INLAND STEEL COMPANY	
and	) Grievance No. 10-F-98 ) Appeal No. 174 ) Arbitration No. 422
UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA	) Arbitration No. 422
Local Union 1010	) Opinion and Award

## Appearances:

For the Company:

W. A. Dillon, Assistant Superintendent, Labor Relations Department

R. J. Stanton, Assistant Superintendent, Labor Relations Department

W. Slaney, General Foreman, 24" Bar Mill Department

M. S. Riffle, Divisional Supervisor, Labor Relations Department

H. S. Onoda, Representative, Labor Relations Department

## For the Union:

Cecil Clifton, International Staff Representative Al Garza, Secretary, Grievance Committee William Bennett, Grievance Committeeman Ralph Crawford, Assistant Griever and Aggrieved

This is a discipline case, involving the stewart, a Roll Provider, in the 24" Bar Mill. He was reprimended for failing to follow a Company rule requiring the conditioning of rolls that have not been in use for six months or more, and he complains that this was unwarranted and unjust, suggesting that it was motivated by discrimination because of his position as steward.

The rule, with which grievant frankly admitted he was familiar, is that a Roll Provider must have the necks ground on rolls that have not been in use for six months. The rolls in question, certain auto hinge rolls, had not been used for 22 months. Grievant had attempted to have this grinding done, but the Roll Grinder (an employee in another department) told him it was not necessary, and if he were to do the job it would have to be at overtime. The rolls subsequently had to have the necks ground, and this necessitated a change in the rolling schedule and the loss of production at a time when production was in great demand.

The charge of discrimination was not supported by the evidence or the facts. He was reprimanded in September, 1958, shortly after he had become steward, but his own testimony showed that the facts on which that reprimand was based were true, and no grievance was prosecuted. Since the grievance before us in this case, which was some two years before the arbitration hearing, he has received no other form of reprimand or discipline, and Article VII, Section 2 in effect outlaws reprimands after one year. This record hardly demonstrates any desire to be unduly hard on grievant because of his Union position.

The simple fact is that grievant as Roll Provider must see to it that properly conditoned rolls are made available in accordance with the rolling schedule. As part of his job he inspects the rolls he provides. The six-month rule is clear; in addition, he may have grinding done on rolls that have been in use less than six months ego if the condition of the rolls requires it. Here the necks of the rolls required grinding, and even if not the six-month rule required that it be done.

The reprimand was based on his failure to observe the rule and to have the rolls conditioned. It is difficult to see how such a reprimand may be found to have been issued without proper cause. The fact that sometimes other circumstances may also cause a delay in the rolling schedule is quite immaterial.

## AWARD

This grievance is denied.

Dated: September 27, 1961

7s/ David L. Cole

David L. Cole Permanent Arbitrator