

February 8, 1977

Membership of AUCE Local 1
c/o Executive Committee
AUCE OFFICE
Campus Mail

This is written in response to the letter which was sent to us by our president, Elizabeth Winterford, dated February 6, 1977. We would request that this be read out at the February 10th, Membership Mtg. under item 6, correspondence.

The content of the letter to which we refer raises some rather interesting questions. Firstly, is not our president a member of the Executive of AUCE Local 1? In the first and second paragraph of Ms. Winterford's letter, she expressed concern with the content of the information package which accompanied the ballot which we recently received. She states "It seems to be rather one-sided, and may even give the impression that the AUCE executive ... is advocating that we break the law. ... interested individuals were invited to make submissions stating their individual points of view, but no member of the executive put forward a submission."

Upon investigation we discovered that indeed individuals, all individuals, were invited to make submissions on this issue and that the executive had every intention of publishing every submission received, regardless of their contents. If Ms. Winterford felt that the package should contain other arguments why then did she not include a submission of her own? Another, quite relevant query relates to the fact that the executive was to meet and approve the comprehensive package before it went out to the membership, any objections to the factual content were to be raised at that time. Ms. Winterford was absent on both evenings when the wording of the ballot was approved and did not even inquire about the wording by telephone. It is very easy to criticize anything after the fact, but unethical to do so when the opportunity to object existed before that time.

Our executive is suppose to be a team. The president of the Local is only one part of that unit and should work together with its other members. Certainly, every individual on the executive has a right to their own opinion but we maintain that in this case Ms. Winterford's actions are questionable. We hope that this was not a personal attempt on her part to circumvent the other people who represent us on the executive. They worked hard on this issue and presented what we feel are both sides of the legal aspects surrounding our present dilemma. How Ian Mackenzie's statement " This is perhaps the most agonizing decision our Union has ever had to make. ... I don't blame (members) a bit for voting YES. I urge people to vote only after the most careful consideration of all the pros and cons." can be viewed as "one-sided" is certainly difficult to understand. What we find even more difficult to understand is Ms. Winterford's questionable, and delayed response to such an important issue.

Pat Gibson	BOB TASSIE
Ned Bennett	Marty McCreck
B. Vant	Karen Pestow
J. Kutter	J.H. McNeil
John Ray	M. Hoffman
E. Rowley	A. Legault
Randy Lorus	Margie Wally
Wendy Murphy	
Pam Woodhead	

February 8, 1977

Membership of AUCE Local 1
c/o Executive Committee
AUCE OFFICE
Campus Mail

This is written in response to the letter which was sent to us by our president, Elizabeth Winterford, dated February 6, 1977. We would request that this be read out at the February 10th, Membership Mtg. under item 6, correspondence.

The content of the letter to which we refer raises some rather interesting questions. Firstly, is not our president a member of the Executive of AUCE Local 1? In the first and second paragraph of Ms. Winterford's letter, she expressed concern with the content of the information package which accompanied the ballot which we recently received. She states "It seems to be rather one-sided, and may even give the impression that the AUCE executive ... is advocating that we break the law. ... interested individuals were invited to make submissions stating their individual points of view, but no member of the executive put forward a submission."

Upon investigation we discovered that indeed individuals, all individuals, were invited to make submissions on this issue and that the executive had every intention of publishing every submission received, regardless of their contents. If Ms. Winterford felt that the package should contain other arguments why then did she not include a submission of her own? Another, quite relevant query relates to the fact that the executive was to meet and approve the comprehensive package before it went out to the membership, any objections to the factual content were to be raised at that time. Ms. Winterford was absent on both evenings when the wording of the ballot was approved and did not even inquire about the wording by telephone. It is very easy to criticize anything after the fact, but unethical to do so when the opportunity to object existed before that time.

Our executive is suppose to be a team. The president of the Local is only one part of that unit and should work together with its other members. Certainly, every individual on the executive has a right to their own opinion but we maintain that in this case Ms. Winterford's actions are questionable. We hope that this was not a personal attempt on her part to circumvent the other people who represent us on the executive. They worked hard on this issue and presented what we feel are both sides of the legal aspects surrounding our present dilemma. How Ian Mackenzie's statement " This is perhaps the most agonizing decision our Union has ever had to make. ... I don't blame (members) a bit for voting YES. I urge people to vote only after the most careful consideration of all the pros and cons." can be viewed as "one-sided" is certainly difficult to understand. What we find even more difficult to understand is Ms. Winterford's questionable, and delayed response to such an important issue.

Signed:

Harlene Crowe
Glandia Thorne
Olivia Eisenhof
Christina Pan

Department of Physics