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A.U.C.E. Local 4 Executive \& Membership Capilano College
A.U.C.E. Local 6 Executive \& Membership Simon Fraser University

To All of The Above,
This letter is in response to the results of the hearing of August 22, 1981.

Despite the results A.U.C.E. Local 5 maintains the position that our democratic rights have been interfered with, by the implementation and subsequent misuse of the new discipline clause from the 1981 convention. 'As a local of A.U.C.E. we had the autonomy to affiliate to the Confederation of Canadian Unions (CCU).

We, the leadership of A.U.C.E. 5 recommended affiliation during a time when our negotiations were reaching a peak, a time when we were seeking support for our struggle. The support received from the Provincial of A.U.C.E. was not received without a battle, the Prince George and District Labour Council did not come to our assistance in any form. However, the CCU supported our struggle by condemning the stand taken by the Provincial Government and giving unconditional support to our cause. It was to this support that the membership responded when the questionuestion of affiliation was considered by our union. The subsequent sement
successfull strike aided by the CCU and its affiliates reaffirmed that Local. 5 had indeed made the correct choice:

Let us also remember that Local 5 won the greatest victory within A.U.C.E. in some time, by obtaining a contract with a wage increase (compounded) amounting to over $29 \%$ in two years, an increase not to be taken lightly particularily in view of the Government cutbacks and general attack on public sector workers.

We find it difficult to believe that a small group of people within A.U.C.E. is condemning us for operating in what we saw as being in the best interests of the membership.

It is clear that there are small groups of people within the locals who we do not believe represent the views of the membership, who support various alternatives for A.U.C.E., and who are characterized by their lack of principles in promoting those goals. It is just as clear to us that these small groups of people are promoting their own causes for political motovations other than the welfare of the membership of A.U.C.E. And this betrayal of the principles upon which A.U.C.E was founded will result in the destruction of A.U.C.E. The reality is that the solutions proped by this group of people, that is, joining abuearocratic union will not solve the internal problems of A.U.C.E., indeed the solutions proposed show an indifference to the needs of A.U.C.E. members.

We at Local 5 are therefore not prepared to send a delegation to the special convention of October 4, 1981, called for the sole purpose of further attempting to discipline the members of our local. We would attend if we had a sense that there would be an open and honest debate, dedicated to the needs and welfare of our members. We are not however, prepared to subject our delegates to another session where debate is stifled and continous procedural arguements take precedence. To us this is not democracy.

We are also concerned that these seemingly endless conventions/ hearings regarding affiliation are an abuse of membership dues and that this money should be better spent and more readily available for the members of a local on strike against their employer.

Finally, should the special convention decide to further discipline the membership of A.U.C.E. Local 5, this executive will begin the procedure of succeeding from A.U.C.E.


President, A.U.C.E. Local 5 on behalf of the Executive of Local 5

