

## MERGER COMMITTEE FINAL REPORT

### Recommendation

In April of 1984, after the membership had decided to leave the AUCE Provincial and merge with a larger union, an ad hoc Merger Committee was struck at a general membership meeting. The Committee was to consider the various options available to us, conduct whatever meetings it felt necessary, and return to the membership with a recommendation. We considered the three options that were given to AUCE in 1980 by the Canadian Labour Congress: the OTEU, the BCGEU and CUPE. In addition we considered two independent (non-CLC) unions put forward by the membership: the VMREU and the HEU. After careful consideration, the Committee recommends to the membership that we enter into a two-year service contract with the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE). A discussion of the other options investigated follows at the end of this report.

### Service Contract with CUPE

A service contract with CUPE will allow us to operate as if we were a CUPE local for two years, at the end of which time we can decide whether to officially become a local of CUPE, or to return to the status quo. During those two years we would pay the full CUPE per capita (\$11.25 per full-time member per month), and enjoy all of the services provided to CUPE locals — legal assistance and research of the kind we now obtain from lawyers and professional researchers, education of our stewards and committee members, assistance with public relations, access to the larger resource and political lobbying arms of the trade union movement (BC Fed, CLC) and, finally, access to a large strike fund.

The Merger Committee, or its representatives, have met repeatedly with Joe Denofreo, who is currently the staff representative assigned to CUPE locals 116 and 2278 on campus, and would likely be our staff rep if we decided in favour of a CUPE merger. In addition, we have met formally with the CUPE Regional Director (Len Stair) and the Director of Organizing and Servicing (Pascal Ingenito) and, on another occasion, with the Regional Director and the Assistant Director of Organizing and Servicing (Barrie Davis). (There have also been informal discussions with executive members of several CUPE locals.)

A tentative service contract has been negotiated with CUPE. The contract would give us all of the services provided to CUPE locals, full access to the CUPE defense fund, and voting representation at the various levels of the organization. The contract would also allow for a rebate of \$35,000 on our annual per capita to CUPE. This amount is meant to help us pay the wages of our own office staff.

## Funding

In May of this year, before the Merger Committee was struck, the AUCE Local One Executive decided that a dues increase was necessary for the maintenance, and hopefully the improvement, of our current operation (see the May, 1984 newsletter). It is our proposal that such a dues increase be put to referendum ballot, and that the added revenue be used to help pay our CUPE per capita. The question of merging with CUPE would be on the same ballot. It is clear, however, that even with that additional revenue, some other measures will be necessary in order to make affiliation with CUPE possible.

There are certain savings arising from a service contract with CUPE. The contract would provide for a \$35,000 annual rebate, as mentioned above. We would not need to spend as much in the areas of legal, research and educational services since these would be provided to some extent by CUPE. We will also no longer have to put 10% of our dues into the AUCE strike fund. Nevertheless, we would still have an annual short-fall if we attempted to maintain our current operation as is. It is our proposal that over the two years of the service contract we cut back our local expenses to the point where we can operate satisfactorily on the revenue available. This could be done gradually, and carefully, if we use our current strike fund to cover some of the transitional deficit. We propose cutting back eventually to two full time officers and one half-time clerical worker. A full financial projection addressing this proposal, and covering the two year period of the service contract, is attached.

## Rationale

The Merger Committee believes that the time is over-ripe for the local to join a large public-sector union, and thus gain access to the kinds of resources necessary to ensure our future well-being and growth. As a public sector union caught in a rapidly changing political context, we are faced with more than just our immediate employer. What we face, more and more, is a concerted attack on the public sector. As we learned last year, when the very legislative basis of public sector labour relations in the province came under attack, there is very little that one isolated union local can do on its own when the problem is greater than one isolated intransigent management. In terms of our own specific interests, we have much to gain from the organized efforts of trade unions representing the education sector. We also worry that continued isolation from the trade union movement will weaken our ability to negotiate (a big strike fund and the support of other unions would help!), and leave us vulnerable to union-busting tactics on the part of management (lock-outs, expensive arbitrations).

The specific reasons we have decided to recommend CUPE are outlined on the following pages.

1. Local autonomy. CUPE is unique in that it somehow has managed to develop into a massive national union, and at the same time maintain an unusual degree of local autonomy. CUPE is really a mosaic of individual locals, each with their own personality and varying degrees of independence. In some, usually small, locals the CUPE staff reps handle grievances and contract negotiations. But any local can handle as much of its own servicing as it wants. Everyone we spoke to seems to be proud of this structure. They admit that it leads to a certain amount of inefficiency and confusion, but the locals themselves seem to be fiercely protective of their autonomy, and it is unlikely that CUPE will become more centralized and less democratic. We feel that this structure would allow us to maintain the kind of union local we now have, while at the same time gaining the benefits of membership in a powerful national union (over a quarter of a million members).

In CUPE we would have the benefit of a professional staff rep with a high degree of experience and expertise, but we would not be dominated by the staff rep, which is something that does happen in some unions. We would still be running our own show. The staff rep could be included or excluded to the degree that we wished. Obviously much would depend on the individual staff rep that we were assigned, and on the relationship that we developed with that person. This is necessarily an unknown factor, but we are optimistic, and have been impressed by what other campus CUPE locals have had to say about their rep. We expect that this person, Joe Denofreo, would also be our rep, and we have already established a good rapport with him. The staff reps do not seem to be over-committed — there are about 20 to 25 staff reps in the province, and each of them services about 2,500 to 3,000 members.

2. Services. CUPE offers a full range of services in the areas of research, legal assistance, education and public relations.

Research. There are national and regional research officers in the areas of contract negotiations, job evaluation, benefits and pensions, technological change, arbitration and labour law, and health and safety. It should be possible for us to get thorough research, and hopefully access to more information than is currently possible since our per capita tax pays for these services. In most of these areas we currently pay for a certain amount of research done by a lawyer or a professional researcher.

Education. Education for union members is offered in the areas of shop steward training, job evaluation, contract negotiations, executive officer training, parliamentary procedure, labour law, grievance and arbitration, women's issues, local communications (newsletter production), public relations, benefits, technological change, and health and safety. Special course could be arranged within the local (we would pay only the cost of booking people off work if necessary). Weekend and week-long courses are

available, including an annual school at Naramata. CUPE also offers a 6-level certificate program, which culminates in an eight-week residential program at the Labour College of Canada (CLC). As well as scholarships to the Labour College, where courses are taught at first-year university level, we would have access to scholarships to the annual CLC Winter School at Harrison.

Legal assistance. CUPE staff reps are fully trained and experienced in the area of arbitration. We would be able to use our staff rep as counsel in arbitration — something we now pay a lawyer to do. We would also have access to their legal department in Ottawa (three lawyers), and would be able to use CUPE lawyers in situations where we could demonstrate that the particular case was precedent-setting — ie. that a win would be beneficial to other CUPE locals or to the trade union movement in general. We would also have access to the defense fund in extraordinary situations — for example, where we could demonstrate that management was trying to break the local by forcing us to go to arbitration on every issue. There is a likelihood that the BC office of CUPE will have an in-house lawyer in the near future. We would also be perfectly free to hire our own lawyer whenever we felt the situation merited it.

Public relations. The public relations department of CUPE would be of some assistance to us when we felt it necessary to go public with our complaints or, for example, to produce a leaflet to distribute to our own members or to the University community. Full scale public relations campaigns can be mounted if necessary, and they are on a 50/50 cost sharing basis, CUPE's half of the cost coming out of the defense fund.

Publications. There is a constant flow of information from CUPE to its local officers and members. Several newsletters and journals are published regularly, each aimed at different needs within the Union. These are useful for keeping abreast of recent developments in all areas of interest to trade unions. Articles of special interest could be reproduced in our own local newsletter.

3. Defense fund. The defense fund would pay \$75 per week to each member after the tenth day of a strike. The CUPE Division will supplement this — ie. if we decided to belong to the Division (an added per capita cost). There is currently between \$15-20 million in the fund. Recent changes in the administration of the fund attempt to ensure that it does not drop below \$10 million as it did a few years ago. The fund can be used, as already indicated, for some purposes other than a strike. In order to qualify to use the defense fund for strike pay, the only condition would be that we were on strike and a proper vote had been taken. The actual decision to strike would be entirely our own, as it is now.

4. Women's issues. The Women's Committee of the BC Division of CUPE was established eleven years ago. It was probably the first union women's committee in the province, and definitely the first CUPE women's committee in all of Canada. The Committee has the right to submit resolutions to the CUPE Convention. Probably the most important of such resolutions was in 1980 when a resolution was passed at Convention that the equalization of base rates would be a major issue in all CUPE collective bargaining. This subsequently became an issue in the majority of CUPE local negotiations (the degree of local autonomy in CUPE would prevent such a resolution being imposed absolutely). Equalizing the base rates means bringing the entry level rates of pay for clerical and labourer positions into line with each other. This has the result of equalizing the pay rates all the way up through the classification schedule, and virtually amounts to equal pay for work of equal value. CUPE in BC was quick to take the issue to their bargaining tables, and managed to achieve their objective in about 14 locals throughout the province, and to go some distance toward achieving it in all CUPE locals. This was a major issue in the Lower Mainland municipal strike of 1980. Unfortunately, the Compensation Stabilization Program of 1982 — extended indefinitely in 1983 — has made more progress in this direction almost impossible.

CUPE has an affirmative action policy, recommending that affirmative action hiring programs be negotiated into CUPE contracts. Such a program has been introduced within the Union itself — ie. in the hiring and promotion of CUPE staff.

There are Women's Committees in every province now, and they continue the work of pushing for women's issues to be brought to the bargaining table. Sexual harassments articles have been negotiated in many locals. Parental leave is another area that is being promoted, and has been achieved in some locals. A whole set of standards for bargaining language on technological change has been developed, and CUPE has been successful in bargaining clauses that allow pregnant women release from VDT work. Child care is another issue of concern, and work-site child care has been negotiated in Ontario.

CUPE has a National Task Force on Women, which concentrates largely on educating women within the Union, on aiding women to become more active within CUPE itself. The Task Force has been responsible for special conferences, and courses on women's issues. It is chaired by a BC woman, Maxine Zurbrigg and its members are drawn from the provincial divisions, with representation from every province, and in addition from every department within the Union itself.

CUPE develops and institutes at Convention policies on social issues not related to collective bargaining. CUPE has policy statements on such issues as abortion and pornography. CUPE is also active in making representation to various Federal and Provincial

task forces and commissions. For instance, CUPE made submissions from both the BC and National offices to the recently concluded Federal Task Force on Child Care.

Half of the CUPE membership are women, and CUPE has a full-time equal opportunities officer (Cynthia Wishart).

5. Education sector. CUPE represents a large part of the education sector workers in the province, and across the country. This includes many universities. In BC, CUPE has locals at UVIC and UBC, as well as at several community colleges. We feel that through CUPE we will have easier access to information about other unions in post-secondary educational institutions, and increased opportunity for contact with other trade unionists who have similar problems and similar goals. Because of the large number of education sector workers it represents, CUPE is also likely to be well attuned to our needs. For example, CUPE produces and regularly updates a SALAD (System for the Analysis of Labour Agreement Data) comparing contract clauses and wages across all CUPE locals, with further breakdowns by sector. So we could find out very quickly what contract articles, and what wages are current in a couple of dozen universities across Canada, and for CUPE-represented clerical workers in general.

6. Affiliation. Belonging to CUPE would give us immediate affiliation to the Canadian Labour Congress (CLC), and allow us to affiliate to the BC Federation of Labour (BC Fed) and the Vancouver District Labour Council. Both of the last two would require us to pay an additional per capita tax amounting to about \$1.00 altogether. Membership in these bodies would increase our access to research and information, education, and the support of other trade unions. Membership in Operation Solidarity has already given us a taste of how useful this can be. The major function of these bodies is to coordinate the struggles of the trade union movement in general, and to deal with the various levels of government in the interest of the trade unions.

7. CUPE's structure. The biennial Convention is the ruling body of the Union (we would have 5 delegates). A 17-member Executive Board elected at Convention governs the Union between conventions, and meets at least four times a year. Only two members of the Board, the President and the Secretary Treasurer, are full-time with the Union. A smaller committee, the National Executive Committee, meets twice between Board meetings. Regionally, the Union also has Provincial Divisions and District Councils, but membership in these bodies is optional for the locals, and also involves an additional per capita tax.

8. CUPE at UBC. There are already two CUPE locals on campus. Our relationship with these locals is fairly good at the moment. We should be working closely together and giving thought to each other's interests. Our becoming a CUPE local would hopefully draw the three locals more closely together, and possibility of coordinated bargaining on certain issues (wages!) is attractive. All three locals would remain autonomous, but the possibility of a closer informal, or even formal, relationship would be to our advantage.

9. The service contract. The willingness of CUPE to offer us a two-year service trial period went a long way to persuading us. This gives us a good long time to assess the actual value to us of such a merger, and allows us the luxury of changing our minds if we discover that CUPE is not what we thought it was. At the end of the two years we could become a chartered CUPE local, or return to our present status as an independent, non-affiliated union.

---

Report on the other options investigated

OTEU. Members of the Committee, and the AUCE office staff, met frequently on an informal basis with Bert Mitchell, staff rep for OTEU Local 15. Local 15 has three small bargaining units on campus. The Committee itself met formally with Mr. Mitchell, and also with Ann Harvey, the President of OTEU's other BC Local (378).

The Office and Technical Employees Union is a large international union. There are about 70 locals in Canada, but at this point only two in BC. If we joined we could become part of either of the existing locals, but we would more likely decide to enter as a third autonomous local. As such we would be able to retain our present structure intact, and our relationship to the other locals would be fraternal (sororal?). The combined membership of the three locals would be around 10,000, which is close to half the Canadian total.

We were assured by both locals that there is no interference in local matters by the international. All funds from Canadian per capita dues are banked in Canada. There is one international rep in Western Canada, and that person is essentially responsible for organizing new units. Locals have one representative on the board of the international, and an international convention is held once every three years. The international also holds educational conferences annually.

The governing body of the Union is, as in most unions, the Convention. A Canadian Convention is held every two years. Between Conventions, the governing body in Canada is the Canadian Consultative Committee (the Canadian Director, four vice presidents

and seven regional officers).

If we affiliated through a separate charter, as we would probably do, we would pay \$2.75 monthly per capita to the international. On top of that we would have to pay \$.50 per capita to the CLC and a similar per capita to the BC Fed (CLC is mandatory, BC Fed is optional).

The defense fund would be available to us only for the purpose of strike pay. We would be able to draw \$35 per member per week after two weeks. The only condition would be that a strike vote had been taken, and proper notice given. The locals we talked to told us that there has never been any problem drawing on the strike fund in the event of a strike. We would undoubtedly want to maintain our own local strike fund to bring the \$35 up to a more reasonable amount.

At the moment there are virtually no services available through the OTEU — the locals are entirely responsible for their own servicing. A Western Regional Council is being established, and it would be responsible for some servicing of the locals. That body will have two or three staff people, one paid by the international who would be responsible for organizing, and for providing research and educational seminars. The other one or two staff would be responsible for helping with servicing the locals (grievances, arbitrations, negotiations). If there is one staff person, we would pay an additional \$.50 per capita to the Council, if there are two the per capita would be \$1.00.

It is our feeling that a merger with OTEU would really only accomplish one objective, and that is our entry into the 'house of labour' — it would allow us affiliation to the CLC, BC Fed, etc., and the support of our sister locals. The defense fund would certainly be an improvement on what we have now and, the cost of affiliation to the OTEU being as low as it is, we could still maintain a strike fund of our own. In OTEU we would have a lot of influence on the organization, at least provincially, and would be able to play a role in the development of the Regional Council. It could be exciting, but we feel that CUPE has more to offer.

BCGEU. The BCGEU is now the largest union in the province. They have a master agreement which is negotiated with the government (through the GERB). This agreement covers the majority of their members. In addition to this group, the BCGEU has a large number of small bargaining units which have their own contracts. A few years ago, these small locals became sub-locals, grouped together into larger units now constituting locals of the BCGEU. There was some resistance to this move as it tended to decrease the autonomy of the individual bargaining units. If we were to merge with the BCGEU we would become a sub-local of Local 59 (support



staff in colleges). We would still have our own bargaining unit, and our own collective agreement. The Local would act as a coordinating body for BCGEU bargaining units in the post-secondary education sector.

We made our decision regarding the BCGEU before actually holding any formal discussions with their administrative directors. It appeared, from informal discussions, very unlikely that we would be able to maintain, within the BCGEU, anything like our current structure — ie. full-time officers, the union office itself. Currently no BCGEU locals or sub-locals have such an arrangement. The maintenance of our structure, of our identity, was important enough to the Committee that we did not pursue our discussions with the BCGEU beyond informal talks with the Membership Secretary, and the Assistant Director. We found the few local executive members who we approached unwilling to give us very much information, and we were always referred to headquarters. The few people that we spoke with did seem satisfied with their union.

In many ways the BCGEU is a strong, effective union. The staff are very highly trained and competent. The BCGEU waged a long struggle to achieve public sector bargaining rights in the province, and all provincial public sector unions owe them their support. However, we felt that the structure of the BCGEU is too incompatible with what we have been used to. The structure is top-heavy, and the power flows for the most part from the top down. We feel that within CUPE, even though it is the country's largest union, there is less bureaucracy and greater democracy.

VMREU. The VMREU 'represents...clerical, technical, professional, administrative and support employees of the City of Vancouver, its boards and regional boards, and of other public bodies within the ...Lower Mainland.' The VMREU has around 5,000 members, and in terms of the kind of work done is reasonably compatible with AUCE. The Union is divided into thirteen bargaining units, all serviced by a central office and staff (three staff reps and one business manager). They are currently attempting to change their structure in order to accommodate the affiliation of other locals such as us. We were assured that if we came into the VMREU we would be able to maintain our own structure pretty much as is. The proposed changes to their structure are not yet implemented, and there could be room for negotiation. These changes are as follows:

The VMREU, as it currently exists, would constitute one local. Other locals would be allowed to affiliate. There would be an Executive Council, elected at convention, with proportional representation from all locals. Each local would have its own executive, and its own bylaws. There would be a provision in the constitution allowing locals to be put under trusteeship, if their members so decided in referendum, or to withdraw from

the Union altogether, also to be decided by referendum. There would be an annual Convention. All locals would pay a per capita amount to the Union, and then be reimbursed the amount necessary for the administration of the local, the amount of the per capita and the reimbursement to be established at Convention. The locals could charge their members a greater amount in dues than the per capita paid to the Union, if circumstances required it. There may be centralized support services, but essentially the locals would be responsible for their own servicing. The Union would be responsible for 'administration of finances, Executive Council expenses, defense fund, Member's Voice (newsletter), steward's education, P.R., etc.'

The majority of the Committee felt that it would be a mistake to affiliate with an organization more or less similar to the one we just left. The VMREU is an 'independent' union, and hence attractive to those members of the Committee who would like to see AUCE remain independent. Independence in this instance means non-affiliation to the CLC and the BC Fed. The majority of the Committee feel that such affiliation is paramount, and in fact a large part of the purpose of this whole exercise. The VMREU, like the AUCE Provincial, is not allowed to affiliate to the CLC and the BC Fed because of a jurisdictional problem. To affiliate to these labour bodies the VMREU would have to become part of CUPE.

HEU. The Hospital Employees Union is a large union representing mainly hospital workers in BC. Dues (1.2% of gross income) cover servicing from and HEU rep, educational courses for shop stewards, grievance processing and strike pay. We did not find out exactly how AUCE could fit into the HEU structure, or the full extent of services available, because we did not have the opportunity of meeting with them to discuss a merger. We wrote to them and spoke with their organizer but, largely because they were involved in a jurisdictional dispute with CUPE, they did not seem anxious to hold formal discussions with us. Subsequently it was announced, at the BC Fed Convention, that HEU has come to a tentative agreement with CUPE and has joined the CLC and the Fed.

---



**association of university and college employees**

November 30, 1984

Dear Member,

Re: Merger & Local Dues Increase

It is important that you take some time and read the following report. The decisions which you will be asked to make in the new year will be important to your future on campus and our future as a Union facing an uphill struggle.

It is difficult for the Union Executive to come to the membership asking for a dues increase. We understand that many of you have felt the pains of a monetary freeze. We did not see our increments this July and we are faced, currently, with a difficult set of negotiations. The Union, by necessity, is faced with higher costs to simply defend those benefits in our contract that we currently enjoy. If we falter in that defense we stand to lose a great deal more than a wage increase. The Union may find itself in a fight to maintain our job security and our lay off provisions. Many members do not realize the security the contract provides them until the issue of layoffs rears its nasty head. I doubt that many would argue that we must keep our jobs even if it means that we make fewer gains this year in negotiations.

Auce Local 1 has much to be proud of. We recently won a very difficult arbitration which resulted in 1150 of our members regaining a day's pay. The cost involved in that case exceeded \$12,000.00 (or almost one month's dues income to the local). We had to spend \$12,000.00 to see that approximately \$75,000.00 was returned to you.

Auce currently has several arbitrations pending which could have very positive ramifications for several hundred of our members. Each of these cases costs us dearly, but they move us forward and we slowly gain ground. Each win for the Union makes our working life more pleasant, secure and rewarding. The Union Office staff recently lunched with one of our members who celebrated her 25th year on staff. She spent a good deal of time telling us just how much her working life has been enhanced since our Union began ten years ago. That afternoon reaffirmed our belief that we have come far and that we cannot afford to jeopardize that which we have struggled for.

AUCE has not raised its dues in three years and our costs have risen steadily. One need only compare the fees we paid to lawyers and arbitrators in 1983 to the amounts paid in 1984 to realize that it is time to face the issue of an increase. The need goes beyond the traditional sense, in that present legislation allows our employer even more latitude to erode our security and threaten large scale down-sizing of our membership. It is easily foreseeable that we will be engaged in even more legal issues in the future.

It was mentioned earlier that there were two subcommittees appointed from within the Executive. The second subcommittee was to conduct a job audit of the functions and services currently rendered by the local union officers. They were to identify those duties which are vital to the local and those that could be transferred to our computer once it is in place. The Executive was well aware that a merge with a larger union would financially necessitate some sacrifice at the local level. While the committee was hesitant to recommend any loss of full time paid staff, it became clear, upon further reflection, that a sacrifice would be needed if we were to move towards a serious merge. It is the committee's firm opinion that if the membership approves a merge, our "phase out" period would be gradual and frequently reviewed. It was felt that some of our current revenue held in the strike fund could be used to cover the transition.

Back to the issue of a dues increase. As you will note from the report attached, the proposal that will be put before you will be to change the current dues payable from \$12.00 per month for full time people to \$20.00 per month. The change for part time employees would be from \$5.25 to \$10.00 per month. While the increase seems substantial, in reality it would bring our dues closer in line with dues paid by most other unions. Many of the major unions are on a percentage formula of 1.5% of gross income or double the employee's hourly rate. Others have flat rates of in excess of \$20.00 plus a more than nominal initiation fee. The proposal, while appearing excessive, really insures that we protect the status quo.

A close analysis of the budget sheet attached will demonstrate that we have currently had to spend in excess of our income in order to remain viable. Even without the question of a merge, it is clear that we would need to come to the membership on the issue of an increase. We felt that we should be reasonably looking at an amount which would see us through a few years so as to avoid coming back to you in a year or two's time. Thus we arrived at the following figures.

For those of you who are not aware, Union dues are tax deductible at year end. As such, the "outlay" does not represent as significant an expense as what may first appear. Our dues formula represents an insurance policy on our livelihood and are dollars well spent. Please consider this issue carefully when making your decision.

In closing, please spend some time reading the rest of this report and come to our Union meeting of December 13, 1984. We welcome your questions and hope to answer them to your satisfaction.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Executive  
by Fairleigh Wettig, President, AUCE Local 1



# association of university and college employees

The following report is respectfully submitted by the Budget Subcommittee of the Executive of Auca Local 1. Our Committee was directed to provide a full financial report on the status of the Union's income and expenses during the past two years as well as a projection for income and expenses for 1985. The projection for 1985 has been based on two assumptions; the first, that our local would merge with CUPE and the second, that the membership would approve a new dues formula. The dues formula upon which the following figures are based is as follows: \$20.00 per month for full time members and \$10.00 per month for part time members.

Further, our calculations are based upon a current membership of 1184 full time members and 198 part time members.

## New Dues Formula: (Proposed)

1184 members X \$20.00 per month = \$23,680.00  
 198 members X \$10.00 per month = 1,980.00  
 Total monthly income: \$25,660.00  
 \$25,660.00 X 12 months (annual) = \$307,920.00

The figure \$307,920.00 is the projected annual income for the local for 1985 and appears in that column below.

Per Capita assessment due to CUPE should we merge, is \$11.25 per month for full time members and \$6.65 per month for part time members.

## Statement of Income and Expenses:

	1983	1984	Budget for 1985
<b>Income and Revenue:</b>	\$ 205,616.00	\$ 190,729.50 *	\$ 307,920.00
<b>Expenditures:</b>		Balance 1983: + 21,534.67	Balance 1984: + 8,239.56
		\$ 212,264.17	\$ 316,159.56
1. Officers' Salaries (Gross)	67,017.00	70,945.56 *	55,000.00**
2. Receiver General Employer's contribution Officers	2,935.06	3,107.81 *	
3. UBC Benefits Employer's contribution Officers	1,782.83	3,234.42 *	
4. Secretarial Support Gross Salary	9,297.57	19,140.00 *	10,000.00**
5. Receiver General Employer's contribution secretary	427.52	924.91 *	
6. UBC Benefits Employer's contribution secretary	52.32	188.61 *	
7. Reimbursed Wages: Union Committee members	11,118.21	10,000.00 *	10,000.00
8. UBC Benefits Payable on behalf members on LOA	3,947.38	5,750.00 *	5,750.00
9. Miscellaneous Wages	0.00	560.00	560.00
10. WCB Annual Assessment	176.32	215.06	215.06
11. Office Lease	1.00	3,301.00	4,800.00
12. Utilities	0.00	480.00 *	1,200.00
13. Telephone & Telegrams	2,090.49	3,100.00 *	3,100.00
14. Office Insurance	498.00	567.00	567.00
15. Auditors Fees	1,085.10	1,100.00	1,150.00
16. Stationery & Supplies	2,142.91	2,600.00 *	2,600.00
17. Equipment rental, repair purchases & furniture	5,373.03	4,020.00 *	3,800.00
18. Office Maintenance & renovations	205.94	3,000.00 *	1,500.00
19. Postage & Courier Fees	1,695.71	900.00 *	1,000.00
20. Printing, Bulletins, Banners, signs, newsletters	6,205.02	3,500.00 *	3,000.00
21. Books, publications & subscriptions	1,990.49	2,100.00 *	2,000.00
22. Donations	1,442.00	1,615.00 *	1,600.00
23. Courses, Conferences	3,809.25	2,900.00 *	2,000.00
24. Parking & Taxis	785.00	600.00 *	600.00
25. Arbitrator's Fees	2,518.69	19,000.00 *	20,000.00
26. Professional & Legal Fees	26,406.55	35,200.00 *	27,000.00
27. Per Capita Tax & Dues Refunds	11,400.06	340.00	140,640.40***
28. Per Capita to B.C. Fed	0.00	0.00	7,110.48
29. Strike Fund Commitments	17,397.33	4,460.24	0.00
30. Miscellaneous Expenses catering, room bookings etc.	2,200.55	1,175.00 *	2,000.00
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES:</b>	<b>\$184,081.33</b>	<b>\$204,024.61</b>	<b>\$307,192.94</b>
Revenue over Expenses	\$ 21,534.67	\$ 8,239.56	\$ 8,966.62

\* As we have not yet finished the fiscal year 1984 these figures denote a projection based on the last 10 months.

\*\* These two figures include all employer contributions to the salary scale as well as gross salary; represent a loss of one full time officer position and a reduction to half time of the current secretarial support.

\*\*\* This figure represents the normal \$175,640.00 payable to Cupe less the \$35,000.00 rebate they are granting us. The Revenue over expenses column is somewhat deceiving as the local failed to meet its strike fund commitment in full for either 1983 or 1984. Had we done so, the local would show in the red both years. According to our by-laws we are obligated to transfer 10% of our income each year into the strike fund (1983 should have seen \$20,562.00 go in and 1984 should have seen \$19,073.00 transferred).

## Should we affiliate with CUPE?

Submitted by Adrien B. Kiernan

In the near future we are all going to be faced with the major decision of whether AUCE Local 1 should affiliate with CUPE for a period of two years under a Service Contract. As with everything, there are pros and cons to this question. The Ad Hoc Merger Committee are going to present their views as to why merging with CUPE is the right way for us to proceed in the future. I would like to make some points to you which I feel should be taken into consideration when making your decision.

Firstly, I think that it behooves us as a union to gain strength because as you all know, in this present economic climate, the more strength we have, the greater our voice will be and also, the more likely the University will listen. It is no secret that the University has become more stringent in their attitudes to AUCE members, all employees and even Faculty as a matter of fact. The evidence of this is in the number of arbitrations we now have, the scrutinizing of our sick leave and the demand of a doctor's certificate when we are absent due to illness. These are just some of the areas that the University has tightened up on.

I think the question is whether we can afford to affiliate with CUPE under a Service Contract, for a two year period, without putting ourselves in financial jeopardy. Certainly, it is a costly business and we need to realistically understand just what the financial obligation is going to involve. We have to realize that in order to enter into this agreement, we must face some cut-backs in the operation of the Union office, such as paring back one Officer's position and also giving up a half time secretarial position. Also, since there are many unknown factors, like the degree of assistance, both legal as well as in the resource areas, we can only estimate the operating costs and savings for the coming year. An attempt has been made to project a reasonable budget with the understanding that we would have to have a significant dues increase, as well as the cut-backs noted above. It is my concern that all members who are going to be asked to make a decision on this issue, fully understand the the pros and cons of the matter so that they are in a position to make a fully informed decision.

It will be inherent in accepting the fact that, should we affiliate with CUPE, that we remain fiscally responsible. We should be prepared to live within a strict budget. We should also feel strongly enough that we need the alliance to give us strength in dealing with the University and are therefore prepared to accept a significant increase in our dues. If this should not be the case, then the only alternative is to vote against merging with CUPE.

At this time we have money set aside in the Strike Fund. I would not like to see us use these funds in order to make merging with CUPE a viable option. I feel strongly that, should it become apparant to us that we do not wish to carry on with the agreement, then at that point in time, we are no worse off than we are currently. In other words, our Strike Fund will not have increased, but neither will we be in the position of starting from scratch. I feel we should ensure that there are adequate funds to undertake the agreement without using our present Strike Fund. This money could be a contingency fund, and invested in such a way that over the two year period it is accumulating interest. Should the agreement with CUPE fail to meet our needs, we will still have a starting basis, as well as the per capita tax assessment of \$140,000.00 per annum to then increase our Strike Fund. This, I feel, would ensure stability of our finances.

## Some Concerns about CUPE

Submitted by Shirley Irvine

AUCE members will soon be asked to make one of the most important decisions affecting their working lives. They will be asked to vote on the Merger Committee's recommendation to become a new CUPE local. The Merger Committee's report highlights the benefits of joining CUPE but not the drawbacks.

The main drawback is financial. We would be required to pay a per capita tax of \$11.25 per month to support the national structure. Our monthly dues would therefore have to be increased by \$11.25 per month to maintain services to our membership at the present level. The only other alternative is a drastic cut in services at the local level.

The services provided by the provincial and national CUPE offices would not go very far in making up for the cut in services at the level of the Union Local. There is also no guarantee that the services provided by the national and regional offices of CUPE would be forthcoming when we needed them. The result could be that we would pay higher dues to support a national infrastructure but receive less service. A budget subcommittee of AUCE's Executive recently calculated that an increase in monthly dues to \$20.00 per full time member and to \$10.00 per part time member would still necessitate the cutting of one full time paid staff position and a reduction to half time of another position. This would occur even with the \$35,000.00 rebate to pay for staff positions that CUPE has promised us. With a smaller staff in our Union office, there would be less service to the membership. Each CUPE representative is assigned to between 2500 and 3000 members. Our local (with approximately 1,400 members) would have to share a staff representative with at least one other CUPE local.

Staff representatives and lawyers provided by the CUPE national and provincial offices would not be particularly sensitive to the special needs of our membership. The staff representative is not elected from our membership and would therefore not have the same in-depth understanding of our working conditions as do the elected AUCE officers. Although we could use the CUPE staff representative as counsel in arbitrations, we would not have the freedom to change staff representatives in the same way that we presently change lawyers if we are not satisfied. When a lawyer is required, CUPE will provide one only if the national or provincial office decides that the arbitration of the grievance will set a precedent.

Our ability to enforce the collective agreement would certainly not be strengthened by joining CUPE. If a grievance is not precedent setting and we still wanted a lawyer to advocate it, we would have to pay the lawyer's bill as we do now. We would, however, as a result of having to pay the large per capita tax, have a lot less money available to pay it. Members with grievances which CUPE decides are not precedent setting could end up shortchanged. This situation would certainly make it easier for the University to make more inroads into our contract and place us in a weaker position than we are in now.

---