



association of university and college employees

July 24, 1980

MINUTES & AUDITED STATEMENT

MINUTES

SPECIAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING - April 9, 1980

IRC 2

12:30 - 4:00 pm.

The meeting was called to order by Marcel Dionne at 1:47 pm.

The agenda was announced by Marcel Dionne:

1. Report by Sandy Masai of the Strike Committee
2. Strike Committee nominations
3. Contract Committee report
4. Strike Committee report

1. Sandy Masai report:

At the outset Sandy presented a brief summary of the events surrounding the proposed picketing of Prince Charles which was subsequently called off. She then proceeded to a preliminary review of the 1978-79 contract negotiations and the strike vote that was taken. She indicated that two to three steps were involved in the taking of a strike vote. Sandy referred the meeting to the concept and explanation of a selective or rotating strike. At the end of her report she stated that the membership would have to authorize the taking of a referendum strike vote. She said that the above items would be fleshed out at a later point in the meeting.

2. Strike Committee nominations:

Eight (8) positions were vacant. The following members were elected by acclamation: Judy Wolch, Ivy Vaksdal, Shelley Tagert-MacInnes, Isabelle Cripps, Annika Mair. Three (3) positions remained unfilled and as a result nominations were to remain open until the next membership meeting.

3. Contract Committee report:

Nancy Wiggs reported the following:

Articles signed to date (4 of which were the University's):

3.02 - Continuing Employee

17.01 - Picket Lines

19.04 - Notice of Intent - Technological Change

22.08 - Orientation Period

31.04 - Reclassification Procedure

33.06 - Disciplinary/Action/Employee Files

34.06 - (i) Recall

(1) Recall

The Contract Committee had dropped the following proposals to date in an effort to get further movement from the University: 3.07 - Retirement, 9.01 - Human Rights, 19.041 - Technological Change, 23.02 - Employee Files, 28.02 - Work Day and Work Week, 30.02 - Compassionate Leave, and 31.04 - Reclassification Procedure. Nancy stated that movement had been accomplished in terms of quantity not quality. The 18% wage demand and the other monetary demands had remained intact, the perception of the Contract Committee being that this area was a priority with the membership. Nancy added that the University had dropped one proposal.

The following items were still on the table: 5.05 - Contracting Out, 7.02 - Full-Time Leave of absence, 21.01 - Tuition Waiver (re-worded to include two courses), 22.01 - Job Postings, 22.07 - Temporary Promotion (re-worded by the Committee on several occasions with the University "philosophically opposed in the end"), Article 27.15 - Time Off Between Boxing Day and New Year's, Article 28.05 - Shift Work, Special Leave (watered down to two days a year) and Adoption Leave (altered to a mere leave without pay).

Nancy said that the University package had been received that morning and that it contained their abhorrent Leave of Absence clause, 100% of Extended Health Benefits (45¢ per single employee per month), a two-year agreement with 9% in the first year (with an additional raise to the Computer Operators of \$100.00). The second year would contain a wage re-opener - a situation Nancy explained that would probably end up in arbitration, a hazardous process

at best.

On the basis of the preceding Nancy said that the Contract Committee was strongly recommending that the membership reject the package. Negotiations had reached the point where membership action was necessary - the Contract Committee had gone as far as possible.

Moved and seconded by the Contract Committee: **THAT WE STRONGLY REJECT THE UNIVERSITY'S PACKAGE OFFER OF APRIL 9, 1980.**

Neil Boucher then took the floor and stated that a rejection was not good enough and that it was necessary for the Committee to know where the membership stood, especially in regards to wages. A discussion period followed. One member asked about the wage gap on campus, another suggested the possibility of a study session, while another asked whether or not the Contract Committee had given any consideration to a COLA clause. A member spoke about the inadequacies of the University's Medical/Dental plan. Other members spoke about the difficulties of living on our present wages. At that point Marcel Dionne decided that it was appropriate that a vote be taken on the motion.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE 500 MEMBERS PRESENT.

4. Strike Committee report:

Sandy Masai provided some flesh for her original skeletal Strike Committee report. She presented a historical perspective of past negotiations and settlements, emphasizing the 1978 negotiations in which we did everything short of striking. She said that a year ago we settled without even taking a strike vote.

Sandy stressed that we should be realistic about what a strike means. She then outlined the stages involved. She said that the Strike Committee was leaning towards selective strike action, a course of action that was financially viable and effective. She outlined what a rotating strike was and how much it would cost - a process that would include a possible assessment or assessments. If 120 workers were to strike for a month the cost per member would be \$37.00. The Committee felt that only members who picketed and/or worked in the Union Office would get strike pay.

In response to the effectiveness of such a strategy Neil Boucher related the history of the Operating Engineers' strike. Marcel Dionne then placed the Chair in Ray Galbraith's hands while he addressed the meeting. Marcel indicated that he was speaking as a member and from the historical perspective of the 1974 study session. He said that the University was surprised by the study session in 1974 and that the situation was similar today.

Moved by Marcel Dionne

Seconded by Michelle McCaughan

THAT THE MEMBERS PRESENT SHOW THEIR SUPPORT FOR THE CONTRACT COMMITTEE AND THAT WE EXTEND THIS MEETING TO 4:00 PM.

After some discussion it was

Moved by Neil Boucher

Seconded by Nancy Wiggs

THAT THE MOTION TO HOLD A STUDY SESSION BE TABLED.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Moved by Neil Boucher

Seconded by Nancy Wiggs

THAT AUCE LOCAL #1 TAKE A REFERENDUM STRIKE BALLOT.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Marcel Dionne's motion to hold a study session was back on the floor:

THAT THE MEMBERS PRESENT SHOW THEIR SUPPORT FOR THE CONTRACT COMMITTEE AND THAT WE EXTEND THIS MEETING TO 4:00 PM.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Marcel Dionne then called for a short recess. The meeting reconvened at 2:24 pm. Nancy Wiggs then announced that the Contract Committee would go through the clauses still on the table and explain why certain ones were dropped. Any motions would be welcome at that

time. After that stage the Strike Committee would then lead a discussion.

Neil Boucher reported that the demand for a bi-weekly pay period had been withdrawn as a University Task Force on Procedures was seriously considering the issue. It was Neil's understanding that a Sub-Committee was to be established to investigate bi-weekly pay periods.

Various members of the Contract Committee then presented clauses on contracting out, full-time leave of absence, tuition waiver, job postings, temporary promotion and time off between Boxing Day and New Year's. On the time off issue Neil Boucher outlined the rationale for closing the University. He said that the University response was not only negative but that they had nothing to offer - they were "philosophically opposed".

Clauses on shift work, special leave, medical/dental and adoption leave were presented. Marcel Dionne then expressed surprise at the members' response on wages. He said that he hoped that the University would listen more closely to the Union's concerns after the show of support. He then invited response from the floor on the wage issue and asked the membership if they still wanted an 18% increase. Ann Hutchison expressed delight at the membership response and indicated that the Contract Committee was tired of the series of "nos" from the University.

Heather MacNeill, an AUCE member, felt that the best approach to publicize our wage demands would be to compile a list of how much it would cost a single parent and child to live each month. She said that the bank workers had done this two years ago and they had found that it would take a gross monthly wage of \$1140. She said that it would provide grist for the press mill. The tack we should take should be one of a justified catch-up for clerical workers. Marcel Dionne said this was the year we must do it, that all other campus unions were in the same boat. The problem was with the University - this was the year to make a stand.

Nancy Wiggs then referred to the proposals which had been dropped by the Contract Committee: retirement, technological change, modified work week, compassionate leave and reclassification procedure. Six proposals had been dropped on Thursday, April 2, 1980. The Contract Committee felt that today should have been a crossroads, that a second offer should have been forced from the University.

Feedback on the items dropped by the Contract Committee was welcomed. A member requested the rationale for dropping the retirement clause. Neil Boucher provided an explanation.

Moved by Kitty Cheema
Seconded by Carole Cameron

THAT THE MEMBERSHIP OF AUCE LOCAL #1 PUT ARTICLE
3.07 - RETIREMENT BACK ON THE TABLE.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Further questions from the floor were concerned with technological change, the modified work week, compassionate leave, pension plans, the reclassification procedure, job classifications and job specifications.

Sandy Masai then took the floor on behalf of the Strike Committee and proceeded to request some specific information. She wanted to have the members inform the Strike Committee when their offices were busy, this being done by letters or telephone calls. She said that if the strategy was one of rotating strikes and that if a member's building was involved the only loss of pay would be the assessment which would affect all members, those working and those picketing. It would be recommended that employees refuse any overtime requests.

Moved and seconded by the Strike Committee

THAT WE AGREE IN PRINCIPLE TO COST SHARING
IN THE EVENTUALITY OF A STRIKE, IE., THE
ASSESSMENT OF ALL MEMBERS.

The Strike Committee's rationale for the motion was to reassure members involved of equal compensation. It was suggested that AUCE Local #1 approach other unions about financing.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Moved by Ann Hutchison
Seconded by Carole Cameron

THAT AUCE LOCAL #1 ISSUE A PRESS RELEASE WITH
REFERENCE TO THE STUDY SESSION INCLUDING AN
UPDATED BUDGET AS PRESENTED IN THE MEETING BY
HEATHER MACNEILL AND ALSO TO REFER TO REFER TO
THE REFERENDUM STRIKE VOTE.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Moved by Ann Hutchison
Seconded by Michelle McCaughran

THAT UNTIL SUCH TIME AS OUR CONTRACT IS SETTLED
THAT THE MEMBERSHIP RECOMMEND THAT NO MEMBERS
WORK OVERTIME AND THAT A MEMO BE SENT TO DEPT.
HEADS EXPLAINING THE MOTION.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Moved by Nancy Wiggs
Seconded by Neil Boucher

THAT THE MEMBERSHIP AUTHORIZE THE EXECUTIVE TO
PURCHASE THE APPROPRIATE BUTTONS AND MATERIAL
TO ADVERTISE OUR JUST CAUSE AND THAT THE MONEY
BE RECOVERED THROUGH PERSONAL DONATIONS.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.

MINUTES

MEMBERSHIP MEETING - April 17, 1980
IRC 6
12:30 - 1:30 pm.

1. Adoption of agenda:

Moved by Ray Galbraith
Seconded by Ann Hutchison

THAT THE AGENDA BE AMENDED TO INCLUDE THE FOLLOW-
ING: #1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA / #2. ADOPTION OF
MINUTES / #3. BUSINESS ARISING / #5. OPENING AND
CLOSING NOMINATIONS / #10. CONTRACT COMMITTEE

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

2. Adoption of minutes:

Moved by Carole Cameron
Seconded by Ann Hutchison

THAT THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 6, 1980 AND THE
MARCH 20, 1980 MEMBERSHIP MEETINGS BE ADOPTED
AS CIRCULATED.

3. Business arising from the minutes:

There was no business arising from the minutes.

5. Opening Nominations:

(a) Provincial Delegates (10) and Alternates (5) - No nominations were forthcoming.
Nominations will close at the May Membership Meeting.

(b) Union Co-ordinator - Wendy Bice was nominated. Nominations will remain open until
the next Membership Meeting.

Closing Nominations:

(a) Union Organizer - Carole Cameron had been nominated. Lid Strand was also nominated.
As a result a referendum ballot would be held prior to May 15, 1980.

(b) Grievance Committee - One position was vacant and as it was not filled it would
remain open until the May Membership Meeting.

(c) Strike Committee (3) - Lin Todhunter, Kim Isaksson and Carol Fisher were elected
by acclamation.

(d) Communications Committee - No nominations were forthcoming. Nominations would remain
open until the May Membership Meeting.

10. Contract Committee report:

Nancy Wiggs, Chairperson of the Contract Committee, presented the report. Her first
reference was to the latest edition of the "UBC reports" which presented a distorted
picture of the latest mediation sessions. Nancy then recapped Monday's and Tuesday's
events in mediation. She said that the Committee had subjected itself to a rather in-
tensive decision-making process Monday afternoon, the results of which were a series
of trades to be offered to the University and a decision to drop some proposals.

The Contract Committee met face-to-face with Strudwick on Tuesday morning. Movement
from the University occurred after the Committee's initiative. By the end of the day
the University had offered 10% in the first year of a two-year contract and 9.5% in
the second year; the Union's position on wages was 15% in a one-year contract. Over the
two days the University did not move to accomodate some of our concerns in the non-mon-
etary area.

The Committee returned to the Union Office Tuesday afternoon to meet with the other
Campus unions, a meeting which reinforced our perception of the University's bargaining
tactics.

Nancy said it was the perception of the Contract Committee that there was more money
"in the pot" and that, contrary to the University's news release, the Contract Committee
had no power or authority to reject any University offer. Such a move would have to be
made by the membership. At that point another member of the Contract Committee, Ann
Hutchison, stated that the University's movement had been solely in the area of money,
that the University had made no effort to address itself to any of our concerns.

Moved by Nancy Wiggs
Seconded by Ann Hutchison

THAT AUCE LOCAL 1 MEMBERSHIP REJECT THE LATEST
UNIVERSITY OFFER.

Neil Boucher then indicated what items were left on the table. He referred to the notice
of Strike Poll which was being sent to members and to the question - "Are you in favour
of a strike?" - which appeared on the upcoming ballot. Neil re-iterated the process of
taking a strike vote and what the vote itself meant.

Neil said that the Retirement Article had been dropped and he provided the rationale for
that move. Tuition waiver was coming down to the wire with the Union proposal still on the
table. The Committee had offered a trade in regards to the Job Postings and Temporary Pro-
motion proposal. The University's objections to Leave of Absence fell by the wayside when
it was pointed out that their concern was covered elsewhere in the contract. Our Full-Time
Leave of Absence article also remained while we had revised our Time Off Between Boxing
Day and New Year's to two floating holidays to be taken during that period. The shift work
proposal had been altered to 5% and 10%, the scheduling provisions from 64 to 46 hours.
We had scaled down our demands for Medical/Dental to 75% and to 100% of Extended Health
Benefits. The Committee felt that our adoption leave was innocuous and that it would be
difficult not to agree with it.

Neil stated that we were still negotiating a one-year agreement, but if the University was
serious about a two-year pact then they would have to come up with more money in the
second year. Questions then came from the floor about threats of lay-offs from Strudwick,
the increase in the University budget and negotiating with Strudwick. After further dis-
cussion the question was called.

THE MOTION TO REJECT THE UNIVERSITY'S LATEST OFFER WAS CARRIED OVERWHELMINGLY.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 pm.

Minutes

Special Membership Meeting - April 29, 1980

IRC 2

12:30 - 2:30 pm.

Marcel Dionne was in the chair and Ray Galbraith was taking minutes. The meeting was called to order at 12:52 pm.

Marcel Dionne indicated that the agenda would be as follows:

1. Report from Carole Cameron on the deduction for the study session
2. Report from the Contract Committee
3. Recommendations

1. Carole Cameron report - Carole reported that the University had deducted the employees for the study session. Such an action was clearly illegal, an opinion confirmed by the Union lawyer. The Union was prepared to deal with the matter as a mass action. Carole requested that photocopies be sent to the Union Office so that a complaint could be filed with the Ministry of Labour.
2. Contract Committee report: Nancy Wiggs presented a chronology from Thursday afternoon. The mediator, Jock Waterston, had been contacted and a meeting had been set up for Monday, April 28th. Waterston felt that the ball was in the University's end of the court. He also believed that his usefulness had ended in the dispute.

At the meeting Strudwick presented the following: a one-year agreement with a \$100.00 signing bonus. Furthermore, all outstanding Union proposals would be dropped. After a caucus the Contract Committee told the mediator to tell the University that we were going back to the membership.

3. Recommendation - Neil Boucher explained what he perceived had happened in negotiations to date this year - the University had addressed only their concerns and issues, not ours. There had been "no bargaining this year whatsoever". Neil felt that we had to show the University in some manner that their positions were unacceptable. The \$100 signing bonus was only a "buy-off". He said that the Contract Committee firmly believed that there was more, although no assurances could be offered.

Moved and seconded by the Contract Committee THAT THE CONTRACT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT WE REJECT THE UNIVERSITY'S OFFER.

The floor was opened to discussion. One member suggested that we go for parity and stick to the concept of equal pay for work of equal value, while another recommended writing to MLA's and newspaper editors. Shirley Dick, an AUCE member urged the membership to accept the 10% and \$100 signing bonus offer. She referred to the SFU strike and stated that our impact would not be great. She did not want to see AUCE being used as a scape-goat in relation to OTEU and CUPE.

Irene McIntyre, another member, said it was silly for anyone contemplating stopping support for the Contract Committee. She said that we should see through the \$100 ruse and support the Committee. Shelley Tegart-MacInnes discussed the SFU situation pointing out that there was more management personnel and that Local #2's strategy was to hold one day rotating strikes. Nancy Wiggs indicated that the University's offer did not leave the table should we strike. She stressed the fact that membership meetings should occur throughout the strike situation and that the decision-making power rested in the hands of the membership. Heather MacNeill said that she would like a Strike Committee assessment at this juncture and she felt that perhaps the Contract Committee should go into detail about what remained on the table.

Two speakers remained on the list. Cathy Agnew said that she recognized a sense of fear in the air. She felt that a strike situation was not desired, but she was strongly opposed to buckling under to the forces that be. She advised members to vote not out of fear, but to vote honestly. Lid Strand stated that the University had taken the decision not to budge at all. If we settled for what they were offering we would pay for years hence.

Neil Boucher reported that the following items were still on the table:

- 7.02 - Full-Time Leave of Absence (can't see what the objections are)
- 21.01 - Tuition Waiver (Union proposal includes sessionals and more benefits)
- 22.01 - Job Postings & 22.07 - Promotion (we want to be replaced during any leave)
- 27.15 - Time Off Between Boxing Day and New Year's (watered down to two floating holidays)
- 28.05 - Shift Work (5% & 10% - CUPE has it and it would cost the University a pittance)
- 30.05 - Medical/Dental (the Union was down to 75% from 100%)
- 30.091 - Adoption Leave
- 36.02 - Wage Rates

Other speakers referred to the deception of the inflation rate - what it includes as opposed to what it really means in purchasing terms. One member extended thanks to the Contract Committee and hoped that the work of the Committee would not go down the drain. She said that the thread which ran through negotiations was the University's attitude of contempt toward us - we were not treated with any amount of respect. She favoured rejection of the University's latest offer. Another speaker said that we needed a strong voice and that it was important that we stick together - we had to support our words with action.

Heather MacNeill said that inflation was occurring was obvious and that it would be honourable to bite the bullet as a country, but the issue was that as women we were underpaid. She made reference to the fact that many women are skilled workers who are in the work force for years. She did not want to see the meeting split down the middle - what we should do is stick together and respect whatever decision we make.

Marcel Dionne indicated that to date the Contract Committee had asked the membership for support at all stages. He said that his assessment of the situation was different from that of the Contract Committee - he felt the University was scraping the bottom of the barrel. If the membership's perception is otherwise he said he would be the first there.

One member raised the spectre of wage controls by December of 1980. Another said that we were awash in a sea of emotions and that the University meted out different treatment to us. For her it was the end of the line, this was the year that she was saying no. Yet another member felt that if we signed this agreement the University would sit back and gloat and take advantage of us each subsequent year. Someone suggested that the strike of 1975 did not have any positive results for negotiations and this year was no exception.

The question was called.

Moved by Joanne Allan
Seconded by Susan Calthrop

THAT WE HOLD A SECRET BALLOT ON THE UNIVERSITY'S LATEST OFFER.

THE MOTION WAS DEFEATED.

THE ORIGINAL MOTION ON THE FLOOR WAS CARRIED OVERWHELMINGLY.

Strike Committee report - Sandy Masai referred to the questionnaires being handed out and asked that they be returned to the Strike Committee. She then announced a series of motions that she was to present.

Moved and seconded by the Strike Committee

THAT THE MEMBERSHIP OF LOCAL #1 AUTHORIZE THE STRIKE COMMITTEE TO ISSUE 72 HOUR STRIKE NOTICE.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Moved and seconded by the Strike Committee

THAT THE MEMBERSHIP OF AUCE LOCAL #1 HEREBY AUTHORIZES THE SECRETARY-TREASURER TO PAY STRIKE PAY ONLY TO THOSE MEMBERS WHO PERFORM PICKET OR ALTERNATE DUTY. IN THE EVENT THAT A MEMBER PERFORMS SOME OF HIS/HER DUTY, BUT NOT ALL, THE RATE OF PAY WILL BE ON A PRO RATA BASIS.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Moved and seconded by the Strike Committee

THAT THE MEMBERSHIP OF AUCE LOCAL #1 HEREBY AUTHORIZES THE SECRETARY-TREASURER TO BORROW

FUNDS UP TO AND INCLUDING \$50,000 TO PAY STRIKE
PAY, IN THE EVENT THAT THE STRIKE FUND IS DEPLETED.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Moved and seconded by the Strike Committee THAT THE MEMBERSHIP AUTHORIZE PAID UNION LEAVE FOR
2 PEOPLE TO CO-ORDINATE THE STRIKE.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Moved and seconded by the Strike Committee THAT THE MEMBERSHIP AUTHORIZES THE SPENDING OF
UP TO \$300 ON PICKET SIGNS.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Sandy stated that the Strike Committee would choose the buildings to be picketed - members
in those buildings would be contacted. She said that a bulletin was to be sent out and that
it would emphasize disciplinary charges and the serious consequences of scabbing. As a part
of the strike strategy, the Strike Committee wanted to see a ban on overtime as passed at
the last membership meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 pm .

Minutes

Special Membership Meeting - May 6, 1980

IRC 2
5:30 to 8:30 pm.

The meeting was called to order at 5:39 pm. by Marcel Dionne. At that point Marcel outlined
the agenda:

1. Contract Committee report of May 2, 1980
2. Strike report
 - (a) Motion re: volunteer picketing
 - (b) Volunteer schedule
 - (c) Answers to Medical/Dental, sick leave (not honouring), no contract, caution
 - (d) Dealing with picket lines
3. Financial report
 - (a) Motion re: \$50.00 assessment
4. Options for continuing:
 - (1) settle for 10%
 - (2) continue and escalation
 - (3) all-out
 - (4) leave to September
 - (5) recommendations

1. Contract Committee report:

Nancy Wiggs, at the outset, announced the resignation of C.A. Connaghan and his re-
placement by James Kennedy. She then launched into an explanation of Friday's negotiat-
ing session, the core of which is contained in Bulletin #11. She stressed the importance
of Vice-President White's budget memo in regards to the 1980-81 allocations. It was the
perception of the Contract Committee that if we were to get a settlement full credence
would be lent to the budget. As a result a package that could not be tampered with was
drawn up; when it was violated by the University the Union returned immediately to the
15% position on wages and brought all the other outstanding items back to the table.
Nancy asked the meeting whether that assessment was correct. She also stated that the
Committee recommendation was to continue the present strategy.

Maureen Gitta, an AUCE member, was the first to speak. She said she could not understand
why the Committee had gone down to 11% - she felt that there was no way the University
could move. She requested further clarification. Marcel Dionne responded by taking full
responsibility for the decision. He felt that the 11% was fairly representative of the
membership at that time - if that assessment was incorrect then it was up to the member-
ship to so indicate. The desire of the Committee was to get an agreement something
which didn't occur. Furthermore, Marcel stated that we were not out for 1%. To which
Maureen replied that she would be galdly our for wage parity and for the concept of
equal pay for work of equal value. Marcel replied that the Committee had to take a lead-
ership role and that it was up to the membership to exercise their democratic preroga-
tive and to say that the Committee was wrong.

Jean Lawrence carried the thread of the discussion a step further. She said she should
have spoken out earlier in negotiations, but she felt that an error had been made when
the Committee moved from 18% to 15% without membership approval. She asked what items
remained on the table adding that people this year were in a "monetary spirit", which
was unfortunate. Jean saw no reason why we couldn't bring retirement back to the table.

Stuart Rush supported the Contract Committee's approach on Friday saying that the Uni-
versity made no attempt to address any of our concerns. He strongly urged that we go
back to the 15% position with resolve. Judy Wright, after concurring with Maureen Gitta
and Jean Lawrence , said that we had to put some teeth back into our 15% wage demand.

Moved by Judy Wright
Seconded by Marcel Dionne

THAT THE AUCE LOCAL #1 MEMBERSHIP CENSURE THE CONTRACT
COMMITTEE FOR HAVING IMPLIED THAT WE WOULD MOVE TO
11% AND THAT THE MEMBERSHIP RE-AFFIRM IN THE STRONGEST
TERMS THE 15% WAGE DEMAND.

The first speaker on the motion, Carol Smallerberg, indicated that once the ball got rolling in the Computer Centre the jobs could be done without AUCE employees. She favoured returning to work immediately - the issue of striking for adoption leave was too stupid. She moved that a vote be held to immediately accept the University's offer. Marcel Dionne explained that the motion was out of order at that time.

After further discussion, most of it favouring the motion to censure the Contract Committee, the question was called.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

At that point Michelle McCaughran expressed her disappointment that retirement had been yanked from the table. She then asked what items remained on the table. Neil Boucher replied that retirement was no longer with us because the Union was having an incredibly difficult time winning issues of human concern.

Nancy Wiggs then reviewed the items still on the table: 7.02 - Full-Time Leave of Absence, 21.01 - Tuition Waiver, 22.01 - Job Postings, 22.07 - Temporary Promotion, 27.15 - Time Off Between Boxing Day and New Year's, 28.05 - Shift Work, 30.05 - Medical/Dental and 36.02 - Wage Rates.

Cathy Agnew took the floor to ask where we went from there; she said we should debate the issue on what we wanted to do from that point and that we should get on to it immediately. Marcel Dionne added that we should be made aware of our financial position. Another speaker stated that we had to stand up and fight for things, that any defeatist attitude was counter-productive. Yet another member said that her supervisor raised the spectre of a lock-out which to her mind focused the issue onto an all-out strike or acceptance on the University's terms.

2. Strike report:

Shelley McInnis presented a brief report. She indicated that the strike had been effective to some degree - two conferences had been cancelled, students were not being registered, some CUPE members were willing to help us picket during the night. Shelley said that volunteers were needed for many of the picket shifts.

Moved and seconded by the Strike Committee THAT EACH NON-STRIKING MEMBER BE EARNESTLY ENCOURAGED TO PICKET THE EQUIVALENT OF ONE HOUR PER DAY.

At that point Heather MacNeill took the floor to speak in broad terms on the various strike alternatives. It was her opinion that the University was on the defensive and that we needed more people to be visible and vocal. It was paramount that we show the University how strong we actually are.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Ann Hutchison then suggested that it was important that we talk about the specifics of the effectiveness of our strike. Nancy Wiggs presented a report on rumours that had been circulating over the past few days, rumours to do with essential services, lock-out, all-out strike, etc. She proceeded to answer or to provide some rationale for the rumours. On the matter of a possible lock-out she informed members to report immediately to the Admin Building should they be confronted with lock-out posters.

Sue Eldridge indicated that her supervisor had called her in and said that the University would get tough with sick leave and vacations. That was based on the premise that we had no contract in effect - thus, the University could withdraw benefits. Marcel Dionne concurred and said that the University was in the position to do with us as they wished - but it was important to remember that several Depts. were sympathetic to our cause. As to medical coverage - we were covered at least until the end of May. Nancy Wiggs reported that grievance procedures and arbitration and many other rights were still available to us under existing laws.

A member then asked why Purchasing and Housing had as yet not been pulled out. She also wanted to hear about our financial position before deciding upon any strategy. Carole Cameron

reminded the meeting that at some point an agreement would be signed and that we would return to our normal duties with the University - that in itself was important in toning down any University over-reactions. Heather MacNeill reminded the meeting of the aspect of retroactivity in any new agreement.

3. Financial report:

Ray Galbraith presented a financial report directly related to the selective strike policy adopted by the membership. He said that the report was predicated on the present strategy and did not account for either a rapid escalation of the existing strategy or a total strike/lock-out situation. Ray reported that the Strike Fund contained approximately \$55,000 and that we had tentative approval from the BCTCU for a \$50,000 demand loan at 18 1/2% interest. Ray stated that at some point the loan would have to be repaid and that would take an assessment over and above any approved at today's meeting.

Ray said that his report was also based on 100% picketing, which was not the case as some members had chosen to forfeit wages by not picketing or serving as office assistants. There were about 200 members affected by the strike to date, with the average daily net pay in the \$40-\$45 range. That would mean that the strike fund would be being depleted daily by the amount of \$8000-\$9000. On that basis the Strike Fund could be depleted as early as May 13th. If the \$50,000 was borrowed and no assessment decided upon we could get by until May 20th to May 21st. With a minimum of a \$40.00 assessment on May 31, 1980 we could continue full pay minus any assessment(s) for all strikers until May 28, 1980.

Moved and seconded by the Contract and Strike Committees TO HAVE A REFERENDUM TO ASSESS UP TO \$50.00 A MONTH PER AUCE MEMBER INCLUDING PICKETERS FOR THE DURATION OF THE STRIKE OR UNTIL A MEMBERSHIP MEETING CHANGES THIS POLICY.

Ray Galbraith suggested that the motion be amended to read:

TO HAVE A REFERENDUM TO ASSESS UP TO \$50.00 ON MAY 31, 1980 PER AUCE MEMBER INCLUDING PICKETERS UNTIL A MEMBERSHIP MEETING CHANGES THIS POLICY.

The suggested changes were incorporated into the motion.

Marcel Dionne recommended that the above motion be table until we decided the strategy.

Moved by Marcel Dionne THAT THE MOTION TO HOLD A REFERENDUM TO ASSESS MEMBERS
Seconded by Michelle McCaughran BE TABLED.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Neil Boucher then referred the meeting to the options at hand. He asked for direction from the membership on the issues of settling for 10%, of continuing and escalating, of an all-out strike, or of leaving everything until September. It was the solid recommendation of the Contract and Strike Committees to continue with the present strategy and to escalate when necessary. He requested some type of motion from the membership.

Moved by Ann Hutchison THAT WE CONTINUE THE SELECTIVE STRIKE ACTION WITH
Seconded by Michelle McCaughran POSSIBLE ESCALATION.

Ann Hutchison motivated stating that the present policy was bringing pressures to bear on the University. A wide-ranging discussion ensued. One speaker recommended voting against the motion and suggested accepting the University's offer. Others supported the strategy and recommended launching a massive publicity campaign through the press and through telephoning. Another speaker, Marcel Dionne, felt that the strategy had not had and would not have the desired effect; his recommendation was to close the University down. Nancy Wiggs spoke against this option of an all-out strike - she felt it was putting the cart before the horse, that there were other more valid routes to follow at present. Richard Melanson suggested that we organize a march of AUCE members, a march that would go from the Dept. of Employee Relations to Kenny's office demanding a contract.

Questions arose in regards to uncovering the location of Campus Mail and of possibly shutting it down, to the status of CUPE's and OTEU's negotiations, to the method by which we plan to get back to bargaining. To that last query Neil Boucher said there was no one definite answer - the request could come from either party.

The question was called.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Richard Melanson then announced that a march would be held the next day and would muster at noon at Sedgewick.

Marcel Dionne announced that the referendum dealing with the assessment was back on the floor. After some further discussion it was stated that the referendum question would include pro-rating for part-time members and that the Union would investigate further alternatives in regards to financing and interest rates.

The question was called.

REGARDS

THE MOTION TO HOLD A REFERENDUM POLL IN TO AN ASSESSMENT OF UNION MEMBERS ON MAY 31ST WAS CARRIED.

Heather MacNeill then asked the meeting their opinions on the proposed march. She believed it was too important to be left to an impromptu ad-hoc committee. She asked for guidance from the membership and after a straw poll it was decided that it should be delayed so that it could be better organized. It was also decided that the next membership meeting would take place the following Tuesday.

Marcel Dionne announced that volunteer picket schedules were available to fill out and Cathy Mooney, responding to a question about changing picket schedules, said she would be willing to make any possible changes to the schedules.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.

Minutes

Special Membership Meeting - May 13, 1980
5:30 pm. - 7:15 pm.
Lord Byng

Marcel Dionne, the President, was in the chair. Minutes were taken by the Secretary-Treasurer, Ray Galbraith. The meeting was called to order at 5:40 pm.

Marcel Dionne announced that the agenda would be as follows:

- a) Report from Neil Boucher of the Contract Committee
- b) Report from Nancy Wiggs of the Contract Committee
- c) Secretary-Treasurer's report on the costs of the strike to date
- d) Contract/Strike Committees' recommendation

Marcel also announced that the Union Organizer position expired on June 15, 1980. With that in mind he referred to the statements of those running for the position handed out at the door. Balloting for a new Union Organizer would be held at the next membership meeting.

Marcel stated that delegates to the Provincial Convention (to be held in June) would be elected at the next membership meeting. He suggested that any nominations be submitted to the Union Office in the interim.

Marcel indicated that there had been some problems with picketing in regards to the times and the shifts. He said that shifts were now assigned and they would be maintained, although it was possible that some members would have to be moved to other buildings if necessary.

a) Report from Neil Boucher:

Neil stated that he wanted to indicate where the Contract Committee stood at the moment. He said that we had not progressed much further. The Committee had been in touch with the Mediation Services Commission to explore ways of getting back to the table. The ball, Neil felt, was in the University's court. The mediator, Jock Waterston, had been told that we were prepared to negotiate and to be flexible. According to Neil, the mediator had no intention of setting up a meeting at which there would be no movement - a meeting was to be set up when the mediator was assured that both parties would move.

Neil then outlined the options available to us in the dispute: 1) Mediation Services Commission 2) Direct letter route to the University 3) Industrial Inquiry Commission 4) Arbitration. Neil presented the pitfalls contained in options 2, 3, and 4 - none of them were what we either needed or were looking for. Neil said that we were advised by the Mediation Services Commission to trust them and to be advised shortly.

b) Report from Nancy Wiggs:

Nancy reported on the success of the march held on Campus. She said that a more dignified, solemn affair was being planned for the opening of the Acute Care Hospital on Friday, May 16, 1980. Nancy then read one impressive letter of support, one among many, from a faculty member that was going to Kenny. Nancy believed that the letter expressed and encapsulated our position as well as anything to date.

c) Secretary-Treasurer's report:

Ray Galbraith presented a financial update on the projected costs of the strike to date, on the procedure for paying picketers, and on the upcoming referendum poll assessment. Ray stated that there were approximately 136 full-time and 24 part-time picketers to date, that the average projected wage was \$370 per picketer, and that the projected total strike pay would come to \$54,760 - an amount that would exhaust our Strike Fund. That led to a report on the necessity of holding the referendum poll assessment, an assessment that would be pro-rated and would cost a continuing employee approximately \$50.00. The amount generated from such an assessment would finance our present strike strategy until the end of May. Ray indicated that there were difficulties and that these would be in the area of the actual collection. It was possible that the University would not program and deduct such an assessment, and that would leave us with collecting the money ourselves.*

The report elicited immediate response from the membership and the Secretary-Treasurer was

called upon to answer several questions about the finances, the assessment, and the effects on members' benefits and pension plans.

Neil Boucher then re-explained the general situation for late-comers to the meeting.

d) Contract/Strike Committees' report and recommendation:

Judy Wolch, Chairperson of the Strike Committee, reported that rumours about an all-out strike were untrue, ie., false. She then referred to the effect of the strike to date and to the interruption of services and to the deleterious effect on P & S. Apparently, more and more P & S were refusing to do AUCE's work. Four conventions had been cancelled to date and others attending conventions were angry to have not been told that they would be confronted with picket lines.

At that point a question came from the floor. The questioner stated that she disagreed with the assessment of the effectiveness of the strike and said that she felt that people were taking the situation lightly.

Neil Boucher continued the report and said that reports of major disruption of work flow could be substantiated - much work was just not getting done. Neil spoke about the necessity of getting behind any majority decision, about the necessity of pulling together. A long weekend was coming and it was necessary to relieve the picketers for at least two days. If we were solid, Neil felt, we could not be defeated.

At that point further questions came from the floor about difficulties of adequately staffing picket lines on a regular and continuing basis and about what constituted a legal picket line. One member asked whether or not one could look for work elsewhere for the duration of the strike. Nancy Wiggs answered that such a move would be up to each individual - if picketing duties were neglected no strike pay would be forthcoming. In response to another question Neil Boucher provided a quick run-down of the areas presently being picketed. He added that if the University demonstrated any willingness to negotiate then the situation could change.

Members commented on the chaos in the Convention Centre, expressed concern about the apparent split in the meeting, supported the concepts of all-out and selective strikes, extended thanks to volunteers. One member related her experience as management at the Vancouver Hotel and spoke about how the supervisory staff was exploited by the upper management - a situation analogous to the P & S. Another member suggested that an effective strategy would be to pull out the medical secretaries at VGH.

At that point Marcel Dionne suggested a concrete strategy be put forward in the form of a motion.

Moved by Jerry Andersen
Seconded by Nancy Wiggs

THAT WE RE-AFFIRM OUR SUPPORT FOR THE PRESENT
SELECTIVE STRIKE STRATEGY UNTIL THE NEXT MEMBERSHIP
MEETING.

The question was called but several questions came from the floor. One member indicated that other campus unions were in negotiations and that it appeared that we were being skewered first - the member wanted more information about CUPE and OTEU. Nancy Wiggs responded that the other unions were behind, that is they were at a lower stage in negotiations. As AUCE goes, so will the rest go. The Contract Committee planned to keep in close contact with the other unions. A member spoke about the necessity of returning; she felt that such an action would not be fatal - the strike should be ended immediately and negotiations commence. Another member stated that AUCE's problem was that we had always given in and that at some point we would have to say no.

The question was called. After a member requested that we encourage professors to write to Kenny the motion was CARRIED.

The meeting adjourned at 7:15 pm.

* Ray then gave notice of a referendum poll ballot for the assessment. The poll was to be held in the Union Office on Tuesday, May 20th and Wednesday, May 21st. He said that the results would be announced at the next membership meeting.

MINUTES

SPECIAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING - May 21, 1980

IRC 2

5:00 pm. - 7:36 pm.

Nancy Wiggs, Contract Committee Chairperson, was in the chair and called the meeting to order at 5:15 pm.

Announcements:

Nancy Wiggs indicated that the meeting could mark their ballots for electing the Union Organizer.

Nancy then announced the results of the Provincial Affiliation referendum - there were 402 votes for and 364 votes against. Questions came from the floor in regards to the legality of the vote. Nancy stated that she and Neil Boucher had challenged the vote on the basis that several Local #1 members did not receive their ballots. The Provincial in turn had turned down the challenge. Nancy asked that members interested in pursuing the issue should contact her.

Nominations were then opened for 10 delegates for the Provincial Convention scheduled for June 21 and 22, 1980. Susan Zagar, Shelley MacInnes, Joan Treleaven and Katarina Halm were elected by acclamation.

Nancy then announced the results of the Assessment Referendum: Yes - 328 / No - 120 / Spoiled - 1.

At that point Nancy Wiggs explained the venue for the meeting. She said that four reports were to be presented and that this exercise would lead up to the posing of the question whether to reduce our wage demand to 10% or continuing the strike. If the meeting decided to continue there would be a preferential ballot on the choices for continuing and in what form (for the full report come into the Union Office and peruse the 15 page report and sample ballot which are affixed to these minutes).

Nancy Wiggs proceeded to read the Contract Committee report. Cathy Mooney followed with a report on the effectiveness of the strike. Shurli Channe then spoke about the options open to the membership. To top it off Neil Boucher presented the recommendation of the Contract/Strike/Executive Committees. Nancy indicated that the issue of lowering our wage demand to 10% or not was now in order, and to that effect she said that a motion was now on the floor.

She welcomed participation at the microphone and answered a question about the strike's cost to date. She said that it would cost a minimum of \$50.00 to the end of May and \$40-\$50 a week after that. Marcel Dionne then spoke from the floor. He felt that this meeting was pivotal and that the decision to continue and escalate needed serious consideration. He said that it was his intent to present a motion. His motion was to include 10% in the first year, 9.5% in the second year, the negotiating of all outstanding items, and a contract re-opener for the second year to negotiate benefit-related items.

Nancy Wiggs stated that as another motion was on the floor that Marcel should move to table it.

Moved by Marcel Dionne
Seconded by Carole Cameron

THAT THE MOTION ON THE FLOOR IN REGARDS
TO LOWERING OUR WAGE DEMAND TO 10% BE
TABLED.

The motion was DEFEATED.

Discussion then ensued from the floor. One member suggested reducing our wage demand to 10% as our strike was a no-win situation - she felt we could not exert much sustained pressure and that the University would wait us out. She felt that by backing down we would lose only a battle not the war. She recommended that the \$100 bonuses be deposited in the Strike Fund and that we take the issue of equal pay for work of equal value to the courts.

Another member, Pat Gibson, spoke in support of not taking 10% and said it was necessary that we continue to strive for fair wages. He suggested that only by going out on mass could we demonstrate to Kenny and the public that we were serious. Judy Wright said that there was no need to go back and as our strike strategy needed time to develop and be effective we

should give it a chance. She felt that after May 31st \$40 a week was not too much too bear considering the issues we were fighting for.

Neil Boucher spoke on the possibility of getting loans for members in need should the strike develop to the point. 10% was not good enough for us - it may be a good settlement for CUPE, but the gap between the two Unions would increase. Neil suggested threatening the University at Convocation if necessary. He felt that we hadn't found out whether or not we could win - if we lost three weeks from now, then we would know that we have lost.

The next member to the microphone asked how much the strike had cost and what the projections were for a continued selective strike strategy. Ray Galbraith provided a detailed explanation.

Lid Strand said we should look at developing strength in the community. He felt that next year AUCE would have no strength to bargain - we have to face up to the reality that we will win. He said that if we remained out long enough we could jeopardize the whole registration period. Strikes were won not by strike funds but by the commitments of each member. It was time for us to stand up and declare our importance.

The next speaker commented on the apparent split of the membership and on the blase attitude of the majority of the membership who chose not to attend. She stated that they deserved what they got.

Lissett Nelson said that if we did not fight this strike to the end then we would suffer a complete defeat. She stated that she was not in agreement with the present strike strategy - she favoured holding out until the late summer. The strategy should include keeping one building out all summer and that the time should be used to prepare ourselves for an all-out strike. Furthermore, we should keep inclose touch with CUPE and plan some kind of joint action with their membership.

Judy Wright spoke again and re-iterated that at present she was out for 15%. She said that she was not surprised at the University's action to date and she reminded the meeting that we were out for more than just the 15%, there were several other items still on the table.

Carole Cameron said that her opinion was in opposition to the sentiment of the meeting. She felt that the University didn't care and that we could stay out until hell froze over. She commented on the fact that only 350 members were present for a pivotal meeting. What we were engaged in was a power struggle between our Union and how right we are and a University that doesn't care. She suggested that it was in our best interests to take the route of a tactical retreat.

Another member raised the spectre of another bout with wage controls and asked how the Union intended to collect any future assessments. She felt that the time might be right to consider a two-year agreement. She said it was not entirely a question of how much we were worth but how much money was in the kitty. She then requested that the motion on the floor be re-read.

Nancy Wiggs read the motion: THAT AUCE LOCAL #1 LOWER ITS WAGE DEMAND TO 10%.

Judy Wright re-stated her position that we haven't lost yet and that we may win. If the University was to reject Marcel Dionne's option then we would lose. If we lowered our wage demand at this meeting we have lost - this was the year for AUCE. She felt hesitant as she believed more members should be present.

The next speaker indicated that at least 800 members were not present - she recommended that we go back to work. The University was not hurting enough and money was being saved while we were out. Those members on strike were carrying the load for everybody.

Ann Hutchison entered the discussion by adding that for most members the strike was not that real. She asked why was it that 10% was not good enough three weeks ago. She stated that we had negotiated exactly nothing to date and that there was no sense of where we stood as a membership. Any decision that we made or should make should be done together. She added

that the Administration too had its weaknesses and its breaking point, that the strain and pressure on the P&S was beginning to tell. She also sympathized with the picketers who had no real sense of their effect. Ann suggested that we maintain the present selective strike action strategy.

The question was called and the motion was DEFEATED.

Nancy Wiggs then stated that the Trustees and volunteers would pass out a four part preferential ballot and that discussion would be entertained on the four options. The ballot read as follows: INDICATE YOUR PREFERENCE BY PLACING THE NUMBERS 1 THROUGH 4 IN THE BOXES PROVIDED: _____ CONTINUE AS IS _____ ALL-OUT STRIKE IMMEDIATELY _____ REDUCED SELECTIVE STRIKE NOW, BUILDING TO ALL-OUT LATER _____ STOP STRIKE ACTION NOW; ALL-OUT LATER.

Lid Strand supported the continuing as is option as the only viable route. He said this should be supplemented by increased publicity and benefits. Another member spoke in favour of an all-out strike for maximizing our effect. Yet another felt that the selective strike strategy was the most effective. A further member favoured the all-out strike so as not to split the membership. She felt that the situation could continue indefinitely as is.

Pat Gibson spoke against the concept of an all-out strike as it was his perception that the Union would fall apart quickly. He said that the Union should react to various circumstances as they arose. The all-out strike had the disadvantage of not keeping any work flowing.

The question was called and carried. Nancy Wiggs announced that the voting should now be in the process of being completed. She requested that a member put a motion on the floor to authorize continuing assessments.

Moved by Pat Gibson
Seconded by Lid Strand

THAT AUCE LOCAL #1 HOLD A REFERENDUM BALLOT FOR CONTINUING ASSESSMENTS TO FINANCE OUR SELECTIVE STRIKE STRATEGY FROM MAY 31ST ON.

Lissett Nelson amended the motion to include a percentage deduction rather than an across-the-board approach. It was seconded by Ann Hutchison. The amendment read: "...ASSESSMENTS BASED ON A PERCENTAGE FORMULA...". Discussion ensued on the amendment. At one point Nancy Wiggs stated that nay assessment would be automatically pro-rated according to the number of hours worked.

Part way through the debate Nancy Wiggs announced the results of the preferential vote. Option #1 garnered 203 votes and as this was a majority of the votes cast it CARRIED. Option #2 received 46 votes, Option #3 39 votes, and Option #4 15 votes.

After further discussion on the amendment the question was called and the amendment was defeated.

THE MAIN MOTION AS MOVED BY PAT GIBSON AND SECONDED BY LID STRAND WAS THEN CARRIED.

Pat Gibson recommended that some action by the Union be considered during Convocation. Nancy Wiggs replied that the suggestion would be taken under advisement by the Strike Committee. She indicated that a further membership meeting might be scheduled for the following Thursday.

The meeting adjourned at 7:36 pm.

MINUTES

SPECIAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING - May 29, 1980

IRC 2

12:30 pm. - 4:26 pm.

Marcel Dionne was in the chair and he announced that the meeting, with the approval of the Employee Relations Dept., would be extended until we completed our business.

He then re-opened nominations for delegates to the Provincial Convention. Helen Glavina, Lissett Nelson, and John Tutlis were elected by acclamation.

Carole Cameron provided a brief explanation of the flyers handed out at the door.

Contract Committee report:

Nancy Wiggs presented the report. She said that CUPE had been offered 10% over one year and 90% parity with the trades. The Contract Committee had met with the University on Friday, May 23rd - the result of meetings with the University were reflected on the beige sheets titled "Proposal to Settle the Dispute Existing Between U.B.C. and A.U.C.E. Local 1 Over the Terms of an Agreement to Replace the 1979 - 1980 Collective Agreement". Both parties had met again Tuesday, at which time the University informed the Contract Committee that the bonuses would be paid to individual members and not the Union. She said that the University's .5% salary anomaly increase proposal had met with stiff resistance from the Contract Committee. A further meeting on Wednesday resulted in the two options contained on Page 2 and Page 3.

Nancy felt that there had been some gains negotiated along with the apparent losses. We had made substantial progress in tuition waiver and concurrency and with Union leave. The University was still unwilling to address any monetary items. Of the two options for the second year, Nancy stressed that the Page 2 option was a virtual minefield and that neither were acceptable. She said it appeared that the University wanted to destroy our Pay Grade system. Either proposal was potentially divisive - it would be difficult to get anything removed from future contracts should we agree to it now. She said there was no apparent logic for the University's doling out of anomaly increases. She said that if members voted to reject what was being presented to them then they would have to vote for continuing assessments.

Ray Galbraith reported on the assessments and the costs of the strike to date. Neil Boucher followed and indicated that the Contract Committee would recommend rejection of the proposal now before the membership. He stated that the Committee did not take this recommendation lightly and that it was arrived at after careful consideration. The Committee felt that the mandate from the membership was not for a two-year agreement, nor was it for 10% and a few other issues. The University had felt enough pressure to come around on the "human issues". Article 7.02 was a tremendous victory.

Neil re-emphasized some of the problems with the options presented on Page 2 and Page 3. He said that with the first option you could run along the page and pick out many more deserving job classifications. The problems were immense - members would be pitted against members. Everything we had done to date in regards to the job classification system would be destroyed. A rejection would mean that the members reject it and then vote yes for the assessments. If the membership accepts what was on the table, then the strike would end.

Neil said the structure of the meeting was complicated and he proceeded to explain how it would operate (see attached form outlining the various options and methods of proceeding). He said that the process might encompass several motions. It was up to the meeting to decide whether a two-year agreement was acceptable. If it was then one of the two options had to be chosen. If not then the members would be asked to vote on the concept of a one-year agreement. If none of the above was acceptable then a course of action would have to be plotted. The item now on the floor to discuss was: WOULD YOU ACCEPT A TWO-YEAR CONTRACT?

Ray Galbraith spoke at the outset on the difficulty of debating such a question before there had been any actual discussion about the effect of the strike. Ann Hutchison said that the mandate from the beginning had been for a one-year agreement and that the .5% proposal by

the University was repugnant. Ann felt that the one-year approach was a way by which we could salvage this year's negotiations. As far as she was concerned the possibility of another AIB was not in the cards. To be stuck with 9% in the second year with an as yet undetermined inflation rate was not a good move.

Moved by Sandy Masai
Seconded by Lissett Nelson

THAT THE MOTION IN REGARDS TO THE ACCEPTABILITY TO A TWO-YEAR AGREEMENT BE TABLED TO PERMIT THE MEETING TO DISCUSS THE RAMIFICATIONS OF THE STRIKE.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Nancy Wiggs, in light of the above motion, opened up the meeting to a general discussion on the ramifications of the strike.

One member asked where many of the members present at this meeting had been in the last six weeks. Another member asked about picketers' benefits. A further speaker returned to the theme of membership indifference being surmounted only when pocket books were to be threatened. Yet another member lamented the loss of unanimity the Union experienced when 72 hour strike notice was served.

The discussion continued and touched on many points and issues until a motion was presented for the meeting's consideration.

Moved by Larry Thiessen
Seconded by Pat LaVac

THAT THE MEMBERSHIP ACCEPT ONE OF THE PROPOSED TWO-YEAR SETTLEMENTS.

Larry Thiessen felt that we should use the time to solidify ourselves and to use the period as an evaluation to prepare ourselves for the next set of negotiations. At that point Neil Boucher made a procedural suggestion to the effect that it would be more appropriate to put the two-year agreement issue back on the floor. Larry Thiessen and Pat LaVac agreed.

The following motion was now back on the floor: WOULD YOU ACCEPT A TWO-YEAR CONTRACT?

Lissett Nelson spoke to the motion and said that such an agreement would prepare the Union for a later assault on the University and allow us the time to affiliate with the labour movement. She then asked whether or not there would be any difficulties in gaining a one-year agreement. Neil Boucher answered that he didn't think it a big problem, but that he didn't know.

Lid Strand opined that what was crucial was what we settled for. He felt that the lesson from the strike was that we should build up the strike fund and set up and approve assessments as a prelude to strike action. A one-year agreement was eminently preferable to a two-year contract. The following speaker asked why this wasn't the year for AUCE and re-iterated that it should be.

Neil Boucher stated that it would be foolish to throw the strike away and said that this meeting could do it. The least obnoxious alternative was a one-year contract. At that time the question was called and carried. THE MOTION WAS DEFEATED.

Moved and seconded by the Contract Committee
WOULD YOU SETTLE FOR PAGE 1 IF WE CAN NEGOTIATE IT?

Lid Strand opposed the motion. He said that it didn't deal with the money, nor did it deal with shift work, medical/dental, etc. The reality with which we were confronted was a long and bitter strike. Judy Wright spoke and indicated that she hadn't heard anyone say that the present offer was a good one. We had settled for 7% last year, but this year we were angry. We should establish our resolve now. Judy was not convinced that we would be left out on a limb. To her the issue was to find out whether or not we were a union.

One member suggested that we were placing the cart before the horse and what we should be deciding was whether or not we were willing to finance the strike.

Moved by Diane Green
Seconded by Judy Wolch

THAT WE TABLE THE MOTION ON THE FLOOR UNTIL A STRAW POLL VOTE WAS TAKEN ON THE ASSESSMENT ISSUE.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

The straw poll vote was conducted by a show of hands by Marcel Dionne. The question posed was whether or not members would be willing to pay for continuing assessments. Marcel stated that for him the vote was not very informative. For the member concerned the result was very informative and indicated to her that the membership was not prepared to finance the strike past May 31st.

The motion in regards to accepting the option on Page 2 was back on the floor. A member asked whether or not Page 1 and the one-year agreement was acceptable to the University. Nancy Wiggs replied that the University was not offering that as an alternative and that the Contract Committee would have to take it back to the University as an option. She said that the Contract Committee was amenable to withdrawing the motion on the floor and presenting the following motion: WOULD YOU TAKE PAGE 1 (IE., A ONE-YEAR AGREEMENT) IF THE CONTRACT COMMITTEE CAN NEGOTIATE IT?

The question was called and Marcel Dionne explained and clarified the implications of the above motion. The motion would include Page 1, the bonus and the letters of understanding.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Nancy Wiggs announced that the meeting was not quite over, that there still had to be a discussion of strike strategy.

Moved by Judy Wolch
Seconded by Linda Jamieson

THAT ALL PICKETERS RETURN TO WORK THE FOLLOWING MORNING.

Lissett Nelson spoke against the motion and said that it was necessary that the present strategy be continued. Another speaker said that if we went back now without an agreement that the University could offer us less. Another member expressed her feelings by saying that should we choose to go back now we would be a "bunch of gutless people".

Nancy Wiggs announced that the Contract Committee had just contacted Strudwick in regards to the one-year agreement. Apparently, the University would not move off their two-year agreement position. But the University was now willing to drop the anomalies rectification and propose 9.5% in the second year. At this point Lissett Nelson spoke in favour of concluding a two-year agreement.

Marcel Dionne suggested that a motion was in order to table the Strike Committee's motion.

Moved by Regina Tsanas
Seconded by Larry Thiessen

THAT THE STRIKE COMMITTEE'S MOTION BE TABLED.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Moved by Nancy Wiggs
Seconded by Larry Thiessen

THAT THE MEMBERSHIP RECONSIDER THE MOTION FOR A
ONE-YEAR CONTRACT.

The motion was non-debatable and it was CARRIED by the necessary two-thirds majority.

Moved by Nancy Wiggs
Seconded by Carole Cameron

THAT THE MEMBERSHIP ACCEPT THE CONCEPT OF A ONE-YEAR AGREEMENT.

The question was called and carried. A motion to have a secret ballot was defeated. A standing vote was conducted and the results were as follows: YES - 288 / NO - 370 / Abstentions - 7. THE MOTION WAS DEFEATED.

Moved by Nancy Wiggs
Seconded by Carole Cameron

THAT WE SEND THE UNIVERSITY'S OFFER TO REFERENDUM MAIL
BALLOT.

Further clarification of the outstanding issues was presented by Neil Boucher. The question was called and carried. THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

The tabled motion in regards to the picket lines was re-introduced in the following form:
THAT THE PICKETERS RETURN TO WORK AT 8:00 AM. ON FRIDAY, MAY 30TH

After some discussion the motion was CARRIED.

Before the meeting adjourned Simeon Garriott raised an issue concerning Marcel Dionne and an incident at Copy & Duplicating. He was assured that the incident would be dealt with by

the Executive and that a report would be presented to the membership in the future.

The meeting adjourned at 4:26 pm.

MINUTES

MEMBERSHIP MEETING - June 19, 1980

IRC 6

12:30 - 1:30 pm.

Judy Blair, the Vice-President, was in the chair and Ray Galbraith, the Secretary-Treasurer, was taking minutes. Judy called the meeting to order at 12:40 pm.

1. Adoption of agenda:

Moved by Carole Cameron
Seconded by Ann Hutchison

THAT THE AGENDA BE ADOPTED AS CIRCULATED.

Lid Strand amended the motion to include the Provincial report under 6(a). The amendment was incorporated into the motion and the amended motion read:

THAT THE AGENDA BE AMENDED TO INCLUDE
THE PROVINCIAL REPORT UNDER 6(a) AND
THAT IT BE ADOPTED.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

2. Adoption of minutes:

Ray Galbraith explained that no minutes would be available at this meeting. Minutes from several meetings dating back to early April had never been presented due to the number of Special Membership Meetings and the strike in May. A complete set of minutes was being prepared and would be presented to the membership at the next two-hour meeting on July 24th.

Moved by Lid Strand
Seconded by Nancy Wiggs

THAT THE ADOPTION OF THE PAST MINUTES AS
YET UNRATIFIED BE DEFERRED TO THE JULY 24/80
MEMBERSHIP MEETING FOR ADOPTION.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

3. Closing nominations:

Wendy Bice was elected by acclamation to the position of Union Co-Ordinator for a year.

Opening nominations:

- Trustees (2): The following members were nominated: Simeon Garriott, Keith Moran, Shurli Channe and Betty Chan. Nominations were to remain open until the July 24/80 membership meeting.
- Bi-Weekly Pay Period Committee (2): Neil Boucher, Nancy Wiggs and Linda Tretiak were nominated. Nominations were to remain open until the July membership meeting.
- Benefits Committee (3): Ann Hutchison, Neil Boucher, Judy Wolch, Cobie Wennes and Susan Zagar were nominated. Nominations were to remain open until the July membership meeting.
- Provincial Representative (1): Susan Zagar was elected by acclamation.
- Provincial Convention Delegates (5): Kitty Cheema and Yvonne Scotchman were elected by acclamation.
- Grievance Committee (1): Susan Zagar was elected by acclamation.

4. Secretary-Treasurer's report:

Ray Galbraith reported that due to the strike financial statements from March, April, and May could not be presented. He said that financial statements for March and April 1980 were ready for this meeting and that the statements for May and June would be circulated at the July 24th membership meeting. The journal ledger entries for May were staggering as that was the month during which the Union paid the 170 odd picketers.

Moved by Ray Galbraith
Seconded by Carole Cameron

THAT THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT FOR THE
MONTH ENDED MARCH 31, 1980 BE ADOPTED
AS CIRCULATED.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Moved by Ray Galbraith
Seconded by Carole Cameron

THAT THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT FOR THE MONTH
ENDED APRIL 30, 1980 BE ADOPTED AS CIRCULATED.

A member asked why our library expenses seemed excessive. Ray Galbraith replied that the expense included several labour-related subscription expenses.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Moved by Ray Galbraith
Seconded by Nancy Wiggs

THAT THE MEMBERSHIP OF AUCE LOCAL #1 AUTHORIZE
A REFERENDUM MAIL BALLOT FOR A FURTHER ASSESSMENT
, THE AMOUNT YET TO BE DETERMINED, FOR THE PURPOSE
OF RETIRING ALL REMAINING STRIKE-RELATED
EXPENSES, AND THAT A DETAILED EXPLANATION OF THOSE
EXPENSES ACCOMPANY THE BALLOT.

Ray Galbraith provided a detailed motivation for the motion, explaining that all of the strike expenses had not been accounted for. The University was preparing a bill for the employers' portion of the benefits which the Union would be responsible for. Ray estimated that the final assessment would probably fall into the \$30-\$40 range. He indicated that the \$50 assessment would come off the June 30th paycheques and that the retroactivity and the \$100 bonus had been programmed by the University and would be included at the same time. In response to a member's question about the status of vacation time for picketers, Ray said that the matter was being discussed with the University and that some accommodation would be reached. Another member asked about the implications of a failed assessment. Ray responded that as we had used our dues as collateral that the Credit Union would have first shot at them when the loan came due. At some point in the future, therefore, the Union Office would have to close down until the debt had been retired.

Ray also stated that the ballot would contain the alternative of having any assessment spread over a period of a few months. Another member asked why the membership was being asked to pay for more than the \$50 already assessed when they had been promised earlier in the strike that that amount was a set figure. Ray replied the increased expenses of the strike had been reported earlier in May, and that the time to express support or displeasure with the situation was on the upcoming referendum mail ballot.

Nancy Wiggs asked about the status of those members who had signed a petition revoking the right to have them assessed. Ray provided a brief outline of the situation and said that it was now in the hands of the Executive, who, in turn, would report to the membership. He said that 17 AUCE members had revoked the right to have the Union and the University assess and deduct any monies from their paycheques. The LRB and our lawyer had been consulted and both sources indicated that those in question did have the right to act as they did, but they were now susceptible to the internal discipline of the Union. No challenge had been lodged with the Union; instead those members involved chose to take their case to the LRB and the University and others during our strike. Ray said it was explained to him that the logic of the situation was as follows: the affair had to be handled by the Union and if the members were found to be in contravention of the Union by-laws they could be ultimately stripped of their membership; as membership in the Union is a term or condition of employment with the University, they, in turn, could be severed. Ray said that there were many intervening stages and possibilities and re-iterated that it was in the hands of the Executive at the moment.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

5. Contract Committee report:

Nancy Wiggs reported the results of the contract ratification referendum - 705 "YES" to 212 "NO". She said that the contract was duly signed at 10:00 am. on Tuesday, June 17th and that it would be put together by Copy & Duplicating. She re-iterated that the retroactivity and the bonus would appear on the June 30th paycheques. She stressed that the Job Evaluation, Benefits, and Bi-Weekly Pay period Committees were vitally important. In response to a member's question in regards to when these committees would begin meeting with the University, Nancy replied that first they had to be filled by the July 24th meeting.

At that point Neil Boucher brought the latest edition of ubc reports to the attention of the meeting and the factual inaccuracies that it contained in regards to precentage acceptance of the contract. He reminded the members that this publication was merely a mouthpiece for the University and little else. He urged members to write to ubc reports and express dissatisfaction with their quality of reporting.

6. Grievance Committee report:

Carole Cameron indicated that there was nothing pressing at the moment.

6.(a) Provincial report:

Lid Strand referred to the strike of data processing workers at Kenworth and the CAIMAW support for the contract demand of equal pay for work of equal value. He said that the Provincial was trying to organize a rally for June 21st at 6:00 pm. in support of the Kenworth workers.

Nancy Wiggs then announced the results of the Provincial Affiliation Referendum. Overall, 1382 ballots had been cast, 721 in the affirmative, 480 in the negative, 97 abstaining and 84 spoiled ballots. At our Local level the vote was as follows: 822 total ballots cast, with 433 in the affirmative, 258 in the negative, 70 abstentions, and 61 spoiled ballots.

Moved by Lid Strand
Seconded by Ann Hutchison

THAT WE OFFICIALLY INVITE A MEMBER OF KENWORTH-CAIMAW
STRIKE TO SPEAK AT THE NEXT TWO-HOUR MEMBERSHIP MEETING.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Lid stated that the Provincial Convention was happening this weekend and that observers were welcome.

The meeting adjourned at 1:26 pm.

The Association of University and College

Employees Local No. 1

Vancouver, B.C.

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

as at December 31, 1979

ADVANCED
ACCOUNTING
SERVICES

200 - 1200 WEST 6TH AVENUE
VANCOUVER, B.C. V6H 1A5
PHONE: 733 - 1104

The Association of University and College
Employees Local No. 1

CONTENTS

Exhibit "A" - Auditors' Report

Exhibit "B" - Balance Sheet as at December 31, 1979.

Exhibit "C" - Statement of Revenue, Expenditure and
Unexpended Revenue for the year ended
December 31, 1979.

ADVANCED
ACCOUNTING
SERVICES

200 - 1200 WEST 6TH AVENUE
VANCOUVER, B.C. V6H 1A5
PHONE: 733 - 1104

Exhibit "A"

AUDITORS' REPORT

To the Members of
The Association of University and College
Employees Local No. 1

We have examined the balance sheet of The Association of University and College Employees Local No. 1 as at December 31, 1979 and the Statement of Revenue, Expenditure and Unexpended Revenue for the year then ended. Our examination included a general review of the accounting procedures and such tests of accounting records and other supporting evidence as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

Receipts as recorded have been verified, however, due to the nature of the operations and receipts of the Association, revenue and receipts are not susceptible to a complete audit and have not been otherwise verified by us. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the revenue and receipts of the Association.

Subject to the foregoing qualification we report that in our opinion these financial statements present fairly the financial position of the Association as at December 31, 1979 and the results of its operations for the year ended on that date, in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles applied on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year.

Vancouver, B.C.
April 10, 1980


S. M. Vandervoort
Auditor

Exhibit "B"

The Association of University and College

Employees Local No. 1

Balance Sheet

as at December 31, 1979

(AUDITED)

Assets

1979

1978

Cash in bank	\$57,058.30	\$57,390.37
Term Deposit	10,000.00	10,000.00
Dues receivable	11,425.75	8,293.00
Loan receivable	-	500.00
	<u>\$78,484.05</u>	<u>\$76,183.37</u>

Liabilities and Unexpended Revenue

Liabilities:

Per Capita Tax Payable	\$ 5,100.00	\$ 2,427.50
Loan payable - Provincial A.U.C.E.	859.50	-
	<u>5,959.50</u>	<u>2,427.50</u>

Unexpended Revenue - per Exhibit "C"	<u>72,524.55</u>	<u>73,755.87</u>
	<u>\$78,484.05</u>	<u>\$76,183.37</u>

The Association of University and College

Employees Local No. 1

Statement of Revenue, Expenditure

and Unexpended Revenue

for the year ended December 31, 1979

Exhibit "C"

(AUDITED)

1979

1978

Revenue:

Dues and initiation fees	\$104,830.75	\$101,027.00
Special Assessments	6,845.00	25,962.45
Interest	5,154.75	5,049.24
Donations	-	141.04
Proceeds from sale of furniture	-	50.00
	<u>116,830.50</u>	<u>132,229.73</u>

Expenditures

Audit	680.00	750.00
Arbitration and legal fees	13,207.06	10,731.06
Donations	7,175.00	2,500.00
Equipment lease	1,345.68	902.88
Furniture and fixtures	1,729.12	393.00
Insurance	170.00	189.00
Library	657.40	663.58
Meetings and conferences	431.50	867.22
Office, postage and mailing	3,195.43	2,596.14
Per capita Tax	31,023.25	30,310.50
Provincial Strike Fund Assessment	6,845.00	-
Printing and stationery	5,621.92	8,549.45
Rent, taxes and utilities	4,522.96	4,960.60
Strike pay	1,077.02	26,089.45
Salaries, benefits and reimbursed wages	39,348.18	32,200.84
Telephone	1,032.30	1,387.80
	<u>118,061.82</u>	<u>123,091.52</u>

Excess (Deficit) of revenue over expenditure	(1,231.32)	9,138.21
Unexpended revenue, beginning of the year	<u>73,755.87</u>	<u>64,617.66</u>
Unexpended revenue, end of the year to - to Exhibit "B"	<u>\$ 72,524.55</u>	<u>\$ 73,755.87</u>

