

Tape #8, Side A. Convention Minutes.

- The next thing on the agenda is a
- motion to seek non union observers and at this point we don't have any, two observers from local #2 and that's all
 - (c) There's another non union person coming in. Who? (name mumbled)
 - Nancy; why don't we vote ^{if they are} as I'm expecting some TA's from U.B.C. to show up. Anybody else?
 - (c); There might be someone from the United Fishermen and Allied workers.
 - (c) ^{union} might be some ^{might be people from another} downtown workers union of downtown workers.
 - (Neil) I think it ^{would} ~~might~~ be inappropriate to have ^{just have} a blanket motion to seat anybody who ^{just walks into the room} ~~is~~ but a motion at the time, it would be better, a quick motion to seat people as they come into the room.
 - (c) that would be in order.
 - C; Motion for adoption of agenda moved by Linda, seconded by Sandy.
 - N; Are we also adopting time limits
 - C; no.
 - R; That at 4:30 we ~~hold~~ ^{open} nominations for Provincial ~~seps.~~ candidates. seconded by Linda
 - C; So then, an amendment that we open nominations for table officers at ~~also~~ 4:30. Discussion? Vote on the amendment. All those in favour? Opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries. Amendment carries.
 - Deriva?; Does that mean the (clothes)? ^{close} that thing on Sunday;
 - C; Yes.
 - D; At 3:30

- C; Is that O.K. by the motioner & seconder? (Yes. Yes.)
Then they open at 4:30 today and close at 3:30 tomorrow. Further discussion on the agenda? So will vote on the agenda as amended. All those in favour? Opposed? Abstentions. Carried as amended.

- C; The rules of order of convention are in the (doffa)? right behind the agenda. Can we have a motion to adopt the rules of order? Motion moved by Nancy, seconded by Michael. Any discussion? Do people ~~we~~ want time to read them? (yes). Are we ready to vote? All those in favour of adopting the rules of order. Opposed. Abstentions. Carried.

- C; Let's have a motion to adopt the minutes of the last convention? In the (doffa)? at the very back. Moved by Nancy seconded by Bob. Any discussion. Can we vote on the adoption of the minutes? All those in favour, opposed, abstentions. Carried.

- C; Next is the election of the tabulating committee. There are to be 3 elected. Open nominations.

Linda nominates - Fred Ludwig further nominations

Liz ✓ - ~~Pierre~~^{Neil} Bouchier

Sheila ✓ - Mick Maguire

Tabulating committee is in charge of doing the votes at the convention & throughout the year.

Further nominations? Any further nominations?

? nominates Sheila Perrault. Perrault.

further nominations

Liz nominates Nancy Wiggs

any further nominations? I'll go back & ask these people if they are willing to stand.

Nancy Wiggs - no

- C; Sheila - yes

Mick - no

Neil - yes

Fred - yes

- C; Nancy; Mick; Sheila + Nancy. Since there's 3 to be elected we should have an election.
 ^{can I change my mind? (yes)}
 ^{Melody} So we have 4 people willing to stand; Sheila, Fred, Mick, Sheila + Nancy.

- ?; How are we going to do this?

- ?; Use the tabulating committee from last year.

- Richard; one of the members to be elected is a member of the old tabulating committee. Perhaps the other 2 members if they are here, we could do it.

- Linda Oakman; Donna Wilcox is in Toronto.

- C; Richard could you conduct the vote? (yes). OK. You need some paper.

- Eva?; While the votes being conducted, perhaps we could go ahead + the tabulating person could go ahead + conduct the vote

- ?; How are we going to do this, vote for 1 person or 3 persons.

- C; You should vote for 3 persons.

- ?; We'll have to have 3 separate sheets.

- C; Richard should decide. Where did he go? (left room)

- Nancy; Why don't we go on with the agenda + let him decide + work it out. We'll have this item tabled for a moment + come back and he can let us know.

- C; Unless there's any objection we'll start with the executive report, and have the vote at some point after that. We're going to have the Vice president read the report that went

into the newsletter. We're going to have the secretary treasurer read it.

- Judy; In the newsletter, page 14. This is a summary of most of our activities throughout the year. This years ^{activities} objectives of AUCE provincial have been ^{largely} mostly followed through. ~~left~~ on issues & activities initiated before ~~at~~ and at our last convention.

(1) Student Work Programs; student jobs, study programs & summer work programs continue to a ~~problem~~ problem to AUCE as well as ^{for other} public sector unions. In September 1977 a group of PSEC representatives met with Melody Bud & Judy Wright (our rep) in Victoria with ^{officials} provincial ^{of provincial department} officials of labour to discuss the issue of student work programs. The PSEC representatives made it clear to the program administrators that they too were concerned with about student unemployment. They pointed out, ~~how~~ however, that their first concern ^{must be for} ~~was~~ the job security of ^{their} union members & the terms of contracts must be adhered to. Students were hired to do jobs not related to the (jurisdiction) of the union but unions would of course have ~~to~~ ^{no} say in the students terms of employment. If however the students were given union work, the unions wanted assurances from the program administrator that the terms of the contract would be respected. They were concerned that the students would not be replacing laid off union members where there were jobs that would normally be created by be reserved by government student works subsidy. For students who were to be doing union work, the unions wanted assurance that the students would become union members with all the

rights + obligations of union members. The unions were also concerned about the fact that in the previous year, very little notice was given them about the nature of the application ^{for} student summer jobs. The unions have been given very little notice to the task of reviewing applications made to the government about ^{proposed} those jobs. In some cases ~~but~~ because of lack of time to review each job description properly, the unions were forced to veto all or nearly all of the proposed jobs. This put the unions in the ~~unthought~~ ^{for} position of having to return to the (fate)? of these jobs when if there had been time, a possible solution may have been worked out with the employer. Lack of notice forced the unions, employers, government and students into an unnecessary ~~an~~ ^{no win} (?) situation. Therefore, the unions pressed that more notice be given in the future. Some unions found out that the employers had gone ahead & hired students without consultation with the unions. Some union locals had under time pressures, etc. allowed the hiring of students at much less the union rates. It was pointed out that this had violated existing contracts and that it also exploited students as cheap labour. The program administrators expressed sympathy for the unions' position. They said that the programs considered by them to be a subsidy to employers as well as incentive to create jobs for students. When we went there that ~~of~~ was the first that any of the unions had heard of this interpretation that had never been said before. The government could not give more than its flat rate of ~~\$50.~~ \$550.00 / per student for work study and not more than \$3.50 / hour per student for summer jobs.

They said that contracts should be respected by employers and if the contract rates were higher than the subsidy it was up to the employer to budget the difference. The unions requested that this interpretation be made clear to the employers because almost unanimously the unions were being told by employers that the rates being paid were the government rates. This put the unions in a difficult position and appeared the government approach to a flat low rate for its subsidies is defeating the purpose of the program. Someone suggested that a better approach might be to give the employer a lump sum from which the employer could create as many jobs as possible of a decent contract base rate. The program reps said they could only enforce working for the terms of the present program. Apparently, the quote "lump sum" option has been made available to employers this year but to what extent, I'm unable to report. The same ~~pro~~ problem of insufficient motives for proposed jobs of ~~1978~~ those of the 1978 program. The unions were also finding that their only recourse was through the grievance procedure when it was found students were doing union jobs but not given rights under contracts. Therefore, on March 28, 1978 a delegation of PSEC participants began that difficult (?) administrators. The unions felt that the administrators should be taking more responsibility ~~and~~ pursuant to programs ~~to~~ being administered properly. The unions made a suggestion of how to resolve this problem. The outline of the solution proposed is as follows; the union would draw any alleged violations to the attention of the program manager, that an investigation be carried out by ^{an} the appropriate person found by the program manager, at the complaint of the student the employer is told by the program

1
manager to cease + (disist) the violation. Put that in brackets because the way it was given to me it didn't have that in it. If the employer does not comply, funding for the program will be suspended. If the union does not agree with the investigators findings the union may then ^{presume to} make a grievance. No response has been given to the suggestion as of yet. More discussion will have to be had of on this issue when the response + suggestion is given to by the program administrator.

(2) Colleges + Institutes legislation bill; The B.C. College of Faculty Federation is in meeting with the support staff of B.C. Colleges + institutes formed a committee CILC to oppose the provincial governments bill 82, the new Colleges and institutes act. The bill ^{went} before the legislature in the fall of 1977 when the committee was formed. The bill represents a threat to the ^{college} faculty's rights to belong to a union under the terms existing under the B.C. labour code. The bill also abolishes the existing college councils which were originally created to give the community and college population, faculty and students, more direct say in the policies and administration of the colleges. The faculty wish the college (?) to be present at their meeting to discuss possible opposition to their bill and discuss possible mutual support. It was not clear by the wording of the bill ^{how} the legislation would affect staff members of colleges. But there is a fear that its wording ~~it~~ may have adverse affects ~~on~~ on non faculty staff as well. Judy Wright, Sid Strand + Melody Red attended ^{the first meeting for} AUCF. About a week after the formation of the faculty committee. CILC, a delegation of committee members, the support representation of staff unions met in Victoria with Pat Mc Ken,

~~of~~ ^{ministers} ~~ministry~~ of education and the ^{labour minister} ~~minister~~ of labour, Allan Williams. Neither Mr. ~~Williams~~ ^{Mc Keen} or Mr. ~~Mc Keen~~ ^{Williams} would recognize the justice of the ~~faculties~~ ^{faculties} concerns and the meeting had no effect on their positions. The ministers denied the bill disallowed faculties rights to belong to unions, with the ^{same} rights ~~of~~ as other unions even though the intent of the act was quite clear by the way it was written. Nor would the ministers admit ^{to} the fact that the ~~abolish~~ abolition of the college councils was a retrograde step in terms of college + community democracy. Unfortunately, CILC was formed a little late in the day as the bill just had its 3rd reading in the legislature. Later the same day, the delegation met with Dave Barrett + Rosemary Brown of the NDP to seek their support in opposing action taken under this legislation. Mr. Barrett pointed out to the delegation that the legislation had effectively passed but said that faculty should continue to oppose the implementation of the act. He said that the NDP would support them where they could. Since then CILC has not been active ~~and~~ at least staff leaders have not been called upon to support the ^{committee} ~~community~~ in any further action. The committee, however, served the purpose of bringing faculty + staff organizations closer together.

(3) The Colleges + Universities conference; November 1977, PSEC. (Public Sector of Employees Council - an organization where all public service unions of the province have representation on this council. The council doesn't have any authority over the unions. It's a voluntary organization and if any one union disagrees with

a decision taken by the council, one union can actually veto or not take ^{participate} in it. It's a vehicle for unions to get together to exchange information. A good mechanism to keep in touch with other public sector unions. Some belong to B.C. Fed, some don't. Melody Bud had a lot to do with getting it together.)

November 1977. PSEC with full ^{participation} support of AUCE provincial sponsored a conference for college + university staff ~~associations~~ organizations in the province. Delegations ^{ates} from staff unions locals and associations from nearly every college + university in B.C. were there. This conference was an opportunity for college + university union members to get to know one another better, to exchange information about themselves and to discuss areas of common ~~areas~~ concern such as Bill 82, the (44 or ^{AIB} ~~TD~~?) budget restrictions, student jobs programs, etc. It was an informational conference + many of the delegates felt the conference was worth while and an interesting opportunity to meet with one another. PSEC may sponsor other conferences of this nature in the future which felt that it was worthwhile. PSEC, AUCE

(4) PSEC, AUCE continues to have representation on the PSEC steering committee with Judy Wright as the provincial's representative on the committee. Although PSEC has not done much other than to organize the College's conference and ~~the~~ publish an informational ~~pro~~ pamphlet ^{which} was available. It is still a worthwhile opportunity for AUCE to find out what is happening on the public sector scene.

(5) The ^{Maternity leave} problem of AUCE #1 + #2 ^{legislation} maternity leave ^{provisions} is

of this situation is still with us. A more complete report is available in the ~~newsletter~~ the convention newsletter & will be presented at the convention. However, it is appropriate to mention here, that through the provincial ~~at~~ a cross local committee consisting of provincial reps and the two locals affected has been ~~has~~ formed to handle the question of maternity leave with regard to unemployment benefits ~~right away~~ regulations. The cost incurred by this situation will be according to provincial prosecution born 50% by the provincial and 50% by the two locals.

(6) Seminars ; two AUCE , ~~SOW~~ SORWOC seminars were held since last convention. The first was a stewards seminar held in the fall of 1977. There were participants from all AUCE locals + SORWOC. The seminar covered a lot of material. However, ^{it was found} with so many locals attending there was not enough time to ~~send~~ spend on the individual concerns of the locals. Later on in the year provincial executive had a long discussion on how to better utilize the resources of the provincial. One conclusion we agreed to was a seminar (?), in many cases, would be more effective if held on a local level with resource people from all locals attending. That way ^{the seminars} ~~it~~ would be made available to a greater number of people at the local level. The costs in most cases would be less and the seminar would be of more benefit to the local's ~~on~~ own particular concern. It was then decided that the next provincial responsible seminar would be a ~~seminar~~ on contracts contract seminar to be

held for the 3 lower mainland locals. Their contracts will ~~have~~^{be} expired in the near future and ^{whose} the ^{with} ^(?) ^{SO KWOC} participation. The seminar was held at the end of February & was very interesting & informative. Unfortunately, while every local had speakers attending, no new contract committee members from AUCE locals attended. This indicated that more thought had to be given to these seminars. Local 5 in Prince George was the first local to ~~request~~^{request} hold a "portable seminar". Its a relatively new local. It felt it could benefit most by having resource people from other AUCE locals conduct a stewards seminar for them. Ann Hutchinson & Jean Priest of local 1 and Rita ? of local 2 went with resource people to local 5 where apparently a ~~successful~~^{useful} seminar was held. This seminar seemed to indicate that the concept of portable seminars is effective. More will be held in the future at the request of locals.

(7) Financial Assistance; Provincial was able to assist locals financially this year. The maternity leave committee is an example of this. We were also able to give local 5 a \$2000 interest free loan to help cover costs incurred in negotiating this contract. Local 1 has found itself in a strike situation this spring honouring the picket lines of the ^{U.B.C.} operating engineers. The provincial made an interest free loan of \$6000 to local 1 to help ^{cover} pay the strike pay costs and a motion was passed by the executive that will allow the local to defer its payment of provincial per capita tax to help cover their costs in this situation. The local will make the request for dues deferral only if they find it necessary

to do so. So, they've deferred one payment so far. Local 2 is in a similar situation as Local 1's last year when an honour to Polly? Card? Unions picket lines for 7 weeks at SFU. Because ~~of~~ the burdens of the cost of supporting a strike and the cost of negotiating their own contract are heavy, provincial deferred Local 2's payment of per capita tax for several months. And as soon as the local was able to afford it, they paid it all back to the provincial. Local 3 in Nelson has found itself in a precarious position with regards to continuation as an AUCE local. Notre Dame University as such has been turned into ^{the} David Thompson University Center and is now being managed by Selkirk College. The staff at Selkirk College belong to CUPE. CUPE as the larger of the two union locals has applied to the labour ^{relations} board for what is ^{called} known as successor rights over AUCE local 3. ^{This means} The labour relations board can unilaterally decide that the staff at David Thompson University Center will belong to CUPE under the Selkirk contract. The Selkirk contract is weaker in nearly every respect to Local 3's, especially for clerical workers. Local 3's members wish to remain members of AUCE. Local 3, a small local, with few financial resources need a lawyer to represent them in Vancouver before the Labour Relations Board. The provincial found them a lawyer and ~~of~~ agreed to pay their legal fees required to fight CUPE's bid for successor rights. A more complete report of the situation will be given at the convention. Local 6, the TA's at SFU launched another organizing drive in the 1978

semester. Their attempts to sign up members were much more successful this time around. In March, the provincial executive passed a motion to pay the salaries of two TA's for one month so they could devote themselves fulltime to the organizing drive. It was felt that, after discussions with local C with the help of these organizers, the certification drive would probably succeed. The salaries of the two TA's for one month amounted to \$1400.00. The TA's have now collected the (LIB) for a representation vote on the basis of the (number of members)? they now have. The Provincial has ~~donated~~ made a few donations to other organizations this year. We had an appeal for a donation for a local of glassworkers in badysmith who had been locked out by their employer for several months. We donated \$50 to them. We also ~~gave~~ ^{made} a donation of \$200 to ()? Neighbourhood Pub workers of SORWOC, who had to go on strike for several weeks to get their first contract. They were successful in getting a contract from an extremely anti-union employer. A donation of \$50 was sent to Press Gang publishers to help cover the cost of their move to a new location where they would have better working conditions. Press Gang, a non-profit printing collective, had, when AUCE was new & without money, donated their labour & materials to us. We felt that Press Gang's efforts are worthwhile & we felt that a small donation ^{to them} when they needed it was a way for us ~~th~~ to thank them for the help they had given to us when we needed it. \$200 a month was donated to the United Bank Workers of SORWOC for 6 months. \$800 of

this donation occurred in the 1977/78 fiscal year ending in March. Last year's convention had approved this donation to SORWOC / UBW. The monthly donation which continues while a referendum vote was conducted of the AUCE membership to see if the donation should continue indefinitely. The referendum was eventually defeated by 6 votes so the monthly donation ceased to be given.

(8) Fraser Valley College; A unionized staff association at Fraser Valley College requested that AUCE send speakers to the College in January to tell them about AUCE. The Fraser Valley College staff of ~~unionizers~~ ^{unionizers} is, an independent association, affiliated to no one. They were concerned about the effect that Bill 82 might have on them, so they were interested in knowing more about our union and the possibility of joining AUCE or some other union. Melody Budd, Kathy Pike and Judy Wright went to the College and gave a meeting of staff members information about we are constituted. The staff association already had meetings with BCGEU and CUPE. We have not heard from the College since then. But they have not decided to join another union or not and may hear from them in the future.

One other thing I forgot to mention + it's not that important is that during last year the federal government put aside funds for trade unions to set up ^{so called} "harbour" education programs and this was something like 16¢, 60¢ a member if you were successful in your application. So, AUCE + SORWOC applied jointly for one

of these grants and we thought that we could sponsor the contract seminar with it. We didn't get it. It was really strange. What I discovered was that these programs, the guy I talked to said, that the bureaucrat down here wasn't even going to send it to Ottawa. Such big discussions because he was ^{afraid} ~~scared~~ we were going to talk ^{about} strategy and actually ^{have the} affect the trade union. (Tried to explain our position but it didn't work). I got a letter the other day and the program is going into its second year and ^{at} the next provincial executive meeting we may try it again. The things that are being sponsored are labour programs at SFU, Cap College. The Collegis & Universities seem to be doing really well. CLC got a bunch of money from the government for labour education, so they decided to put some money aside for independent unions.

C; Do any other executive members have comments to add? Or any of the delegates have questions? Can we have a motion to adopt the Provincial report? Segid seconded by Michael. Any discussion? All those in favour of adopting the Provincial executive report, opposed, abstentions

Richard; A point of information, can I clear up the voting for the ~~talking~~ ^{tabulating} thing?

C; Yes, I think this would be a good time.

Richard; At first we were going to do it with three individual pieces of paper with three names. I'd ~~just like to point out~~ It was pointed out to me that one person could vote 3 times and that would be contrary to intent. So, I was wondering if the convention would agree to one piece piece of paper with 3 names of it?

Do I need a motion for that?

C; You are conducting the vote.

Richard; My problem is I don't have any more paper.

?; We do in the back of our (dockets)?

C; So, what have you decided Richard?

Richard; One piece ... (no reply)

?; Could we have the names?

C; Yes, I'll give the names again. Sheila Perret, do you want to stand up, from local 4, Fred Ludwig from local 2, Mic Maguire, local 4 and Nancy Wiggs from local 1.

Will; Is it Mike or Mic?

C; Mic, so it's Fred, Sheila, Mic & Nancy

?; Could we have the first two again please?

C; Fred, Sheila, Mic & Nancy.

Will; Do we just use first names?

C; Yes, I think that would be easiest. Fred.

Fred; Yes, madam president or madame chairperson, I'm going to have to be leaving on Saturday & Sunday to get back to work at 2 o'clock. So, I hope this will not affect my work with the tabulating committee.

C; I think that would be alright. So the names are; Fred, Sheila, Mic & Nancy.

?; We need 3 right?

C; Yes, you write ~~down~~ ^{down} 3.

(Knock at door)

C; Do you want to get it?

C; Has everyone given Richard their vote? OK well carry on with the financial report & then after that

now that we've got ~~an~~ ^{a new} out of town local that explains the higher cost. Wage reimbursement is for time that people were brought off work & the union paid them for various things like International Women's day.

Melody and I only had 3 days together here in the office. It was really helpful. She got ^{some days off work at} the note of the Provincial to come down periodically to help me in the office. Attending seminars; that would actually explain the bulk of it, I think. So, (end of tape)

Tape # 8, Side B

Convention Minutes

Judy, and per capita tax and that's all the revenue coming in from that thing. That's the top figure. Those are all our assets. OK all the expenditures are listed down, that's the next figure. So the difference ^{between two} of those numbers gives you access of revenue ^{over} ~~over~~ of expenditure. And appropriation strike fund # 30, ^{so that} for a while Melody & I were ^{not} putting money into the strike fund because the locals, different locals were quite far behind and it was really difficult to calculate what was owed to the strike fund with the dues all over the lot, like local 2 wasn't able to pay, and other locals were paying it, so when they caught up we calculated the amount that should go into the strike fund & took it from the chequing account, where it had been & transferred it to the strike fund, which is the savings account. So that's where they appropriation of strike fund. It's just a bookkeeping thing.

Chairperson); How we calculated the strike fund was to take 25¢ for every \$2.00 of per capita tax and the problem with that is, last year that was quite alright, because everyone paid \$2. per capita tax. This year there are part time people that pay 25%. Now, we continued to calculate 25¢ for every \$2.00 because we did not have the list that would tell people who were part time from all the locals. So, what we need to do is talk to the Treasurers of the locals and ^{see if its possible to} ~~try to~~ get those lists. And then calculate.

Judy; So we have to know what each part time person pays to the Provincial. That's different because its 25%

the dues that

of what they pay to their local become provincials.

C; Yes. It may be unworkable, we haven't ^{quite} figured that out yet.

Judy; So anyway that's that and we don't have ~~the~~ ^{that} information and been just doing it on the basis of 25%.

C; And our constitution is a bit vague it just says, 25% of the per capita tax shall be deposited in the strike fund. So, ...

Judy; I personally don't think it adds up to ^{too} much money and don't think it makes much difference. What we've been doing is taking the total and taking 25% of ^{the total} it rather than breaking it down to who's part time and whose fulltime paying \$2.00. ... a total sum rather than by each individual. And I don't know how many part time people in the locals but I don't think it adds up to a tremendous amount of money.

A?; I don't know if we need a motion or anything but it sounds to me likes it's a lot easier ^{just} to take 25% per capita and that's just what the constitution says to do, no matter how much the actual per capita tax is, whether it's part-time or fulltime.

Judy; Yes, it's just that, like that's how Melody & I've been doing it, just for simplicities sake, part time people certainly do pay a little different. That's how I prefer to see it done. So, we only pay per capita tax or give the transfers recently. It was only recently, like with the convention coming up that I've gotten per capita tax to come up here because local 2 was able

to pay - we actually got the money. ^{Now you know what expropriation of strike fund is.} Then you take access of revenue or expenditures down the front, that is taking...

C; The main thing is that more money came in than went out. And the first total, access of revenue over expenditure is the absolute amount + then money is put into the strike fund. And the last figure is the actual money that we brought in this year and wasn't spent. So, we're \$3,914.00 ahead from our position last year. Neil?

Neil; I have ^{got} 4 questions. The first one is about a balance sheet, now, I'm not an expert on this but I thought balance sheets were supposed to balance. Now, we have a loan receiv... we're out by \$2000 and the loan receivable is \$2000 so I assume that's... then why isn't it in our liabilities then? I mean, if it's a loan receivable it's an asset + it's also liability in ~~the sense of~~ ^{its extent when} when it goes out.

Chair; page 2 and it's the difference ⁱⁿ of figures, the assets...

Neil; the strike fund balances.

Judy; let me explain this... (mumbling)

C; Neil... Richard.

Richard; It's added wrong, your \$8000 added to \$15,000 is \$23,000. It says \$21,000.

Judy; Wait a minute.

Nancy; Where are you Richard?

Richard; Here it says balance, end of year.

Nancy; Which page are you on?

E; (General confusion) There's no problem, it's added wrong.

Let me explain what he told me.

Neil; I can understand the explanation but I do think the least we could do is contact Winspear + Higgins and ask them when they do an audit, for which we pay, I'm sure, a ^{goodly} sum, that they could have it added & typed correctly. You see the figure in the middle of the page, \$21,135 should be \$23,135 as Richard just said. Now, I mean, I think that's really tacky.

C; And the thing is, this sheet is supposed to be looked over by his superiors.

Neil; I would like to make a motion that we do not handle our books through Winspear Higgins.

Wilf; I second that motion.

C; Could we have the motion a little later so that we can continue discussion on this report.

(All mutually agree)

Neil; I have 3 more questions.

C; I was wondering of asking you, the questions are due to the balance sheet, right?

Neil; No, actually I'm onto the statement of revenue and expenditure.

C; ^{We've already gone over that.} OK go ahead with your questions

Neil; This is not absolutely ~~to~~ related to this but I would like to know anyway, and I don't think it would be out of order to ask, what Winspear Higgins did charge for this particular one, I ^{assume} presume to Professional fees which we have recorded for 1978, \$612 is the last year's audit expenses, am I right? So, do you know?

C; They charged \$475 last year & the year before.

Judy; And they haven't billed us yet this year.

Neil; They haven't billed us yet this year?

Judy; No.

Neil; OK. Another question, when you were on the item Office, \$2025, you said that included office rent yet there's another item office rent.

Judy; Yes, when I reading down...

Neil; So we only paid \$900 office rent?

Judy; Yes, rent is only \$15/month.

Neil; So, I'm still a bit confused as to what's ^{exactly} under office.

Judy; (hum haw.)

?; Because in this one she's got the rent + office stuff together whereas in the other one it's broken down.

C; the 1977.

?; The one on the back of the newsletter is different than the one by the auditors. And I think she was reading from the one off the back of the newsletter.

Neil; Well when she was going through, she was going down page 3 which is what I'm looking at, statement of revenue + expenditures. and we have 3 items...

?; No, I think she was using this one because...

Judy; No I wasn't... I was using the two.

Neil; Well, is furniture included under equipment or under office?

Judy; It's under office.

Neil; (Was the furniture expense department...)

Judy; It wasn't that bad, two chairs, a table and a bookcase, for storing paper + junk in...

the chairs were \$30 each

Neil; Do you keep the books?

Judy; Yes.

Neil; Well, when you enter things into the account, office, what do you normally enter into ~~the~~ account office.

Judy; Account, office is broken down, more than that in the auditors report.

Neil; Can you show me where please?

Judy; In the back of the budget, back of the newsletter, office supplies, I put that together

Nancy; But you've already got printing + stationery. But what's office opposed to office equipment? Still what I don't know.

Judy; Office equipment is the typewriter, the copying machine, like that kind of stuff, fixed assets. The other stuff is paper, paper clips, things that are used on a daily basis.

Nancy; Then what's printing + stationery?

Judy; Printing + stationery is like the newsletter, referendum note things.

Nancy; So, OK, so printing + stationery means things that go to the membership + office means stuff that doesn't go to the membership, if we look at it really simplistically, I'm just wondering why there are 3 or 4 categories here, that's all.

Judy; OK paper + printing, like the newsletter, it's the paper used to print it on.

C; I think we're still on Neil's question. Do people who want to ask questions, put their hands up + I'll start

1

a speaker's list.

Neil; OK, I guess I ... I'm still not really sure ^{about} it and I wouldn't mind seeing a ~~further~~ ^{purge} report a little bit of a ^{further} break down on that. I find It's not that I find it (an outraged decent) or anything, it's just that I think ^{that} you should be prepared ^{to have} ~~with~~ that information just in case ~~at~~ anybody asks it, why this is split up like that.

Judy; OK, questions on office equipment + office rent, has that been answered?

Neil; No, not to my ~~self~~ satisfaction, I have to admit.

C; What we could do is bring a breakdown for tomorrow.

Neil; Sure. I have one other question. This is in revenue. ~~We have~~ under interest, we have \$88 interest. Is this as a result of putting our money into long term, high yield certificates so we don't have very much interest. It seems absolutely incredible to me that we could have this kind of revenue + \$88 worth of interest.

Judy; We were ~~actually~~ much lower ~~than~~ in the total year than actual running money, ~~money~~ actual cash on hand. Largely because local 2 ^{wasn't able to pay it's dues} ~~hadn't paid~~ for 1 months. We got the total amount in, finally, only, at the end of March. So, the actual cash, at one time we were down to zero. We actually over-wrote a couple of times. I couldn't get paid for a week or two. So, this is interest ...

C; This is interest on the chequing account. On page 2 the interest on the strike fund is \$879. Now I don't know why he didn't put it in the revenue at the top

here.

Neil; Well, I do, it should be under the strike fund. There's got to be a better way of handling this. OK, that's all.

C; Micheal did you have a question;

Micheal; I had 2 questions. One of them ~~was~~ been answered, I'd like to see a more detailed breakdown, perhaps tomorrow...

C; Of the office?

Michael; Well, actually, anything, travel as well. Just a bit more detail would be interesting + the other thing is I'm not clear, is office furniture under office equipment? (mumbling) No?

?; A desk or something is.

?; I don't think so. (mumbling)

Michael; I think it should be.

C; We'll find out tomorrow.

C, Michael do you have another question?

Michael, (mumble)

C, Linda?

Linda, I just want to know if at this time ^{or} we just discussing the financial report and when are we going to discuss the proposed budget for next year? Like, is that going to be discussed now. Are we going to pass the budget for next year at ~~that~~ ^{this} time? Or is this coming up later on in the convention, you know what I mean, like I want to find out whether we're just sort of like ~~th~~ looking... like finding out the auditors did do a very good job clear report or are we just sort of discussing the financial report from last year and asking all these questions with the view to approving the proposed budget for next year?

C, As far as I know we're going to go over the financial report & then the budget.

Linda; So at this time in the convention we're also going to pass the budget for next year.

C; Yes.

Linda; This is coming up too, so maybe we should break it down in two separate parts, like, look at the financial report & make sure everybody understands it and then look at the proposed budget for next year.

C, Yes, that's what we're going to do. OK Wilf.

Wilf; I have 2 questions, the first one is on page 1, Auditors Report, I see it's been signed by Winspear, Higgins, Stevenson & Co. but no name.

The person that did the audit, did not sign their name so, I don't think it's...

? ; Did he sign the original ?

? ; No. (mumbling)

Wilf; This isn't the original ?

Judy; No... (mumbling)

Wilf; And also in that same report, middle paragraph I don't go for at all.

C; Receipts as recorded, that paragraph? have not been verified?

Wilf; ~~Has~~ ^{Have} not ^{been} otherwise ~~been~~ verified by us.

Judy; He explained that to me, what ~~it means~~ that means is that the...

Wilf; It means ~~a~~ that they're gotten of the hook, as explained to me by my wife whose a certified bookkeeper.

Judy; Yeh, like the thing is because of the nature of the operation he can't audit all the ~~to~~ books of all the locals because the revenue comes from separate locals.

Wilf; No, they do it on ~~all~~ the ordinary ones too.

Judy; He can ~~to~~ verify the money we've got + how we've spent it but he can't go around + check all the books of all the locals. He doesn't know the fact they're (sending some money they've sent us)?

Wilf; That doesn't make it a proper audit.

Judy; OK we should hire one auditor to do all the books of all the locals.

Wilf; That's to make a proper audit, yeh.

Judy; Pardon

9 11
Will; That's the only way to make a proper audit. That's why they sign it like that. And I see on page 2, approved by the Provincial executive, does nobody have to sign that?

?; After its approved.

Will; No, it should be approved before its submitted, to the membership, right?

Nancy; No we approve it so they ^{can} sign it. This convention approves it & then ~~we~~ ^{they can't} sign it. They can't sign it without our permission.

Will; No, they're supposed to approve it before its brought to convention, according to my way of thinking, by 2 of the trustees. They should have gone over this before it was presented.

C; We don't have any trustees in the Provincial executive.

Will; You don't?

C; No. Sheila?

Sheila; The question I have is regarding the strike fund through the per capita tax. What happens in the case of part time employees where Provincial has seized a % of their dues paid to the local which could turn out to be less than 25¢? What does Provincial do about the strike fund, how do you proposition that?

Judy; Right now what we're doing, I explained that before, is, that is the difficulty now because with us right now because we don't know what the part time people send in, like what proportion of the dues that we get from the locals is part time dues.

how much each part time person has sent in.

Sheila; Well, when you get the list, what do you think you'll do? Do you think you'll get less than 25¢?

Judy; Good question.

C; Well, I would suggest that this convention have a motion, that, in the coming year try to find out if it's workable & if it is try to amend our constitution.

Linda; I would ^{just want} like to make a suggestion, maybe we can vote on this later on, ^{but} I would say, instead of ^{so much % of} going trying to go to all the figuring out of every temporary (da da da). I just think that for every \$2.00 the Provincial receives in per capita tax, 25¢ of every \$2.00 should go into the strike fund. And that's what they've been doing & that's... say a temporary gives only 24¢ / month ^{well if} you get 8 temporaries or something & they all... so then... I mean just do it on a flat... instead of trying to figure out 25% of 24¢ per temporary blah de blah de blah blah. And that would be my solution that 25¢ of every \$2.00 per capita tax be put to the strike fund.

C; ^{well,} I'd like just like to have an open discussion for now and at the end of that have motions come forward.

Linda; like I said, I'm not making a motion just a suggestion.

C; OK Tom's next.

Tom; Yes, Tom Hedekar, local 5, getting back to this audit business, I don't know how you feel about it but to

me when a chartered accountant makes an adding mistake, the guy has blown his credibility in my opinion. Now, to turn ~~at~~ around in view of that fact + pay these people a professional fee for a non-professional job doesn't quite sit right with me. I don't know how you feel about that but I just thought I'd throw that in.

C; Nancy?

Nancy; I really agree + further more I don't think it would be in order for this convention to accept an incorrect audit. I don't believe that we can vote to accept this ^{because its wrong} and we've found a mistake in it. Being an adding mistake or whatever it indicates that ^{the thing is} ~~its~~ incorrect. The most we could do is accept it pending the fact that he did it right. But I really do agree we've got to change auditors + if anyone knows any good auditors

C; Kathy Nancy, no Cathy?

Cathy; I was going to suggest more or less the same thing that we just continue to look at page 2 + have motions to do with the report which would include a motion to ... uh of non-acceptance I ^{presume} ~~assume~~ + then go on to the motions of the second, Linda was making.

C; Judy?

Judy; Yes, possibly ^{because} there's the question we shouldn't accept it but I thought, I personally would like to double~~check~~ check back with the auditor about why that's there if there's an explanation, there might be like it sounds funny but due to the facts that our

f

14

dues were coming in at strange times that we were having to take money from the chequing to the strike, there may be an explanation for it & I'd like to find out from him in fact if there is no not before you assume that there's no purpose for that number not being right, you know, what we think it should be.

Fred; C; Fred,

Judy; Because he is a good mathematician.

Fred; Yes, I go along with Judy that we should not reject this but table it for some future discussion.

C; Neil?

Neil; When you took the books to the auditor, did he ask you what type of audit you wanted, a light audit, a medium audit, a heavy audit?

Judy; He done our books everytime & he didn't ask me.

Neil; OK. This is a light audit and in the face of a light audit it is a correct audit, other than this minor problem that its wrong. The item, the 2nd paragraph of the auditor's report on page 1 is correct under the item of light audit and I do think ~~on~~ ^{that} our Association can get away with a light audit. I don't think our books are so complicated that they require even more than a light audit. However, that being beside the point, I do ... my question is will its disrupt the business of the 78/79 Provincial executive to table this, the approval of this audit? (General mumbling)

C; I think it is just something this convention will have to decide whether they will (table?)

Neil; Could I have a decision on that? Or on the opinion that it would disrupt because I feel if it will seriously disrupt the running of the executive or this provincial association that we are more or less

C; Why, don't we have a motion? Do you want to bring forward a motion?

Neil; I don't want to put forward a motion. No.

Nancy; Can you tell me what it would mean?

C; Bob's next you can go after.

Bob; Nancy can go ahead if she wishes.

Nancy; If we table this we'd have to get back together sometime to accept it or accept something else, right? If the convention accepts the audit, then the convention at some point would have to get back to accept something, technically. So, to that extent it would be disruptive because it wouldn't be until tomorrow. So I think ^{it's whether} people think that's valid in view of the fact that it's our money, ^{an} audit & stuff like that ^{or} whether they think it is (superfluous)?

C; I think that's correct. Bob's next.

Bob; I'm not sure if we're speaking along the same lines but referring to the minutes of last year's convention to see what we did at that time and there is no motion at last year's convention to accept the auditors ~~of~~ report. There was a motion, that the financial report as presented be adopted, I'll assume that this financial report included a, the auditor's report although it's not made clear.

There is another motion that was approved at last year's convention that I'd like to point out, & a direct question to the secretary-treasurer. And the motion was to next year's audit we have an interim audit. My question is, what does this mean & has it been done?

Judy; I just means we go over the books before first before it goes to the auditor. ... mumbling. It saves time & we know more about what's happened over the whole year.

Bob; So the audit that was approved by last year's convention was conducted by yourself & Melody Is that correct?

Judy; Yes, we went through

C; Segrid?

Segrid; I was just wondering if we cannot accept the audit on the basis it be corrected?

C; I'd like to say that on page 2 of our constitution the convention is to accept the auditor, pg 12 & it doesn't say anything about accepting the audit. The motion on the agenda is to accept the financial report. It's what's presented. So I just want to ask, do people have any questions as to regarding the balance sheet or we can we go on to have a motion regarding the auditors & the financial report? And then after that the budget.

Wily; I would like to make a motion if I may?

I move that we accept the financial report & reject the auditors statement.

C; I think that's confusing, what is the financial

report as ^{different} differs from the auditor's report.

Will, In my way of thinking he didn't do what he was supposed to, the auditor.

C, OK. Can I break it down?

Will, Go ahead.

C, So, the first one is to ...

Nancy, They are one & the same thing, there is no separation.

C, Yes, so can we have a clear motion from someone. Richard, do you have one?

Richard, Well, basically I feel that the 3rd paragraph of the auditor's report, pg. 1 says that, our finances are in agreement with the balance sheet & ... expenditures except for one addition. I move that the addition maybe corrected to state $23,935$ and then I further move that the auditor's report be accepted so that we can move on to further business.

~~Hinda~~ Hinda, I'll second that.
C, ~~So we~~ can we have that motion that the auditor's report be accepted with the correction of the addition & Hinda seconds. So the wording, is this OK

~~Now~~ by you Richard, that the auditor's report be accepted with the correction of the addition on pg 2

Richard, Yes.

C, Hinda seconds it. Now can we have a speakers list? Are there some points of order? No? OK. Start with Neil.

Neil, Just the understanding of this correction of the addition is the the correction will be done by the

auditors and not by us Is that correct?

C: Richard do you want to

Richard, Well, the auditor has stated here, that in his opinion the financial statement is presented fairly so if we correct that what's he going to say, bill us another \$200 because he's made a mathematical correction. I feel that it's within our rights to make this correction without going back to him and close it right there.

Neil, OK in that case I speak against the motion

C: Nancy?

Nancy, I agree, I think that if this motion to my understanding, if it's just that we make a penciled in correction on an audit, I'm really opposed to doing that, I could support it if the intent was that it go back to the auditor for correction. But I can't support it if it means that it gets penciled in. I don't think that it's proper.

C: Cathy

Cathy, I'm against the motion. I think we're thinking we can't proceed with any business because the convention has to approve it. From what Melody Rudd, the convention has to approve the reappointment of the auditors. OK that's another motion we can make but as to accepting this, what's the point of getting someone ^{body} to do something for you if they do it a crummy crumbly job and you then say we'll accept it. ^{we} you don't know what their explanation

for the error is, we don't know what they're going to say. then we're stuck with a motion that says accept it with a correction but what if they don't agree with that correction or what if it's not correct. So, I say we should simply not accept it. It says there on pg. 2, approved by the Provincial executive, so the executive, I could be wrong seems to me when we get a corrected audit, can't approve it. And the Convention should decide if we want to appoint Winpear Higgins etc. on the motion that is on the agenda.

C; squid, no. Tom

Tom; I was just going to add to that in that I think Judy mentioned she could check into it & that perhaps as Neil's pointed out a light audit and there is perhaps an explanation ~~why this~~ for this figure. It appears that we don't have a chartered accountant amongst us today to explain anything in the way of a financial report. So, perhaps we could work something out on that basis, we get an explanation and moved that for the time being we reject it. If that's the only avenue as Judy's pointed out we should investigate this before ~~we~~ we say it's a mistake.

C; Judy?

Judy; There's something ~~AA~~ nagging at me, he may have said ^{something} more about it. It's bothering me. You know I'm not an accountant and ~~I~~ nobody's quite capable. (mumble) So what I'd like

to see, is we don't have a motion to accept or reject we just... by not having a motion to accept or reject, we're just not accepting the report. So I really agree with Cathip's methods. That we maybe reject the auditors for next year. The format for example is ~~at~~ hard to understand and there's not enough explanation so maybe the auditor's in... The convention will continue to pay its bill etc. We're not going to hamstring the actual functioning of the provincial and will continue to go. So I think Cathip's solution is the best ~ I don't think Richard's idea is

C, bid?

bid, First of all I'd like to

for

bid; First of all I'd like to find out whether there would be any way of contacting him before tomorrow and verify if it is, I think it would be in order to defer this ~~to~~ vote until the end of the convention so that we'll have the chance to have discussion on it.

Secondly, I know a number of other institutions when they have an audit^{or} they request that the auditor come and be present when the report is presented so that ~~that~~ person can discuss what this means & what that means, why it was done this way, why it was done that way. It would have cleared up a lot of problems if this auditor could have been here. Oh, what it meant was this, and we wouldn't have had this whole long discussion. Thirdly, I think we should be looking at the kind of ways that headings are set down. They're awful vague & (double)? Perhaps, if whatever auditor we take we should be looking at for a clearer way of delineating the kind of heading & the kind of expenditure. So when you see office you know that means office furniture & when you see office stationery that was the paper used. Office equipment means the Gestetner, right now it's awful vague & makes it difficult to judge ~~for~~ where our money went & how much it compares to last year.

C; Anne is next, then Richard then Sandy.

Anne; My concern is, what position does this does a defeat of this motion, a rejection of the auditors report place us in between now & the next convention

C; You want an answer to that?

Anne; Yes,

?; This isnt exactly an answer but I dont see a motion to accept the auditors report. I see a motion to reappoint the auditors & a motion to accept the financial report. I could be wrong but isnt the financial report the report that the executive has presented, & the part that Judy has presented? and not acceptance or acceptance of the audit?

Nancy; We've got a motion on the floor.

C; Yes, there's a motion. I think ...

Nancy; What's the motion on the floor so we can speak?

C; Can you read the motion?

?; Yes, the motion is what you said "The auditors report be accepted with the correction of addition on page 2.

C; Just a minute. In answer to your question I think it would be no problem for the executive to carry on.

?; OK.

C; Richard

Richard; Basically my view is that there is no problem. I think Judy would have presented the problem in her figurings. From her bookkeeping

the correction of the addition on page 2

C; All those in favour, opposed, (abstentions), motion is defeated. Cathy?

Cathy; A motion that we do not reappoint the auditors, unless its out of order, and we simply skip it. I make a motion that somebody, or a committee be appointed to choose another auditor. I think that would be better. Maybe someone can approve my motion?

?; What's your motion?

Cathy; A motion that the executive choose another auditing company for the next convention.

?; You're moving that?

Cathy; Yes.

C; Neil seconds. As soon as Cathy gets it down, we'll read it one more time + have a speakers list.

?; Have we got a seconder.

C; Neil seconded.

Cathy; I move the provincial executive choose another auditor.

C; Neil?

Neil; OK. ~~It~~ We've been through it + it's obvious why that motion was made. But I did want to bring up one other point and that is that local #1 also has (Winspear) Higgins for () with the exception of the most recent audit + we found not only ~~did we~~ we were dissatisfied with the actual wording of their audit report but we found their prices were very, very much out of line.

the figures presented to us were in contradiction to the figures that we had. Now that's the problem, and mathematical addition is not the problem.

Now, I feel that we should be rid of Wenspear Higgins. Now if we're going to keep calling these guys up and be stuck with them next year.

I feel that we should, I say reject the auditors report if somebody could tell me ~~there's not a~~ ^{that there was another} problem there. I don't see another problem there

C; Sandy, Neil then Fred.

Sandy; I just wanted to ask Cathy to repeat the motion again.

Cathy; That the auditors report be accepted with the correction of the addition on page 2.

Sandy; OK, fine.

?; I speak against the motion. First because it's not necessarily clear that that addition, well 8.5 add up to 13 maybe a reason why it says 21. The reason could very well be the 2000. There's a note 5 that says that money, we don't have right now & we get it in 18 months. It seems to me the most logical, simple thing to do is for this convention to give the executive the authority to check that out, approve it as stated & that we go on with other business.

C; Neil

Neil; pass

C; Further discussion on the motion? Could you read the motion again & we'll vote on it

?; Mover that the auditors report be accepted with

We were quoted $\frac{1}{2}$ that price ^{at least} by 3 or 4 other auditors (. . .) and the amount of time they took on our audit was much in excess of what most auditors said they would take.

C, Further discussion? Question?

Ed, I'd like to make one quick point, which it might be convenient if we do use the same auditors as local 1 and as the other locals, if possible.

Nancy, That's out of order anyway.

C, OK. Will have the motion read one more time & vote on it.

Cathy, ^{How} That the provincial executive choose another auditor.

C, All those in favour, opposed, abstentions. Motion carried. Richard.

Richard, I have another motion that the provincial executive in choosing a new auditor ask the Public Service Employees' ~~Council~~ Council who they retain as an auditor & they might phone other unions in the lower mainland as well.

?; Why don't you ~~suggest~~ just make that a motion. I don't think you need a motion.

C, I'd just like to point out say that they don't have an auditor at this point. ~~to~~

Richard; No I mean the unions who are members.

? Don't make it a motion.

C, Is there a seconder for this motion?

?; I could record in the minutes that a suggestion was made.

C; Are there any objections to having that as a

suggestion?

? ; Would you mind repeating the suggestion?

Richard, The secretary treasurer ~~has~~ ask the member unions of the PSCC who they have as an auditor.

C, Sandy.

Sandy, I just want to make a point of order, I think when someone calls a question the Chair is supposed to call anyone on the speakers list after that has to wait until the Chair calls a vote on whether people are ready to vote on the matter. And if that's voted down you can continue the debate. But its just for future methods.

C, From my point of view it was a toss up whether Linda said the question or bid put his hand up. Who did it first, right?

Sandy; I'm not challenging the chair, I'm just saying for future method.

C, Sure, OK, do we have some more motions for the financial report? Judy?

Judy; Originally I was going to make a motion to accept the financial report, but with all these hassles, what I'd like to do is defer acceptance of the financial report, no defer discussion on the financial report until tomorrow, again.

THE END