

CUE Executive Meeting
Nov. 12, 1986

Minutes

Suzan Zagar, Kitty Byrne, Ted Byrne, Mary Vorvis,
Shirley Irvine, Edmund Kam

1. Approval of agenda. Moved by Suzan, seconded by Edmund. Carried.
2. Approval of the minutes of Oct. 14 and Oct. 28. Moved by Suzan, seconded by Edmund. Carried.
3. Business arising from the minutes.

Daycare referendum. Suzan pointed out that the Executive had not yet approved Michelle McAnulty's statement re. the daycare referendum. She was concerned that some information omitted from the second draft should be included, in particular the fee range. The fee range was also not accurate in the first draft, and the accurate information should be in the final statement. Kitty said that the final draft also gave the wrong impression about student use of daycare. 60% of the usage is by students, but on a per capita basis their use of daycare is less than ours. Suzan then asked whether the information regarding Cupe 116's and the Faculty Assn.'s decision should be incorporated into the statement, or should the Trustees include this information in some other form. In either case it is important that our members know that neither of these groups were going to assess their members. Kitty agreed, since it was information we were asked to provide. Edmund felt that we should not include this information, arguing that if we set a proper example the other groups might be influenced by our decision. Ted suggested that the Trustees draft a statement for a decision by the Executive at our next meeting. Kitty suggested that Suzan contact Helen Glavina and tell her what is needed in order to conduct the referendum. Suzan said that they would endeavor to have the referendum done by early December. Kitty suggested that if that was not possible it should wait until January.

Page 4, of Oct. 28 minutes. Patricia House's return right to return to a bargaining unit position. Suzan suggested

Nov. 12, p. 2

that should such a position be available in the next couple of months, she should have a right to it, and that this would absolve us from having to continue paying her. There may be a position available at the end of December, or early in January. Could we require the University to hold this position for her. After some discussion regarding the length of leave, the following motion was given:

That we give the University one month's notice that the first available LA 3 position should be offered to Patricia House. Moved by Suzan, seconded by Edmund. Carried.

The notice should be given for the period Dec. 31 to Jan. 31.

~~Page 6, Oct. 28 minutes. 'Cost of audit \$5,500 - we were expecting to pay \$7,000'. Mary said that she had not said this, and that this line should be deleted from the minutes. This was accepted by consensus. Kitty said that she would correct the minutes.~~

4. Discussion of the Oct. 30 General Meeting. Ann Hutchinson attended the Executive Meeting in order to express her concerns regarding the suspension of Patricia House which was presented to the membership on Oct. 30. All of her concerns, she said, had to do with her feeling that we are moving away from being a democratic organization. She was concerned, 1. that there was no mention in the notice of the meeting that this serious matter was to be discussed; 2. that the Executive had made a decision on its own which she did not believe it had the authority to make (there were only two options: recall or discipline); that the membership did not have an opportunity to endorse the decision that Kitty Byrne replace Patricia; and 4. that, though it was apparent that Patricia was not doing her job — we were not getting minutes, financial statements etc.—the Executive did not take action when it should have, and did not act according to our bylaws, and she is concerned that the same kind of situation could develop again if we do not make a decision to stick to the bylaws.

Kitty responded by saying that we had considered the options available to us under our bylaws, and had decided, on advice of counsel, that the Executive did have the authority to take the action it took, and that the recall procedure, which would be the appropriate section for dealing with this kind of problem, was

not only unworkable — it would require the gathering of 300 signatures to begin with — but would be likely to prove damaging to both parties.

Ann asked why the discipline section had not been considered an option.

Kitty said that the discipline section was designed for one member to bring charges against another member for actions detrimental to the Union, such as crossing a picket line.

Ann said that she felt it did apply since Patricia was a member, and it was a question of a violation of one of our bylaws: namely the duties of the position. The membership is the highest body, and the decision should have been in its hands.

Ann remarked that, if in fact the bylaws cannot be used in a situation like this, perhaps a bylaw amendment should be considered by the membership.

Suzan said that she had heard from a number of members that they were upset that the problem had not been brought to their attention sooner, and at the length of time it has apparently taken the Executive to act.

Ted responded to Ann's concerns by saying that: 1. we were not explicit in the notice because, although we had to bring our decision to the attention of the membership, we did not want to make a public issue of it for fear of damaging both Patricia and the Union. 2. The Executive is the governing body of the Union between membership meetings, and we did have the authority to make the decision we made, subject to review by the membership. It is still open to any member to institute proceedings under the bylaws, or to propose a motion concerning the Executive's action. 3. Not bringing the decision to have Kitty work in the office to the membership was an oversight. 4. We never had the kind of unanimity on the Executive in the past that would have allowed us to take action against Patricia. The Executive does have some responsibility for allowing this problem to persist for so long, but there were also particular circumstances that required that we act quickly and decisively when we did.

5. Development Office. The University has proposed moving three positions from the Alumni Association to the new Development Office. These positions are non-union, and we have been asked whether or not we would consider

accepting these employees into our bargaining unit, and allowing them to maintain their seniority. They are apparently all long term employees. There are also going to be several new positions created in the Development Office. The Alumni Assn. employees will be doing the same work, only directly for the University. The University has also requested that we consider 'red circling' these employees, since their wages are now higher than the bargaining unit wages they would be paid. We told the University that we will consider allowing them into the bargaining unit, but that it would be difficult for us to allow them to be red circled. We will be receiving a written proposal some time soon, and we can discuss the matter more fully at that time. We do not know at this time, exactly what the classifications will be, how long these employees have worked for the Alumni Assn., or what they are earning currently.

6. Notice of motion re. compensation for our members in the hospitals in the event of a strike by hospital employees. There was some discussion regarding the substance of this motion, and about the possibility and advisability of an assessment, use of the strike fund, etc. The Executive was not in agreement on the issue, and did not feel that it should itself make a proposal. Ted said that he would speak with the person who gave notice of motion (Kay Wilen) and suggest that she give us a concrete proposal, in writing.
7. Essential Services. Ted and Kitty reported on the LRB decision regarding essential services in our hospital locations. The University requested that 23 positions be declared essential, and the Board, after hearing from both parties, at two separate hearings, decided entirely in favour of the employer. We felt that the decision was incorrect, that the Board had not given proper consideration to our arguments, and that the format of the hearing was unfair to the Union. The decision is out of line with the landmark VGH/HEU decision of 1976, but in line with recent Board decisions re. the HEU. The BC Fed is concerned about recent decisions of the Board, and Joe Denofreo will be approaching them to see if there is anything they can do for us. We will also be appealing the decision.

Motion: that we appeal the LRB decision on essential services, and that we seek the services of John Baigent. Moved by Suzan, seconded by Shirley. Carried.

8. Office report.

Nov. 12, p. 5

Motion: that the Executive approve booking Mary Vorvis off work for one day to prepare the budget for Sept.-Dec. 1986. Moved by Ted, seconded by Suzan.

Helen's report was discussed. There should be a phone poll of the Executive once we know the cost of the accounting course. Office supplies: ceiling of \$500, including the cost of a calculator, approved.

9, 10, 11, tabled.

Meeting adjourned. Next meeting Tues. Nov. 25.