

# Association of University and College Employees

LOCAL No. 1 (U.B.C.)

September 6, 1978

## CONTRACT BULLETIN 15

FROM THE CONTRACT COMMITTEE

- the August 29th Membership Meeting voted by a 292-214 margin to accept the University's new wage offer of \$45 as of October 1, 1978
- the Contract Committee had recommended that the membership reject the offer - we were wedded to the conviction, and we still are, that the University would make one "final" offer
- yet we can see the reasons why the membership, by a narrow margin, chose to accept the \$45 offer - many of the reasons were expressed at the meeting
- but one issue raised and discussed at the meeting should be rehashed once again - that is the extensive and possibly misconstrued discussion surrounding the Contract Committee's \$55 position presented to the University during the August 24th mediation session, a position given to the University at Ed Sims' request "without prejudice"
- before diving back into the "without prejudice" discussion it must be noted that the membership's decision to issue 72 hour strike notice on Wednesday August 23rd won further gains
- the University coughed up an additional \$10 and agreed to the Union's position on Human Rights and Maternity - two significant gains
- just as our positive strike vote netted measurable progress so did the issuing of strike notice
- now back to the controversy surrounding our \$55 "without prejudice" wage proposal: that position was decided upon by the Contract Committee within the context of the August 24th mediation session
- Sims had requested that both parties eventually present "final" positions on the wage issue, with the goal of arriving at an acceptable wage settlement
- the offers and the proposals were to be made "without prejudice" which meant that if no agreement was reached during that mediation session then both parties were free to revise or return to their former positions
- the Contract Committee stated at the end of the session - a session at which the University tried to stampede the Union into an agreement - that we had reached our rock-bottom position; and, in addition, we declared that it was a distinct possibility that we had gone further than the membership would support
- thus, the Contract Committee came to the August 29th Membership Meeting with one University proposal (wages) and two Union proposals (wages and Disciplinary Action/Employee Files) on the table
- although the meeting is now history, the Committee would like one last whack at the cat: the issue before the membership was to set a dollar figure which they felt was just and reasonable so that the Committee could try to arrange another session with the University - for this to take place the membership would have had to reject the University's latest offer

- the issue was not whether we would strike for the \$10, but whether we would threaten strike action for another amount to be decided upon by the membership
- the Contract Committee firmly believed that another University wage offer was a real possibility - so much so that we had tentatively scheduled a further membership meeting for August 31st to consider any additional University offer
- we also expected that the University would give way on Article 33.06 - Disciplinary Action/Employee Files - an article they had taken a merciless beating on during the latter stages of mediation
- to that point in time it had been the University's practice to force us into escalating the pace of negotiations when we discovered their feet to be dragging i.e., mediation, the strike vote, 72 hour strike notice
- the University played one of their last cards in the face of a threatened strike and bought a relatively cheap settlement
- the Contract Committee is not wired in the throes of despondency, despite our case of cold feet at the end
- what we had done during the course of negotiations was to prevent any damaging incursions into our contract - and make no mistake about it because the University tried to gut our contract
- the actions of the membership knocked the University's proposals off the table one after another, thus backing up the position that the Contract Committee had taken from the outset of negotiations - i.e., that the Union would not entertain any proposals which diminished any negotiated rights or benefits
- along the way, or to be accurate, during the course of mediation, we made seven or eight gains; we also negotiated a wage agreement - an agreement that the membership, by a small majority, perceived as being closest to what was possible under the circumstances without resorting to further strike preparations
- some members of this year's Contract Committee have expressed a willingness to meet over the next couple of months to begin discussion on a new set of contract proposals; those willing to be involved are Jay Hirabayashi, Ann Hutchison, Michelle McCaughran and Ray Galbraith
- any members interested in participating please contact the Union Office and leave your names with Michelle
- one further suggestion: there is no better time than the present for each Division to consider electing a Contract Committee representative so that new proposals can be brought before the membership in November and December
- it is our hope that negotiations for a new contract/collective agreement (1979-80) can begin early in January, 1979
- a reminder: the referendum ballot for the just completed set of negotiations will follow on the heels of this Bulletin

# Association of University and College Employees

LOCAL No. 1 (U.B.C.)

August 30, 1978

E. Sims  
Mediation Services Branch  
Ministry of Labour  
4211 Kingsway  
Burnaby, B.C.

Dear Mr. Sims;

It was decided at the membership meeting of August 29th to advise you of a development that occurred during the course of negotiations.

The facts are as follows: Jane Strudwick, Chairperson of the University Negotiating Committee, contacted a member of the bargaining unit, during working hours, both prior to and after the membership meeting of August 23rd. Having investigated the case the Executive ascertained that Jane Strudwick played an active role in soliciting information from the employee concerned in regards to the results of the above meeting.

The sentiments of the August 29th membership meeting were that this action was highly unethical and I was instructed to draw this matter to your attention.

Yours sincerely,

*Ann Hutchison*

Ann Hutchison  
President

cc: Jane Strudwick