

Minutes

Executive Meeting - Thursday, May 27, 1981  
2:30-5:55 pm  
Union Office

Present: Elizabeth Brock, Sharon Newman, Andreana Phillips, Helen Glavina, Carole Cameron, Joan Treleaven, Marcel Dionne, Suzan Zagar, Wendy Bice, Wendy Lymer, Anne Hutchison

1. Adoption of agenda:

Moved by Marcel Dionne  
Seconded by Elizabeth Brock

THAT ANY MOTIONS PERTAINING TO THE JOB EVALUATION COMMITTEE BE TABLED UNTIL AN EXECUTIVE MEETING CAN BE ARRANGED TO WHICH THE JOB EVALUATION COMMITTEE IS INVITED.

The motion was CARRIED.

Moved by Helen Glavina  
Seconded by Joan Treleaven

THAT THE AGENDA BE ADOPTED AS AMENDED.

The motion was CARRIED.

2. Adoption of the minutes of the April 23, 1981 Executive meeting:

On page 10, Helen Glavina expressed uncertainty regarding the seconding of the motion regarding the questionnaire. She added that the motivation didn't seem to relate to the motion.

Gary Sawchuk, Russ Selinger, and Daryl Wallace joined the meeting at 3:00 pm.

Marcel Dionne requested clarification of the motion which appears on page 10. Carole Cameron requested of Anne Hutchison who had xeroxed portions of the original minutes that a copy of page 10 would be appreciated in order to correct the record.

Moved by Andreana Phillips  
Seconded by Joan Treleaven

THAT THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 23, 1981 EXECUTIVE MEETING BE ADOPTED AS AMENDED AND WITH THE EXCEPTION OF PAGE 10.

The motion was CARRIED.

A discussion ensued on the computer operator reclassification issue. Gary Sawchuk stated that the computer operators intended to defeat the motion which prevents job upgrading. Marcel reiterated a motion previously passed which would prevent any motions pertaining to Sections 11 and 12 of the agenda being introduced until a meeting could be arranged with the Job Evaluation Committee present. Gary continued that if the Union supports reclassification, then it must also support the policy of upgrading. If the Union supports the motions passed at the last membership meeting, the University has no alternative but to reject all group reclassifications at the present time. Gary then inquired as to the wording for the ballot. He wanted a referendum ballot to go out. Carole responded that Gary was suggesting a motion to reconsider the motion. He must therefore find someone who voted in favour of the motion to suggest reconsideration. He would need a two-thirds majority to make the motion to reconsider successful.

Further discussion encompassed the ins and outs of a motion to reconsider. This discussion later proved to be irrelevant when it was discovered that the motion to reconsider was inappropriate. A motion to rescind the motion passed was found to be more appropriate.

Gary Sawchuk said the following motion would be made at the next membership meeting.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE UNION ACCEPT THE  
JOB UPGRADING OF COMPUTER OPERATORS.

Marcel pointed out that the computer operators would have to wait for the result of the referendum ballot which would delay the response to the University. Gary said that the computer operators would request a secret ballot vote at the meeting in order to get the results quickly. Marcel expounded on the benefits of a referendum ballot.

The computer operators then left the meeting. The Executive returned to the agenda.

3. Business arising from the minutes:

Helen inquired if an answer had been received from APEX, the clerical union in London, England, which was successful in obtaining an agreement which limits time spent on word processing equipment. So far there has been no response.

Marcel asked why the resolutions which appear on pages 6 and 7 of the minutes were not presented at the membership meeting. Wendy Bice explained that the VMREU dispute was settled shortly after the last Executive meeting. Therefore, it was deemed unnecessary to present them.

4. Business arising from the correspondence:

Helen asked if an answer had been received from the Labour Minister on the issue of legislation with regards to the inspection of new commercial buildings. To date there had been no response.

Elizabeth Brock asked about the letter from the Southern Africa Action Coalition. Wendy Lymer explained that the Coalition was requesting that our association support their campaign to remove South African wines and liquors from B.C. liquor stores. Helen asked if this letter could be printed in the newsletter.

Moved by Helen Glavina  
Seconded by Andreana Phillips

THAT THE EXECUTIVE SEND A LETTER TO THE MINISTER OF CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS, CONDEMNING CONSUMER AFFAIRS FOR SELLING SOUTH AFRICAN WINES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA, AND THAT THIS LETTER BE PRINTED IN THE NEWSLETTER AND THAT A COPY BE SENT TO THE COALITION.

The motion was CARRIED.

Carole Cameron offered to write the letter to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

Marcel asked to see the May 25 letter to the Board of Governors re parking fee increases.

The letter from Sheila Blace, Provincial Trustee, received May 27th, regarding by-law amendments, was also discussed briefly.

5. Secretary-Treasurer's report (Wendy Lymer):

Attention was drawn to a request for a donation from the CCCA (Concerned Citizens for Choice on Abortion).

Moved by Marcel Dionne  
Seconded by Wendy Lymer

THAT A DONATION OF \$50.00 BE FORWARDED TO THE CCCA.

The motion was CARRIED.

Marcel expressed his concern over the apparent lack of security in the new office location. He suggested that the office staff check into obtaining locks for all of the existing filing cabinets.

Moved by Marcel Dionne  
Seconded by Sharon Newman

THAT WENDY LYMER AND WENDY BICE INVESTIGATE SECURITY SYSTEMS FOR THE OFFICE FILING CABINETS.

There was one abstention.  
The motion was CARRIED.

The auditors told Wendy that the General Ledger was incorrectly balanced. The fee for the audit was \$800. An additional \$250 in accounting fees is being charged to bring the books up to date.

The amount of \$4165.11 has been reimbursed to AUCE members so far (GSAB & Dentistry). Approximately 64 people have yet to claim reimbursement. Wendy estimated that each person, on the average, would receive \$45 each.

The income tax form was filed late and a penalty fee of \$50 was charged as a result. As we are a corporation, we have to file our return two months prior to the end of April.

Wendy requested recognition for Suzan Zagar, Wendy Lymer and Marcel Dionne to have signing authority for AUCE Local 1.

Moved by Wendy Lymer  
Seconded by Helen Glavina

THAT THE EXECUTIVE GIVE SIGNING AUTHORITY TO SUZAN ZAGAR, WENDY LYMER AND MARCEL DIONNE FOR AUCE LOCAL ONE.

The motion was CARRIED.

Further to the donation to the CCCA, Helen Glavina suggested that the Executive reiterate its support by making a motion to that effect at the next union meeting and that a letter of endorsement be sent to the CCCA. Wendy Lymer would be in charge of this matter.

6. Union Organiser's report (Carole Cameron):

Carole had three issues to report on:

1. The integration of motions into the Convention's agenda (specifically those motions which were not accepted by the Provincial as they were submitted after the deadline) which are aimed at amending the Provincial by-laws.
2. Discussion of Local Five and its affiliation with the CLC. An attempt will be made to move this item to the beginning of the agenda.
3. A meeting with Katy Young to determine our rights regarding the Local 5 issue. Carole read a letter to Ms. Young requesting information on this and one other subject. The second dealt with Section 7s being filed against the Union (members claiming unfair representation).

Moved by Carole Cameron  
Seconded by Wendy Bice

THAT THE ISSUE OF LOCAL FIVE'S AFFILIATION WITH THE CCU AND THE ISSUE OF A SECTION 7 COMPLAINT AGAINST THIS UNION BE TAKEN TO OUR LAWYER FOR MORE INFORMATION.

The motion was CARRIED.

7. Union Co-ordinator's report (Wendy Bice):

The Medical Services Association knows more about funds going into their plan (from the University) than the CU&C. The Wage Indemnity Plan was discussed during a meeting at the CU&C office.

A 96.1 has been filed for an interpretation of Section 23.01 of the collective agreement. An officer will attend a meeting at Employee Relations next week on Tuesday afternoon. The officer did express concern as to whether the 96.1 would achieve anything. Although the procedure takes longer, it is far less expensive in the long run.

Lissett Nelson's arbitration has been postponed in order to enable the person filling Lissett's position to be made aware of the situation and what effect it might have on her. Wendy contacted Stuart Rush today and he will let us know when new dates have been set up.

Wendy Bice and Carole Cameron attended a meeting at VGH on May 20th with AUCE members. Discussion centered around reclassifications and other grievances. HEU (Hospital Employees Union) members are making \$200 more per month doing the same job as AUCE members. Carole and Wendy intended to speak with the administrator on the issues discussed at this meeting on May 28th, before meeting with our lawyer.

A letter has been written to Wes Clark to request two-hour meetings for our members at VGH, to be held at VGH. To date, we have provided transportation for those members wishing to attend meetings at UBC. However, those members are very isolated. At the meeting on the 20th, they were informed of their rights and although they have grievances, they do not want to process them.

Wendy attended a meeting at the Walter Gage Towers where a meeting was set up by the Administrator of Housing and Conventions. A shop steward in Housing also attended. Two people became shop stewards as a result of that meeting.

8. Communication Committee report (Wendy Lymer):

Wendy drew attention to the deadline for newsletter submissions: Wednesday, June 3, at 4 pm. Sheila Bennie is a new member of the Communications Committee. Wendy Bice has also been helping in the production of the newsletter. Joan Treleaven has also offered her assistance. A newsletter production workshop is being held at the Downtown Education Centre on June 19 and 20. Wendy B., Wendy L., and Jet Blake will be attending. The AUCE office will be closed on June 19 as Carole has prior commitments on that day as well.

Carole referred to resolutions printed in the newsletter. She suggested that they be brought up at the Convention. Elizabeth Brock offered to bring those resolutions to the next Provincial Executive meeting. Carole asked that Suzan let the Union Office staff know when she couldn't attend Executive meetings; time would be requested for Elizabeth should this happen.

9. Grievance Committee report (Helen Glavina):

Helen referred to Lissett Nelson's grievance. Two arbitrators have to be chosen. Carole said that legal fees for five arbitrations scheduled for 1981 will amount to approximately \$20,000. Helen continued that Lissett's grievance was extremely complex; it involved a complete faculty and their policy of offering jobs to whomever they liked. Helen added that we do not have enough experienced members to handle grievances. Suzan has become an expert on reclassifications. Andreana said that the ruling on this grievance would have far-reaching effects; it would set a precedent if we won.

Anne Hutchison asked if it was still the practice to have the whole Grievance Committee at arbitration meetings. Carole responded that it was not always possible due to other commitments.

Wendy Bice indicated that Veronica Oxtoby's case would be going before the Labour Committee.

Carole indicated that the Grievance Committee plans to prepare a report for each newsletter from now on.

10. Provincial report (Suzan Zagar):

Legal advice was sought on the Local 5/CCU affiliation. The lawyer consulted felt that there was no clearcut violation of the constitution. Eventually, however, the lawyer did agree that there was no such thing as "dual affiliation."

Suzan briefly referred to Local Five and the raiding of their own members which resulted in affiliation with the CCU.

At the Convention, the Provincial Executive plans to propose a second salaried position at the Provincial Office. The Provincial Executive intends to endorse Sheila Perret's overtime over which there is no control at the present time. Suzan would like to see our delegates vote against this proposal.

The Provincial Executive passed a motion which allows one member from each Local to attend a Legal Education course. The \$150 fee will be paid by the Provincial. This course will come up again in the fall if we miss it this time.

Anne Hutchison said that the issue of overtime must be addressed at the Convention, and not the issue of a second salaried position. Suzan indicated that Carol McQuarrie was called in frequently to do part-time work.

Suzan attended a Resolutions Committee meeting but left it early. A discussion occurred between Lid Strand and Sheila Perret on the rules of order to be applied to resolutions not yet received which may be addressed at the Convention.

11. Job Evaluation Committee report (Sharon Newman):

Marcel, referring to a phone call from Anne Hutchison, said that an Executive meeting would be set up with the Job Evaluation Committee present, and where motions pertaining to that Committee would be discussed.

Elizabeth indicated that a Strategy Committee meeting had been set up for May 28th in the Union Office at 12:00.

Anne H. referred to the function of the Committee which was to inform the University of the result of the last membership meeting.

Moved by Sharon Newman  
Seconded by Elizabeth Brock

THAT THE JOB EVALUATION COMMITTEE INFORM THE UNIVERSITY  
OF THE DECISION TAKEN BY THE MEMBERSHIP.

Wendy Lymer informed Anne of what had taken place at the meeting prior to Anne's attendance. A discussion ensued on the interpretation of the Job Evaluation Committee and Executive responsibilities. Wendy Bice referred to a communication gap between the two groups. She stressed her concern over the filing of Section 7s against the Union. Wendy felt that an extension for our response to the University would not cause much hardship.

Elizabeth felt that the thrust of the motion was not that one group excludes the other, but that the Job Evaluation Committee should be responsible for the response. Helen expressed concern that the Executive appears to be under scrutiny and looks like a culprit when it is incumbent upon the Executive to deal with problems such as this one. She talked to a lawyer about the possible Section 7 complaint and feels confident that if the Union has acted in the best interest of the Membership, a Section 7 complaint will not succeed. Lastly, Helen emphasized that the Executive should rubberstamp any decisions made by the other Committees of this Union. Marcel understood that the Executive represents the authority of this union when dealing with the University, the Membership and the Committees. Historically, committees have come to the Executive for guidance and assistance. Recommendations from the Executive have not been turned down by Committees in the past. The Executive should know what is happening at the Committee level. He suggested that the Executive be recalled if the members are dissatisfied with their decisions.

Suzan indicated that the questionnaire was sent out to enable the membership to question the issue before a decision was made on it.

Anne strongly disagreed with the Executive's attempt to control Committee activities. The Executive should share in Committee concerns but should not curtail them. The practice used to be that the Committee would take its proposals to the Membership for approval. This Committee was set up to do a task. It is doing it. The membership has authority over the Executive.

Helen felt that when contentious issues arise, the Grievance Committee consults with the Executive. Grievance Committee correspondence goes through the Union Office. The link must always be there.

Wendy Lymer said that the Chair must recognize an individual who wishes to make a motion to reconsider the motions passed at the last membership meeting. She stressed that we must listen to everyone in the bargaining unit, not just a few.

Carole indicated that a further extension had to be requested from the University. It is the purview of the Job Evaluation Committee to deal with the University any time they want.

Helen asked Anne that if the University were to relay information on this or any issue to the Job Evaluation Committee, what would their response be? If their motion passed, would they notify the University tomorrow?

Carole stressed that the people at this meeting had to go to the membership as a united group before responding to the University. She suggested that the motion be tabled.

Moved by Marcel Dionne            THAT THE MOTION ON THE FLOOR BE TABLED.  
Seconded by Suzan Zagar

The motion was CARRIED.

Elected members of the Job Evaluation Committees and nominees will be invited to the Executive Meeting on June 10th. An extension would have to be obtained for a response to the proposal for word processing operators.

12. Executive report (Carole Cameron):

A note will be sent to all Committees regarding the use of office equipment, in order to ensure proper usage and avoid costly breakdowns. Wendy Bice was concerned as to who had access to the Union Office. Anne felt that if Committees wanted to distribute leaflets at membership meetings, then there should be no opposition to it.

Anne said that the Job Evaluation Committee was surprised to see that the questionnaire went out after all that had occurred at the last Executive meeting. The Committee had understood that the Questionnaire would not go out at all.

Carole suggested that the possibility of strike action by CUPE should be discussed at the next Union Meeting. Marcel expressed opposition to a discussion at that time. Carole said that there is a possibility that we may open up the contract. Do we expect our members to honor CUPE picket lines when they spring up out of nowhere? She suggested that it be recorded as a topic under the Executive report of the agenda.

A brief discussion occurred on the issue of Executive responsibilities. Andreana said that if a Committee produces a motion, it must be presented to the Executive for approval. Any matter dealing with the University should be approved by the Executive and should come from the Executive.

Anne said that the Grievance Committee meets with the University all the time. They, however, only have to go to the membership for approval of their decisions. Carole felt that when we sign our name to a piece of paper, we represent the Union as a whole. A discussion ensued on the interpretation of the contract clause which refers to the Job Evaluation Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:55 pm.

Executive Meeting - May 27, 1981 - Things to Do

Wendy Lymer:

1. Place auditor and personal notes in Secretary-Treasurer Job Description file (Wendy Bice)
2. Note: File AUCE income tax return two months in advance of general deadline
3. Letter to CCCA with \$50 donation
4. Next meeting: another term deposit?
5. Look into keys for filing cabinets (Wendy Bice)
6. Helen Glavina, reimbursement to UBC; we are responsible for 2:45-4:30.
7. Print, if possible, letter from Southern Africa Coalition in newsletter.
8. Send letter to Karen McPhee re dues deductions
9. Add to agenda for membership meeting: Opening positions on Job Evaluation Committee; nominees are Elizabeth Brock, Gary Sawchuk, and Andreama Phillips
10. Add "CUPE negotiations" to agenda under Executive report for the next Union Meeting

Wendy Bice:

1. Put personal notes from auditors bookkeeping session in Secretary-Treasurer's Job Description
2. Keys for filing cabinets (Wendy Lymer)

Carole Cameron:

1. Make motion to have six month limit on picking up reimbursement cheques
2. Acknowledge CUPE Local 386 donation request letter
3. Letter to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs re sale of South African wines in B.C. liquor stores
4. By-law change to put Job Evaluation Committee rep on the Executive