

AUCE Local One (UBC) NEWSLETTER

Association of University & College Employees

ACROSS CAMPUS

VOLUME 2 NUMBER 5

MAY 1975

2162 Western Parkway - 224-5613

sfu STRIKE!

At SFU, AUCE local #2 is in a very critical stage in its attempt to wrest a good first contract from the University. On Monday, April 14, local #2 went out on strike- the first AUCE local to have been forced to take such action! They went back to work the following day, April 15, not because their employer made a serious proposal on the outstanding issues, but because AUCE local#2's Contract Committee felt that they had impressed upon SFU their determination to secure a fair settlement. Negotiations are continuing.

A brief history is necessary to set the stage for the present situation. Last fall, after a long hard fight, AUCE local#2 won the right to represent SFU's clerical workers and technicians. Contract negotiations opened shortly after certification was achieved, and (as was the case at UBC), the University administration quickly showed it was not as reasonable or liberal as its PR people would have us believe. Some examples:

1.) In response to the AUCE demand that SFU employees should have wage parity with those in similar jobs at UBC, the negotiators for the University insisted upon parity in non-wage areas also- even if this meant reduced benefits for SFU workers. Thus the University offered SFU workers UBC's sick leave plan- which is not as good as SFU's present plan!

2.) For a long time the SFU administration insisted that two union negotiators from the same office could not attend negotiations at the same time, even though doing so would not affect the office concerned.

3.) The University insisted that all non-monetary issues were to be signed before they would present a counter offer to AUCE's monetary package.

AUCE members decided they had had enough of these sort of antics from the University. So after several divisions began work slowdowns and work-to-rule, and after the University saw that staff were not volunteering (in contrast to past practice) to work in the upcoming Open House, AUCE was given a two-hour lunch meeting. It became clear that the University would not move unless the union pressured them.

The final straw for AUCE members came when the University presented their long-awaited money package. In contrast to AUCE's demand of \$332 per month across the board, the University offered \$133. This, coupled with a \$90 raise last fall, would bring SFU clerical workers to parity with UBC counterparts - but only until September. SFU's contract will not expire until next April or May. So AUCE went on strike. The one-day strike was quite an experience for the workers - most of whom had never been on a picket line before. The strikers discovered first-hand just what it means to strike. Other workers, truck and bus drivers, respected the picket lines and many students helped in whatever way they could.

Even though the strike ended after one day, things have changed at SFU. Negotiations reopened but if the University had any doubts before, they have none now that AUCE members are prepared to back their contract demands to the hilt. And, as importantly, AUCE members have confidence in their own power to secure themselves a just settlement.

As ACROSS CAMPUS goes to press, the situation at SFU is still quite fluid - if the University continues stalling in the negotiations, AUCE Local Two will strike again - this time, until the University makes a reasonable offer.

vice-president resigns

The Executive
Local One, AUCE

I wish to inform the Executive and Trustees that I am resigning from the Executive of AUCE Local One. I have a number of reasons for resigning; one of which is that my work will be taking me off campus for fairly long periods this year, and I feel I will be unable to carry out the office of Vice-President effectively. I very much regret having had to make this decision. I have considered the matter carefully - and have had the benefit of a vacation in which to do so!

Ann Hockey

Contract Committee 1975

The Committee normally meets on Monday evenings at 7:30 at 3159 W. 14th Avenue, but if you intend to go, please check with someone on the Committee to make sure that plans have not changed.

DIVISION	NAME	WORK LOCAL
A	Robert Gayton	3725
B	Dale MacAslan	2761
C	(not yet elected)	--
D	Diane Green	4384
E	Suzanne Lester	2406
F	(not yet elected)	--
G	Pat Le Vac	2275
H	Dick Martin	4191
I	Mary Woodsworth	2438
Ex-Officio	Emerald Murphy (President)	6731

THE DEADLINE FOR THE NEXT ISSUE IS:

wed. april 21

HEARINGS, MARCH 24-25, 1975

*by fairleigh funston*A. STUDENT ASSISTANTS

Having never been to a formal hearing of any sort, I can not really make comparisons with respect to how this case was handled, so all I have to share are my personal impressions as well as some high points of the morning proceedings.

Harry Rankin had first crack at presentation and since the primary issue to be dealt with was whether or not the case was arbitrable he could only reiterate AUCE's stand, that having exhausted our grievance procedure, arbitration was the next step under the contract.

It took only about five minutes before Jack Giles, legal counsel for the University, admitted that the case was arbitrable but he made it quite clear that the University would like to have the case referred back to step four of the grievance procedure and in the event of another impasse he would rather a mutually agreed upon individual decide it, rather than have the Labour Relations Board rule. In other words, he was expressing Colonel McLean's passion for delay tactics, and at the same time was inferring that the case did not go through the proper procedures to start with. The Board preferred to have us present our case and reserved the right to decide the case if they chose to, or alternatively, refer it back to our arbitration provisions.

Throughout the morning University counsel did not disappoint us; he was both colourful and leading during cross-examination of our witnesses. At one point, while questioning one of our LA I's, Mr. Giles was attempting to show the job as one bearing heavy responsibility and involving vast numbers of duties certainly not within the capabilities of a mere student assistant. He quickly received a reply that prompted giggles from our side. The employee responded with, "My job doesn't really involve as much as you're making it out to." She had earlier testified that having been a student assistant in the past she, or other students, had done all the duties currently required of an LA I.

Another such incident occurred earlier while a student assistant was under oath. Still tacitly maintaining a rather low opinion of duties performed by students in comparison to those done by our illustrious-selves, Giles questioned the lady as to her typing capabilities. When he received an answer of "oh, roughly 70 wpm.", he seemed a little rattled, to say the least! As a secretary whose hourly rate exceeds hers by \$1.64, and whose typing speed falls short of hers by 20 wpm., I almost felt ashamed.

Moments like this became the trend of the morning with a splash more colour thrown in for good measure during cross-examination of our last witness. While referring to the individual's union activity, Mr. Giles conveniently side-tracked the line of questioning in the best interest of his client. Of course, it crossed our minds that this tactic was employed because, as a supervisor, our witness trained both students and full-time workers, and was in a prime position to judge the similarity between their respective duties. By casting the shadow of conceivable bias, they could discredit him. This turn in the line of cross-examination was also intended to cause repercussions of a different nature. University counsel pointed out that under Article 31 1(a) (Providing acceptable and recognized job descriptions) the Union had refused to recognize some submitted job descriptions so therefore we had nothing to compare the student duties to. This argument was soon thrown out when Harry Rankin pointed out that each of the student assistants present performed duties comparable to those covered in job descriptions recognized by AUCE.

In closing, Harry Rankin pointed out the absurdity surrounding student assistants working 10 hours a week or less as opposed to those working more than 10 hours. As he put it, as soon as a student works

10½ hours a week, the University finds them a pigeon hole with a wage scale. Why can't students who perform the same duties but only work 10 hours a week have the benefit of parity wages. He also pointed out that almost all unions had provisions of this nature to cover casual labour and protect their membership.

University counsel kept his closing remarks brief. He pointed out the Labour Relations Board's shortcomings by saying that from the evidence submitted they could only rule on those cases heard and that the Union had obviously chosen the most attractive cases to prove a point that the University sees as a misconstrual of the contract. (In case you don't know, students are outside our certification).

After receiving the final summations the Labour Relations Board made the following ruling

Students shall remain outside our certification and shall not be considered employees as defined in the contract.

Student Assistants working 10 hours or less shall be paid as follows:

As of January 1, 1975, their hourly rate shall be \$3.67 (this is the base rate of a Clerk I in AUCE's wage scale) and this rate shall be increased as of April 1, 1975 to \$4.16 corresponding to the increase received by full-time employees.

This settlement means \$1.17 per hour retroactivity for all students working presently at \$2.50 per hour and roughly \$175.-\$200. retro pay for those students who have worked an average of 10 hours a week since January 1, 1975.

From the stand point of someone who has been actively involved with this case for several months, I feel this is REALLY FANTASTIC. Casual labour, outside any union's certification, that has existed since the University itself, and has always had to contend with minimum wage standards, is now making \$4.16 an hour.

B. SENIORITY STEPS

When asked to write this report I got the impression that rather than elaborate on the portion of the hearing dealing with the student assistant dispute, I should go into more detail on the dispute regarding seniority steps. Well, I'm sorry to disappoint everybody, but I was not able to attend the whole session on seniority steps. I was present during the final summations and have been made aware of some of the entertaining moments I missed.

The University appeared as though they really had not done their homework. (In my opinion, our case was so clear-cut that, had they spent a lot of time in preparation, they would still fall short of finding valid arguments.)

Colonel McLean (the only witness for U.B.C.), while maintaining his ever-stubborn exterior, made his points, or rather accusations, in his normal fashion. He stated that to his knowledge the only form of wage proposal ever presented before our membership for ratification was a straight \$250.00 across-the-board increase and that Schedule A of our contract and the Grievance Committee's interpretation of the schedule was never set before our eyes or ears.

He further stated that from the University's understanding, Schedule A was only to apply to those employees who started on, or after, April 1, 1974 and would not affect anyone who by our interpretation was on an incorrect step prior to the contract. This testimony was, of course, extremely contradictory to that given by our witness from the old Contract Committee.

During his final remarks, Jack Giles decided to take a slightly offbeat approach and appeared like the bleeding heart martyr for the poor minority AUCE members who might suffer as a result of the Union's interpretation of the section in question. What he was referring to was the small, very small, number of people in our union who are presently on a higher step than they should be. As

cont. page 3

Letters

ON UNION MEETINGS ...

Over the recent past our members have been legislated into our obligations to other Unions. We have been told that these are crisis situations and must be taken care of immediately and as a result we have used up precious time at our monthly meetings doing just that.

Committee members have attended these meetings expecting to hear their reports discussed and vital issues decided upon. There has been no opportunity.

As a result we now have dissension and frustration in our ranks, because the primary business of AUCE, which is to keep abreast of the happenings in our own and other locals, has been neglected. The strike at SFU, about which we have heard nothing, is an excellent case in point to demonstrate my concern about where this union is going regarding priorities. I doubt if most of the members were even faintly aware of its possibility or of the issues.

Some of us have been distressed about these factors but have hesitated to draw them to the attention of the entire membership. I hope everyone will give some thought to this issue of priorities and try to get AUCE back into the strong and functioning unit was a year ago.

Ella Marsden

A CALL TO LIFE TO AUCE NEWSLETTER

First off, let me say I was overjoyed to see the change in layout and content in the last Newsletter. My immediate reaction to former issues had been to throw the damn things into the wastepaper basket - if our Newsletter was any indication of the creative energies of people working on campus, I wanted to completely dissociate myself from it. So, to see a more distinctive layout and some input other than 'union business' was a welcome change.

My main criticism of the Newsletter is that it doesn't reflect the interests, ideas and work of people in AUCE. It is the only concrete thing we have to reach out to each other, share our ideas and skills (like writing, poetry, graphics, recipes, books, whatever), get to know each other. I am not only a trade unionist and I want more out of my work and the union than to see the next contract signed, as important as that may be.

I would like to see more input from people out there like: what do you want to see in this Newsletter, who's out there anyway (maybe some autobiographical stuff from people about who they are, what kind of work they do) and using the Newsletter to explore and learn.

Peggy Smith

CAMPUS CO-OP RENTAL HOUSING

Plans are now underway to provide rental housing for employed staff at the University. Studies have been done on availability of rental units west of MacDonald Street and, as you know, whatever there is soon goes to students. This is only natural. But we feel that there is a segment of the university population that has been overlooked. By providing housing for support staff it would, hopefully, decrease the need for some public transit and significantly decrease the need for private cars to come on campus.

In addition it would be much easier for support staff members to take up-grading courses, and degree completion work if they were within striking distance of the campus.

With this in mind we propose to find our own solutions. Rental units consistent with the recommended guidelines for tenants to pay not more than 25% of their income is our aim. We hope that this is not the 'impossible dream'. The high-rise blocks and other various suites in blocks on the Endowment Lands are fully booked and generally in the high income bracket. In order not to make employed staff second class citizens by restricting available suites and houses in the area to only those in the very high income brackets, or those students who are lucky enough to either afford subsidized housing or to those able to pay for 'frats' or whatever, our plan is to provide our own.

In addition, should prices and wages restraints be implemented or imposed - voluntarily or involuntarily - then social issues are an area of increasing importance in the cost-of-living decisions of employed staff.

It is our intention to proceed with plans for rental housing and to incorporate a day care centre in the project. If you are interested in this concept please feel free to get involved. Let us know your thoughts and we will keep you posted through the Newsletter. No-one has time to carry on a large correspondence on the subject nor do we have a budget for this - but we do plan to make our information freely available through the courtesy of AUCE.

Direct your questions to:

Housing
University Community Credit Union
Box 101
Student Union Building, CAMPUS

We also have in the works a plan for cooperative housing. That is a little farther away, but let us know if that is what you want. A list has been started for this type of housing also. Same address.

GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE, cont. from page 2

he put it, "no union negotiates a contract that will take things away from their members; so the union [meaning AUCE] is therefore misconstruing the intent of the agreement". In closing, Mr. Giles invited the Board to look behind the words of the contract and determine the intent during negotiations - an invitation that obviously he had hoped would result in a different party.

In response, Harry Rankin commended counsel for the University for an eloquent address to an absent jury (he meant the old Perry Mason type jury), and proceeded to successfully blow holes in all the arguments presented. Since when were contracts so perfectly established that minorities of some sort did not exist, and was the University suggesting that, if the union's interpretation was accepted, anyone who is presently being paid at a rate higher than they should be would take a cut in pay? Would that be legal? Schedule A represents wage increases up to a 60 month period of service within a classification. If our original intent was that this schedule only apply to new employees, why would such lengths of time be even noted in an 18 month contract? Remarks like these, and others I wish I could remember, brought our case to a close.

On April 8, 1975, we received the written decision of the L.R.B.:

The Board has decided that the correct interpretation of the steps referred to in Schedule A is that these steps refer to the length of service within the classifications and do not refer to the length of service with the University.

The parties shall implement the step changes based on the length of service in the classification in which monthly paid employees were on staff as of April 1st, 1974. However, the rates of pay will not reflect the length of service until the effective date of April 1st, 1975. Calculations do not include previous service in classifications other than the classifications of the employee at April 1st, 1974.

[This simply means that retroactivity only dates back to April 1, 1975.]

Any employee whose present rate of pay is greater than his or her length of service within his or her individual classification, will be "red circled". Such employee will continue to receive his or her present rate of pay until such time as their rate of pay matches the proper length of service within their category in Schedule A.

I feel that this Local's Grievance Committee deserves a pat on the back with special thanks to Harry Rankin, who was well worth his exorbitant fee.

MEMBERSHIP MEETING

MAY 8 5:15 p.m.

buchanan 102

PROVINCIAL AUCE:

What it is *What it can be*

provincial report

DEBORAH UDY

The weekend of April 5 and 6 was the scene of yet another Provincial Association Executive meeting. Attending this meeting, which was held in Local One's Union Office, were: Sandra Lundy, President, Ross Klatte, Vice-President, Jackie Ainsworth, Secretary/Treasurer, Dreena McCormack, S.F.U., Anne DeCosson and Ruth Dirkson, Capilano College, Jonnie Klein and Shirley Bonney, Notre Dame, and Heather McNeill and Deborah Udy, U.B.C. Dick Martin and Jennifer Clemmons were observers.

Once again, we had a full agenda. First we adopted the minutes of the February 22nd and 23rd meeting then moved on to correspondence, which was highlighted by a letter from Capilano College asking AUCE to comment on the idea of setting up a Labour College at Capilano College to be funded by the college. The other important correspondence was the letter of withdrawal from Malaspina College. Copies were sent to all locals and it will be read at a membership meeting. The Provincial Executive is writing back to express our regrets and the hope that they will continue to communicate with AUCE.

The next item was the approval of Local Bylaw amendments. This has to be done by the Provincial Executive before the amendments are in order and ratified. Local One's amendments were approved except for Section J-7 (changing the date of the fiscal year to September), which was referred back until other relevant sections are also amended. Local Three (N.D.U.) and Local Four's (Cap.College) amendments, to do with their dues structure, were also approved.

Local Reports

N.D.U.

- are preparing for negotiations, which they hope to start in May.
- still haven't heard what their status is regarding the government takeover.

S.F.U., Capilano College

- see other sections of the newsletter for a complete report

Convention

-a report from the sub-committee on the Convention was read and discussed. It has been decided that six seminars will be held on Sunday of the Convention, with the following topics:

1. Women in the workforce (including daycare)
2. Job evaluation and reclassification
3. Strikes, lockouts, boycotts, job action
4. Grievance procedures
5. Negotiation experience
6. Future of the provincial - affiliation, autonomy, and organization

All Locals were urged get their delegates elected as soon as possible so that resolutions and constitutional amendments can be formulated. There will be a docket provided for the delegates with information about conventions, copies of rules of order, and other necessary information.

Topics referred back to Locals to be discussed before the next Provincial meeting are:

1. Do we want a full-time Provincial Organizer?
2. If so, do we have enough money to pay one without disturbing other priorities?
3. If there is not enough money available, would the members be agreeable to raising the per capita tax?

4. Do members want a special convention in the Fall to deal with policies, i.e. affiliation, organization?

Membership and Treasury Report

We now are approximately 1749 members strong (as of 1 April 1975):

U.B.C. 1151

S.F.U. 485

N.D.U. 39

Cap.College 74

+ 2 Headquarter members

Balance as of Feb. 21, 1975	\$3846.70
Income Feb. 22-April 4	1018.00
	<u>\$4864.70</u>

Expenses	\$ 685.33
----------	-----------

Excess of revenue	\$4179.37
-------------------	-----------

Strike Fund	746.25
-------------	--------

Balance on Hand	<u>\$3433.12</u>
-----------------	------------------

Strike Fund total	\$1791.75
-------------------	-----------

Research

Heather and I have not yet received any written or formal recommendations on the question of research; therefore, it has been referred back to the Locals again.

Meanwhile, the Provincial Executive is acquiring 1974 Labour Relations Board decisions and Jackie has been authorized to spend up to \$30.00 during the next month to buy up-to-date L.R.B. decisions. We are also on the mailing list of many other unions and copies of letters are filed in the Union Office. Please feel free to come in and read them. We are going to request copies of contracts from other unions to have on file.

to affiliate...?

- by Heather Prittie

One subject under discussion at the Provincial Convention will be "The future of AUCE". A question on many members' minds is: does the future hold affiliation with one of the unitary labour organizations - namely, the B.C. Federation of Labour (part of the Canadian Labour Congress), or the Canadian Council of Unions, the smaller association of unions independent of continental ties. Which one? Or is it better to stay unaffiliated?

The issue has been tossed around informally since AUCE was formed and the Convention will be its first real arena for discussion. That will only be a start, of course, and obviously won't be resolved there. It is, in any case, not something to be considered only by the Provincial, since presumably any Local could choose to affiliate on its own.

The Newsletter is interested in publishing any views you have - and would like to provide a forum for a full debate on the matter. It is likely that some kind of investigative committee will be set up to collect information on the choices, but it is also possible that groups of members who are already convinced of one of the alternatives could form a committee to campaign around that position. But most of all - let's get started with some kind of discussion - it's extremely important.

what is to be done?

three views:

I by Heather MacNeill

From talking to people in AUCE Local One, I get the feeling that to most members the Provincial is irrelevant and that the \$1 a month portion of their dues allocated to the Provincial Association is something of a formality.

It's quite understandable - in its first real year of operation the Provincial has spent a lot of time helping the newer locals establish themselves, preparing for this year's convention and getting used to the straight administrative work involved in setting up a provincial organization. This work is not very visible, especially to established Locals, but it's been important.

Now that most Locals are nearing the end of the first hurdle - the initial contract, we should be seriously considering what we want the Provincial to be doing. Here are my ideas of the priorities for the Provincial:

1. SERVICE/RESEARCH: One of the advantages of a Provincial Association is that it can centralize a lot of the research and information needed for the different Locals. Many Locals are duplicating research, or don't have the resources to do any (two of our Locals have less than 80 people). A full-time provincial organizer could help out; cross-Local committees could be set up to investigate pension plans (for instance); and we could hold provincial seminars on certain areas.

2. SEMINARS/WORKSHOPS: One of the most useful parts of last year's convention were the workshops dealing with common areas of interest. This year an entire day is to be set aside for workshops on the following topics:

- ** Reclassification/Job Evaluation
- ** Grievances
- ** Strikes, Lockouts, Boycotts, Other Job Action
- ** Negotiations
- ** Womens in the Workforce/Daycar
- ** The Future of the Provincial

In a seminar workshop format, union members have a great chance to share their experience and knowledge. We also have a chance to bring in people from outside the union who have a particular know-how in a certain area.

We've got to start having more of these workshops, not only within our own Local, but on a provincial basis between conventions.

3. WOMEN: I think it is generally accepted that the creation of AUCE was to a large degree a response to the situation of women in the workforce. Last year's contract stands in many ways as a model for other workers, particularly in the area of maternity leave and wages. However, even with our \$225 across-the-board, we have not yet reached parity with many 'male-typed' jobs. We have hardly studied the problem of day care, although for many members the question is an important one. We have only started to investigate the little-known hazards of office work - like the effect of fluorescent lighting, noise levels in larger offices, or the effect of detailed paper work on a person's eyes and nervous system.

The position of women in our society has changed remarkably in the past 10 years. But there's still a long way to go and I think that AUCE, as an organized union primarily composed of women, can contribute alot.

The Provincial Association could play a useful role by starting the accumulation of research, working with other unions or organizations who are concerned with the position of working women.

4. THE UNORGANIZED: This last priority is related directly to the question of women in the workforce. Most women workers are not in trade unions, and as a result, are at the bottom of the ladder, both in wages and working conditions. Although our jurisdiction as a union only applies to university and college workers, we can certainly encourage the unionization of the rest of this sector. We should be letting those other workers in non-union situation know that we exist and what we've done. **5**

II by Sandra Lundy

I am sure that every member of AUCE realizes what a positive force the Union is, or can be, in our lives. Since we successfully negotiated our first collective agreements at UBC and Notre Dame University of Nelson I have been able to afford a lovely new car. How about you? A trip? A new house? That stereo you had been craving? Soon the members at Capilano College and Simon Fraser University will have collective agreements too.

Whatever growing pains our young Union is experiencing, we must recognize how much richer we are now, not just in terms of money but in terms of new relationships and new skills which we are acquiring to run our own Union.

AUCE is entering a new phase which will test our organizational ability and our capacity to respect each other for our different viewpoints.

Over the last few months I have been talking to experienced trade unionists and taking courses in how to administer the Union and run meetings. A number of AUCE members have been invited to attend seminars run by the Nanaimo District Labour Council and the Vancouver & District Labour Council. Members of the Provincial Executive have also paid a visit to the office of the Canadian Association of Industrial, Mechanical and Allied Workers (CAIMAW), an independent union which has helped AUCE ever since we first started to organize.

There seem to be five basic functions a union must perform if it is able to act effectively for its members:

1. It must run itself not as a business, but in a businesslike way.
2. It must research and negotiate collective agreements which produce improvements in wages and working conditions for its members.
3. It must enforce those agreements through the grievance procedure.
4. It must have an ongoing program of education for its members and stewards.
5. It must develop some policies which govern its relationships to other unions and the world around it.

That's a mammoth job, folks, for a union our size. It means every member should be familiar with our Union's structure by studying the Constitution and the Local Union By-Laws and being prepared for meetings. Some members must be prepared to act as stewards and officers, and the membership should provide them with the tools to do the job by paying sufficient dues to enable the Union to operate.

AUCE's four locals will come together at the Convention in June to start tackling this job in terms of the whole union. All locals will elect, by April 30th, the delegates who will represent their views at Convention, based on the resolutions and constitutional amendments approved by the membership.

Some discussion has already started on the question of salaried staff. In a union of 1,800 members we have one staff person at UBC. No other union can manage like this, and most locals feel our situation needs changing. But how? Should we have salaried table officers elected at large from amongst our own membership? Perhaps in addition some salaried officers elected from the representatives of the Locals on the Provincial Executive? Some clerical staff too? Why not get a copy of the Provincial Constitution from the Union office and read up on Section 7 to see what you think?

Supposing you think we need 'em, how are we going to pay 'em? Think we can do it on \$1.00 per month per capita tax to the Provincial Union? Run an office and pay staff on \$24,000 a year? Take a look at Section 15 Revenues & Finances of your Constitution. A lot of union members nowadays pay 1% of their salary in dues.

What about the term of Office? How long did it take you to learn your job? Think you could learn about those five points I mentioned in one year? Refer to Section 7 of the Constitution again.

Continued on page 6

Another thing to think about for the Convention will be the relationship of your Local to the other Locals in the Union. One of the Objectives of the Union is to maintain the principle of Local autonomy. Lovely principle, but what does it mean? In practice it means that other Locals are going to choose different ways of running their Locals than your Local does. Remember, all our Locals have clerical workers, but only UBC is mainly clerical workers. At Capilano College technicians, service workers and student assistants are members; at NDU we have maintenance and service workers; at SFU a substantial proportion are technicians. With so many differing backgrounds there are bound to be many differing concerns. Somebody who risks falling off a 10-ft. ladder may be a lot more interested in Workers' Compensation than Day Care.

Different viewpoints about how to get things done, and the future of the Union abound too. Many members of the Union want discussion started on affiliation to a council or congress of trade unions such as the Confederation of Canadian Unions (independent unions) or the B.C. Federation of Labour. Unions unite together into larger groups so that they can provide support to each other, share their experiences, knowledge, educational opportunities, research facilities, press governments for legislation beneficial to workers, and just plain make friends with other people who have similar goals and concerns. Some members want access to these facilities, and other members don't want to hear about it! Perhaps it wouldn't do any harm to set up a committee at Convention to study the question of affiliation. These are a few of the things we need to start acting on. The future of AUCE is of direct concern to you, and something you can do something about. I hope you'll call me if you want more information on how to do it. 228-3131 (days) 736-3601 (evenings) 224-4212 (provincial association).



by Dick Martin

The Executive of Local 1 claim to represent the membership because they were elected. In the case of the Local 1 Executive's censure of Sandra Lundy's letter to Capilano College, the Executive feel that they have been delegated the authority to determine censure. It is clear that the Executive have been given certain powers and it is not undemocratic to exercise these powers as long as the rules and procedures are followed. If these rules are not followed, then the Executive is acting as a totalitarian committee.

Democracy is based on the manipulation of power, both real and political, and this to me is the thing that is wrong, not the individuals involved. To develop a union that does not restrict the membership's control of the actual union functions, these functions must be decentralized as much as possible.

The position of the Provincial President is an authoritarian position by its democratic nature and this is not the fault of the individual involved. The answer is not to deal with the individual, but with the situation. This means removing the authority from individual positions in the Provincial Executive.

There has been a proposal referred back to all AUCE Locals for further discussion from the last Provincial convention to change the structure of the Provincial Executive. This proposal would remove the table officers from the Executive and create a Provincial Council consisting solely of delegates from each Local. There would be no referendum vote of the entire Provincial membership, but rather each Local would choose its own delegates. This proposed Provincial Council could arrange the work among themselves and avoid a lot of trouble over who does what.

Similarly, we can see the problems that exist in our own Local Executive. The positions of the table officers place far too much responsibility upon individual positions. It would be much better if the Executive were replaced by a Council composed of members of all divisions, and standing committees. In this way the Executive Council could work more as a collective, sharing the work among all its members.

At the April 10 Membership Meeting a motion to endorse Local 1 Executive's stand on the Provincial President's letter to Capilano College was tabled in view of the fact that not everyone received a copy of the letters with their newsletter. It was felt that without this information, the membership could not vote responsibly on the matter.

Copies of Sandra Lundy's letter to Capilano College, Local 1 Executive's letter to Sandra Lundy, and Sandra Lundy's letter to the Local 1 Executive are available in the Union Office. Feel free to stop by and read this information. The matter will be discussed at the May 8 Membership Meeting.

malaspina leaves

Malaspina College Support Staff,
375 Kennedy Street,
Nanaimo, B.C.
March 11, 1975

Ms. Sandra Lundy,
President (Provincial),
Association of University of College Employees,
2162 Western Parkway,
Vancouver, B.C.

Dear Sandy:

I have been directed by the Malaspina College Support Staff to advise you that: after very thorough consideration the Support Staff of Malaspina College has voted to withdraw their charter with the Association of University and College Employees.

We have found AUCE to be wanting in certain areas: matters causing deep concern were lack of skilled personnel, lack of fundamental trade union knowledge and total inability of the Provincial Association to offer the type of service we would expect.

Because of the nature of our labour oriented community it is the consensus of opinion within our membership that we should reside within the recognized house of labour.

Enclosed please find the voided cheque for \$300.00. Enclosed are the signed membership cards and please note all money collected in the name of AUCE has been refunded to our members.

We at Malaspina wish you well in all future endeavours. We can assure you that Malaspina College Support Staff will join you in your fight for equality within the working environment.

Yours sincerely,

Maxine Zurbrigg (Mrs.),
Support Staff Rep

AUCE PROVINCIAL CONVENTION

june 21,22

HOLIDAY INN
1110 HOWE ST.

COMMITTEES, REPORTS, ETC.



communications

The response to the new format of the Newsletter has been very encouraging. In the next few issues we hope to make changes in the content, but we need contributions from members other than the regulars. This month we have included a book report and a poem. We know that there are talented people on Campus other than faculty and students, and we would like to hear from you.

Your Newsletter is now in the hands of five people. Our desperate plea for help has more or less gone unanswered. Below are our names. Any contributions or offers of assistance will be greeted with alacrity.

Jack Gegenberg	3894
Louise Hamilton	2720
Heather Prittie	2773
Margot Scherk	5219
Peggy Smith	3276

financial

What follows is a comparison between the tentative budget approved by the membership on September 12th, 1974 and the actual expenditures for the period October 1, 1974 to March 31, 1975 (six months). The amounts in the projected budget have been cut in half in order that they correspond to a six-month period.

TOTAL REVENUE as of March 31st, 1975 (Oct. 1/74 to Mar. 31/75)	\$23,179.07
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$19,457.48
Cash on hand as of April 10, 1975	\$ 8,477.02 (including balance brought over from previous fiscal year)
Per capita tax paid to date	\$ 4,902.00 (no provision made for this in the Sept. 74 budget priorities and estimates)

PROJECT BUDGET (approved Sept. 74 - halved)

Commitments already made:

Rent	\$ 1,500.00
Telephone	150.00
Hydro	100.00
Salary	4,750.00
TOTAL	\$ 6,500.00

EXPENSES (Oct. 1/74 to March 31/75)

\$ 1,500.00	
216.70	(does not include amount recently received from Provincial for use of Local One's phone)
109.74	
3,883.52	
\$ 5,709.96	

Predicted estimates

Telecommunications	\$ 50.00
Meetings & conferences	500.00
Office equipment & furniture	1,000.00
Communications & printing	1,250.00
Office supplies	+ 900.00
	= 2,150.00
Postage	200.00
Equipment maintenance	100.00
Travel	250.00
Car Allowance	150.00
Rental of copier & supplies	1,250.00
Library	250.00
Insurance	62.50
Accountants & auditors	1,000.00
(represents sum budgeted for fiscal year, not 6 mos.)	
TOTAL	\$ 6,962.50

Actual expenditures

\$ 67.46	
358.53	
1,223.69	
3,075.50	(includes printing of contract - \$816.37)
50.46	
117.47	

3,445.21	(this represent purchase of Toshiba photocopier and a year's supply of paper)
8.15	

850.00	
\$ 9,146.47	

TOTAL
(of both sections) **\$13,462.50**

\$ 14,856.43 (this does not include certain miscellaneous items, eg. petty cash, special functions)

The following were also included in the September 1974 budget approved by the membership:

Contingency Fund:

Special allocation for strike & defence.....	\$ 4,500.00
Fund for arbitration, legal fees, & misc. such as referenda.....	\$ 8,475.00
	\$12,975.00

(this represents the projected allocation for the complete fiscal year Oct. 1/74 to September 30/75)

In regards to the above, a few things can be mentioned. To this point no contingency fund has been established, but discussions are beginning to establish savings accounts and/or term deposits to this end. It should be easier to set definite priorities and amounts as this organizational year/fiscal year ends in September 1975.

If any member has questions or suggestions on how the financial aspect of the Union is being conducted, feel free to contact me. If anyone so wishes, I could provide a breakdown on the business we do with separate companies for a future Newsletter.

Ray Galbraith
Treasurer