

The session on Thursday 26ag76 again opened with the absence from work issue. Jean Lawrence informed Grant that some members of the Contract Committee were still experiencing difficulty in getting away from work. Grant stated that Dept. Heads "should know that they can't put static in front of us." Grant indicated that some Dept. Heads were requesting that he fund replacements and said that he was "...coming with a request not to negotiate through Registration week." He asked: "Why don't we look at our needs in terms of the reality we have to face?"

Jean brought him back to the question of paid AUCE negotiators and indicated that the membership was disappointed with the University's position. Marcel Dionne said that to date the University had not compromised - to which Grant replied: "We'd like to compromise down to four." Grant continued with his large-group-as-inefficient theory. What was needed is "...small group of people to thrash out the issues...with no publicity about the issues." But "because of our philosophical differences, we will never get down to a small group." The University, according to Grant, was doing better than most. The University felt that their offer to finance 6 was reasonable; the Union's position "...hinders negotiations." Jean re-iterated that the University was not paying for replacements. Marcel told Grant that he was playing "the number game", and Grant answered with: "My answer is too bad. I don't see any reason for leading the pack anymore than we are."

The discussion dragged on, and Grant said he felt that both sides were "...getting onto a side game and trying to question one another's integrity." Furthermore, he stated that there was "...some difficulty in that we have problems in getting across the reasons that we are here." Grant requested to leave the issue - "Hold on and let nature take its course. No answer is ever final in this business. I hope you are looking at it the same way."

Jean agreed with leaving the issue for the time being and getting down to the Contract Committee's proposed amendments to the collective agreement. The method of presentation was the same as during the previous meetings. Individual members of the Contract Committee would present their sections; Grant would usually proceed to read the clause in question out loud, attempt to interpret it, and ask questions. He was forever searching for "clarity" and for "intent".

The issue of employee definitions was apparently of major concern to Grant. "This is one major item we should address ourselves to." The meeting broke off at 11:30 am. for lunch and resumed at 12:30 pm. The meeting resumed with the involuntary transfer clause, and Grant asked whether or not the Union had a definition. He went on to speak about transfer and the assignment of work within a classification. He felt that the Union had presented "...some good points", but he said an employee's position, classification, and job duties were all mixed up in his mind. He went on to suggest the possibility of "special meetings" on this issue - an issue that was "so fundamental". Grant stated that the University could assign work within a classification. At some point in the discussion Jeff Hoskins agreed that involuntary transfer should probably be defined. Fairleigh Funston provided an example of involuntary job transfer during the Library's job freeze. Grant simply said: "Fine, I've got you." Both sides agreed that a definition was necessary.

The Union's proposed wording for a new lay-off clause was obviously another sensitive area to Grant. "We should spend some time on this." It was an "area for good dialogue." He continued: "If we can understand what you're getting at, then we can work through the language." Detailed discussion on this issue was to be deferred until the actual negotiations were under way. One exchange worth noting occurred when Grant questioned Jeff Hoskins as to the meaning of the sentence: "...all positions of the same classification within the bargaining unit shall

be considered equal...". Jeff explained the problems which AUCE had faced with grant employees and temporary employees. To which Grant added: "An employee has a relation with the University and fits into a classification...regardless of the funding and the duration of the position." The proposals part of the meeting ended with Article 34.11 - Continuing, Sessional or Probationary Status.

Jean requested that the next meeting be scheduled for Monday, 30ag76 pointing out the Article in the contract which stated that all contract proposals must be on the table one month in advance. Grant replied: "I'm not trying to play legal games with you." He then asked how we were going to proceed in his absence. Before responding, Jean indicated that the Union wanted to negotiate through Registration week. Grant answered with: "I'm not really hung up about it." He added: "It doesn't appear to be the routine form of amendments which can be settled in 7 to 8 weeks" as there were "some fundamental changes here". The meeting adjourned at 1:30 pm.

During the hour after the meeting the Contract Committee discussed a series of issues and problems: the Union Organizer's (Fairleigh Funston) position during negotiations, the number of contract representatives, a possible motion to the membership in regards to paying some members of the Contract Committee if they should be docked pay, and sessional employee status vis-à-vis lay-off. It was decided that Fairleigh would move to the Union Office and act as liaison with the membership. The importance of maintaining 11 representatives at the table was stressed.

The session on August 31, 1976 opened with Jean Lawrence presenting the University with a compilation of all Union proposals. The Contract Committee presented the remaining issues, and Grant usually responded by indicating that he understood the intent. He commented as follows: "That's clear." "The writing seems much clearer to me, in any case." On the Union decision to delete the Working Conditions Committee and replace it with access to all information on the subject of working conditions, Grant stated: "We understand what you are saying. We'll talk to it at the proper time. We'll have some dialogue on that." Margie Walley presented the proposal for time off between Boxing Day and New Year's Day and indicated that a survey taken last year demonstrated that 1/3 of the responding institutions gave the time off. Grant's comment was terse: "They must have money to burn."

Some discussion did occur on the proposed vacation schedule. Grant said: "Quite frankly, this language has been quite confusing to me. I have no proposal to go back on the language." On separating the time and money aspect, especially in relation to part-time employees, Grant informed the Contract Committee that he had a proposal that could resolve the situation. He found the suggested wording "quite clear". On the overtime definition he stated: "You'll get no offence from me for clarity." The Job Descriptions clauses produced further debate. The Union outlined its position and rationale for the changes. Grant used the occasion for a little back-patting - "I have a job evaluation concept I am trying to sell on campus. I hope when we come to discussing job evaluation and Job Descriptions, I hope that I am here." Grant said that our intent was clear, but that he was having trouble in understanding one area, that of job duties and Job Descriptions. Ian Mackenzie explained that job duties were to be a "sub-set" to the Job Descriptions. Most of the Union's proposals were "quite clear", and Grant had no difficulty in understanding them. A momentary hassle arose when Grant led himself to believe that the Union was asking that old grievances be processed under the conditions of the new contract.

Fairleigh Funston presented the wage rates article. The presentation paralleled the rationale that AUCE had developed during the negotiations for the first two contracts. Grant listened to the proposal for parity with CUPE 116, and at the end stated: "The only thing you haven't told me is where the money will come from."

Fairleigh replied: "I hope we are not looking at a future time bomb." Grant in turn indicated that he had expected the Union's approach from private discussions with Union members. On the issue of changing the increments to each employee's anniversary date of service, Grant said: "We'll be able to respond to that one correctly. We have a proposal before the President's Office." As on so many other occasions this provided grist for Grant's philosophy mill. "I've been looking at issues and concepts. Obviously, we've been looking at the same issues..." He said he hoped that he could persuade those who administer the University: "It does mean that we have the basis for negotiation", and then he added, "...in the long term." At the end of the presentation Jean informed Grant that there would be a few housekeeping measures presented on Thursday. Grant nodded and replied: "We'll be making our complete presentation on Thursday."

Grant went to say that it was "a long painful process" in building trust. "I'm trying not to get into a personality thing. I'm finding out in due course" (an obvious reference to AUCE'S past dealings with Wes Clark). "I'm not going to pull out of bargaining with you, but I won't be here full-time. I'll be telling you what our objectives are and what our areas of concern are." On Thursday the University was to initiate a different kind of presentation. "We've worked hard to provide the wording." Grant hoped that the Union would appreciate his kind of dialogue. Jean then suggested that both parties defer the absence from work discussion until Thursday. Grant said that as AUCE went above him on the issue he would not answer at this time, even though he had his answer ready - an answer decided in discussions with White. He did say that he hoped he was still going on vacation but it depended upon the timing of CUPE's negotiations.

The session on Thursday, 2se76 opened with an aside from Grant to the effect that he had a scheduled meeting with the President at 2:30 pm. Jean Lawrence submitted the final batch of Union proposals, entitled "Further Errata". On the list of job duties clause, Grant stated: "This is a subject which I would like to have a major discussion about...in order to evolve some kind of approach." The proposals were few in number and were quickly despatched with.

Prior to the discussion of the remaining proposals, Jean had pointed out the continuing difficulties with the AUCE contract representatives getting away from work. At this point Grant mentioned that he was still experiencing "...a little bit of static". He also indicated that he had been called into the President's Office. He said that Wes Clark was attempting to get the CUPE thing settled. Grant had been instructed to "get negotiations moving, irregardless of whom is sitting in this chair." He was to meet with the President at 2:30 pm. to discuss the University's proposals. He was to begin his vacation Friday, 3se76. Grant then suggested that we reconvene later that afternoon so that he could present the University's proposals "formally". Furthermore, both parties could "at the next meeting, start to negotiate on the basis of the two documents." The University had no intention to "stonewall". And, "if we do run into problems, I am prepared to take a plane back." At this point, Jean presented the "Further Errata".

After the above presentation and after a caucus, Grant returned to speak to the job evaluation/classification issue - "...one of the more troublesome issues." Grant felt that it would "serve some useful purpose to find out what the Union is looking for." Grant waxed philosophical - what was needed was a "...serious in-depth discussion."; the University would "like to come to grips with it"; and Grant wanted "to set up some approach to getting a discussion going and resolving this issue". This subject apparently caused Grant much consternation. "I am really trying to come to grips with this one. This is a very subjective area." He then proceeded to elaborate on what a Job Description should identify. But, as yet, Grant admitted he had no proposal. "I see no point in coming in and throwing down a proposal without having seen your proposal." Although "evaluating jobs is subjective", Grant wanted "to adopt a rational approach? which would involve "a trial per-

iod for say a year." He re-iterated that the University was "eager" to come to some agreement on this contenti us issue. Jean then informed Grant that the Union was willing to reconvene at 3:30 pm. Grant said he would return with written proposals and said that he didn't want "to have to weasel..." with the Contract Committee. The meeting temporarily adjourned. The Contract Committee discussed the job evaluation/classification issue raised by Grant, but came to no official position.

Grant did not return from his audience with the President until shortly after 4:00 pm., although both Committees had met to reconvene at 3:30 pm. The tension was heightened. Grant arrived with his typical energetic flourishes. He informed the Contract Committee that he had "never tried this technique before. I have tried to express our position in the terms of our objectives. Our Advisory Committee wants to attempt to build up a harmonious relationship." Grant presented two documents - one which outlined the University's objectives in regards to AUCE, the other, consisting of 10 pages, which outlined the University's proposals. Grant added: "We will be negotiating Tuesday, 9:30 am. We feel we can move during this period, if there is anything that can get going I am prepared to structure it and get it moving."

On the absence from work issue, Grant volunteered the following information. "Well I'm afraid I've got bad news, from your point of view. The University did not move from this position. We are leaving it at 6, and are leading the pack. I am bringing the reply, and you know where I've been." Jeff Hoskins presented a rebuttal to the University-as-leading-the-pack claim, but to no avail as Grant stated that "at this point in time, I can't say any more." To which Jean replied: "We can't formulate a position without going back to the membership." The meeting ended with a comment by Grant: "Hopefully, you will have made some good progress by the time I get back."

It was only at this point that the members of the Contract Committee were able to study Grant's written submission. The initial impression was one of disappointment. After all of the hoopla and philosophy which accompanied the build-up to the presentation of the University's proposals, it did not appear that the University's unique approach lived up to its advanced billings - in fact, on first reading it appeared that the main thrust was an attempt to undermine some of the negotiated rights in past contracts. It was a disappointment.