



**association of university and college employees**

Feb. 18, 1985

Libby Nason  
Senior Labour Relations Asst.  
Personnel Services  
Campus Mail

Dear Ms. Nason,

This is to commit to writing the proposal for settlement of the 1984-85 contract that was made by our Contract Committee to your Negotiating Committee on Feb. 11, 1985.

The fulcrum of our proposal is that AUCE Local 1 is prepared to accept a zero percentage wage settlement for the period April 1, 1984 to March 31, 1985. This is a major concession on our part, and it is the only one we are prepared to make. This aspect of our proposal answers the question you posed to us when you stated, in negotiations on Feb. 11, that there was nothing in this package for the University. The uncontested acceptance of a zero wage settlement by our membership would be a significant gain for the University. There is no reason that, in return, you should not accept the minimal, but for us important concessions outlined in this letter.

The University has already admitted that our members deserve a wage increase. President Pedersen told us, on January 15, that he was aware that the wages of AUCE members are below the market value of the work they perform. This is especially true for certain classifications, as your proposal on hiring above the base rate and differential wage increases indicates.

On February 5, 1985, Dr. Pedersen stated publically (CBC AM, Early Edition) that the University would like to give a wage increase to its employees but is unable to do so. Such a statement is a further indication that staff deserve more, and that the services they render are valued. It is inconsistent, in that light, for the University to argue at the bargaining table that the proposal before you is not worthy of recommendation. It must also be said that there is no logic to the argument that it is fair for us to accept a zero wage settlement because 'it is AUCE's turn'. In spite of the fact that AUCE had a wage increase in 1983-84 while other groups did not, a broader, objective examination of



Libby Nason, Feb. 18, 1985, p. 2

compensation packages negotiated with other groups during previous years clearly indicates that wage increases negotiated with AUCE are running behind those of other groups, as well as behind the cost of living. Once again, the position we are taking with respect to wages is clearly a major concession on the part of the Union.

There are certain of the University's 'housekeeping' proposals that we are willing to accept. These are:

- Article 27 - Vacations (specification of hours only)
- Article 30.08 d) only (Compassionate leave)
- Article 30.09 e) only (Compassionate leave)
- the movement of 30.08 and 30.09 to follow 3.02 and 3.04 respectively
- deletion of the letter re. staff rooms
- modification of the letter re. involuntary transfer, to indicate that an agreement has been reached regarding these positions

The remainder of the University's proposals we consider to be concessions, and our membership has instructed us, continuously from the onset of negotiations, that we are to accept none of the University's proposals that alter the contract to their detriment: no concessions. It is particularly impossible for us to take any other position in the face of a zero wage offer.

What we propose is a one-year, status quo contract, with the exception of the above mentioned 'housekeeping' articles, and the following terms:

1. That the parties negotiate and agree to an article on VDT safety, our proposal being 24.09 as already presented.
2. That the University agree to Article 19.06 (re. electronic monitoring) as proposed by the Union.
3. That the University agree to make those changes to our Collective Agreement that are necessary to maintain the status quo as a result of the amendments to the Employment Standards Act. The Union's proposals are as follows:

- Article 27.07
- Article 28.02
- Article 30.07 (as revised, June 20, 1984)
- Article 34.07 (as revised, June 20, 1984)



Libby Nason, Feb. 18, 1985, p. 3

4. That the University agree to include adoption leave in Article 30.07. The Unemployment Insurance Act has been amended to include benefits for parents on adoption leave. We believe that once such a thing has been recognized by Federal legislation as a right, it is only fair that it be incorporated into our contract.
5. That the University agree to incorporate the letter of agreement re. sexual harassment into the body of the contract. See the Union's proposal for Article 9.04.
6. That both parties agree to jointly seek an exemption from Bill 3 if and when the regulations are put in place.
7. That our agreement contain the following clause:

If a general or structural increase is granted to any other groups subsequent to the signing of this agreement, members of the bargaining unit will receive an equivalent salary adjustment.
8. It must be agreed by both parties that AUCE is not waiving its right to the incremental payments due in July of 1984. And further, that the increments payable July 1, 1985, remain in the contract under the bridging clause which will take effect April 1, 1985.

In summary, we would like to say that this proposal amounts to a reasonable and fair exchange, and we urge you to reconsider your stated position that you will not recommend it to your principals.

Yours truly,

Ted Byrne  
Union Coordinator  
for the Contract Committee