



**association of university and college employees**

November 2, 1982

Ms. Libby Nason  
Senior Labour Relations Assistant  
Employee Relations Department  
University of British Columbia

Dear Ms. Nason:

I have read your letter dated October 28, 1982. While I concede that the proceedings in the Julius Kane decision were more clearly of an adjudicative nature than those in the present instance, I think that your conception of the scope of the decision is artificially narrow. It would seem to me that a procedure that was found to be unfair when used by the Board of Governors must equally be unfair when applied by the Appeals Committee, although the same legal consequences may not follow from this unfairness. I do not think the Appeals Committee would want to operate in a manner which has been held to be unfair by the highest court in this country.

With respect to the presence of Employee Relations personnel at the Appeals Committee hearing, it appears that A.U.C.E. was never provided with information about the composition of the Committee. If you have written guidelines governing the composition of the Appeals Committee, I would be pleased to see them.

The Union has no intention "to dictate the method of operation of the Appeals Committee." There is a substantial difference between asking that fair procedures be used and trying to dictate what procedures are to be used.

Yours truly,

Shirley Irvine  
Co-ordinator  
A.U.C.E. Local I

cc: Dr. J. Campbell  
Dr. J. Stein  
Dr. P. Baird  
Mr. A. Shirran  
Mrs. D. K. Rumsey