ 47,935	\$ 54,153

*The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements*

**THE CANADIAN AUTOWORKERS PUBLIC REVIEW BOARD**  
**STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS**  
**Year ended December 31**

	2010	2009
<b>Revenue</b>		
Grant from the Canadian Autoworkers Union	\$ 100,000	\$ 50,000
<b>Expenses</b>		
Rent	26,618	25,377
Executive secretary fees	8,168	8,955
Meeting fees	7,400	16,300
Board member fees	4,900	4,900
Audit fees	4,515	4,758
Administrative and secretarial	3,575	5,542
Translation fees	2,591	-
Telephone	2,112	943
Office and miscellaneous	1,833	1,147
Printing	1,243	1,625
Computer services	463	430
Travel	110	1,067
Meeting room rental	-	431
Amortization	1,539	1,681
	65,067	73,156
<b>Excess (deficiency) of revenue over expenses</b>	\$ 34,933	\$ (23,156)

*The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements*

**THE CANADIAN AUTOWORKERS PUBLIC REVIEW BOARD**  
**STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN NET ASSETS**  
**Year ended December 31**

	Net assets invested in equipment	Unrestricted net assets	Total 2011
Net assets, beginning of year	\$ 6,218	\$ 47,935	\$ 54,153
Deficiency of revenues over expenses	(1,225)	(9,568)	(10,793)
Net assets, end of year	\$ 4,993	\$ 38,367	\$ 43,360

*The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements*

**THE CANADIAN AUTOWORKERS PUBLIC REVIEW BOARD**  
**STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS**  
**Year ended December 31**

	2011	2010
<b>Revenue</b>		
Grant from the Canadian Autoworkers Union	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000
<b>Expenses</b>		
Meeting fees	36,550	7,400
Rent	26,350	26,618
Executive secretary fees	18,015	8,168
Audit fees	6,633	4,515
Administrative and secretarial	6,063	3,575
Board member fees	4,900	4,900
Office and miscellaneous	3,257	1,833
Printing	2,644	1,243
Telephone	2,354	2,112
Translation fees	896	2,591
Meeting room rental	672	-
Travel	647	110
Computer services	587	463
Amortization	1,225	1,539
	110,793	65,067
<b>Excess (deficiency) of revenue over expenses</b>	\$ (10,793)	\$ 34,933

*The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements*

**THE CANADIAN AUTOWORKERS PUBLIC REVIEW BOARD**  
**NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**  
**DECEMBER 31, 2011**

---

**1. Purpose of the organization and income tax status**

The Canadian Autoworkers Public Review Board is a non-profit organization. The Organization was established for the purpose of ensuring a continuation of high moral and ethical standards in the administrative practices of the National union and its subordinate bodies, and to further enhance the democratic processes and appeal procedure within the Union as they affect the rights and privileges of individual members and subordinate bodies. The Organization is exempt from income tax under the Income Tax Act.

**2. Significant accounting policies**

**Use of estimates**

The preparation of financial statements in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the balance sheet date and the reported amounts of revenue and expenses during the reporting period. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

**Revenue recognition**

Grants are recorded as revenue in the fiscal year they are received.

**Equipment and leasehold improvements**

Purchased equipment and leasehold improvements are recorded at cost less accumulated amortization. Amortization is provided annually on bases designed to amortize the assets over their estimated useful lives, as follows:

Office equipment	-	20% declining balance
Computer equipment	-	45% declining balance
Leasehold improvements	-	straight-line over 10 years

**Future changes in accounting policies**

**Accounting Standards for Not-for-Profit Organizations**

In November 2010, the Accounting Standards Board (AcSB) issued a set of standards for Not-for-Profit Organizations (Part III). The framework retains the current approach of the private enterprise standards (Part II of the CICA Handbook issued December 2009) supplemented with specific standards for areas of concern to not-for-profit organizations and closely resembles the current standards with few changes. The standard is effective for fiscal years commencing on or after January 1, 2012, with early adoption permitted. Not-for-profit organizations have the option of adopting International Financial Reporting Standards.

The Organization plans to adopt the new Not-for-profit standards effective January 1, 2012.



**THE CANADIAN AUTOWORKERS PUBLIC REVIEW BOARD**  
**NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**  
**DECEMBER 31, 2011**

**3. Equipment and leasehold improvements**

	Cost	Accumulated Amortization	2011 Net Carrying Amount	2010 Net Carrying Amount
Office equipment	\$ 5,484	\$ 3,420	\$ 2,064	\$ 2,580
Computer equipment	4,325	4,049	276	502
Leasehold improvements	4,826	2,173	2,653	3,136
	<u>\$ 14,635</u>	<u>\$ 9,642</u>	<u>\$ 4,993</u>	<u>\$ 6,218</u>

Amortization expense for the year amounted to \$1,225 (2010 - \$1,539).

**4. Financial instruments**

**Fair value**

The carrying amounts of the Organization's financial instruments, consisting of cash and term deposits, and accounts payable and accrued liabilities, approximate their fair values due to their short-term nature.

**5. Capital management**

The Organization defines capital as its net assets. The Organization's objective when managing its capital is to hold sufficient unrestricted net assets to enable it to fund its major activities while maintaining a solid financial position.

The overall strategy with respect to capital remains unchanged from the year ended December 31, 2010.

**APPENDIX C**  
**INDEX OF APPEALS**  
**2009 - 2011**

**INDEX OF APPEALS CONSIDERED  
2009 – 2011**

**Case Name and Number**

Case No. 56/08 (Reconsideration)

Member, Local A v. President, CAW Local A and the CAW National Executive Board

Case No. 59/09

Member, CAW Local B v. CAW Local B and the CAW National Executive Board

Case No. 60/09

Member, CAW Local C v. CAW Local C and the CAW National Executive Board

Case No. 61/09

Member, CAW Local D v. President, CAW Local D and the CAW National Executive Board

Case No. 62/10

Member, CAW Local E v. CAW Local E and the CAW National Executive Board

Case No. 63/11

Member, CAW Local B v. CAW Local B and the CAW National Executive Board

Case No. 64/11

Member, CAW Local F v. CAW Local F and the CAW National Executive Board

Interim Decision

Member, Local G v. CAW Local G and the CAW National Executive Board

Case No. 65/11

Member, Local H v. CAW Local H and the CAW National Executive Board

Case No. 66/11

Member, Local I v. CAW Local I and the CAW National Executive Board

Case No. 67/11

Member, Local C v. CAW Local C and the CAW National Executive Board