



**association of university and college employees**

February 23, 1984

AGENDA

1. Adoption of the Agenda
2. Adoption of the Minutes: October 31, 1983  
November 10, 1983  
SEE FEB. NEWSLETTER January 19, 1984
3. Business Arising From the Minutes: -Announcement that the Appeal of the LRB decision regarding our November protest will be heard on April 10, 1984.  
-Status of Discipline issue  
-Report on Harrison Winter School  
-Bylaws Amendments (see newsletter)
4. Nominations: Grievance Committee  
Contract Committee  
Tech Change Committee  
Committee of Inquiry  
Communications Committee  
Strike Committee
5. Contract Committee Report
6. Secretary Treasurers Report: See 4 motions on the back of Newsletter
7. Grievance Report : Report on Statutory Holiday Issue as well as current grievances
8. Other Business



Chair: Fairleigh Wettig

Secretary: Patricia House

1. Adoption of the agenda

Moved by Adrien Kiernan

Seconded by Sheri Murray

THAT THE AGENDA BE ADOPTED AS CIRCULATED.

The motion was CARRIED.

2. Adoption of the minutes

Moved by Adrien Kiernan

Seconded by Deborah Bunyak

THAT THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 31, 1983; NOVEMBER 10, 1983 and JANUARY 19, 1984 MEMBERSHIP MEETINGS BE ADOPTED AS CIRCULATED.

The motion was CARRIED.

The December 1, 1983 minutes will be published in the next newsletter.

3. Business arising from the minutes

Fairleigh Wettig reported on:

- a) that the appeal of the November LRB ruling re: picketing will be heard on April 10, 1984. It is unusual to have a hearing usually the lawyers just submit written arguments.
- b) Discipline issue....so far only 3 nominations have been received for the Committee of Inquiry. The deadline is February 29, 1984 for nominations and for charges.
- c) Harrison Winter School....Fairleigh reported that over 300 delegates attended from over 30 unions. The course she took went step by step through the whole arbitration process. It was excellent and well worth the money spent. Marcel Dionne reported on the negotiating course that he attended. It was very well organized and the course was excellent. There were 28 people in his class and it focused on negotiating in the current political situation especially for the public sector. He made some good contacts and learned a lot from talking to the other union people in addition to what he got out of the course.
- d) By-Law amendments:

1) Section M Strikes and Lockouts

A bargaining unit shall not strike without the approval of the membership. Voting shall be by secret ballot and sent by mail referendum to all members. Such balloting shall be in full accordance with sections 48 through 58 of the B.C. Labour Code regulations and all other applicable sections and a majority of votes cast shall be necessary for a strike to take place.

2) (a second paragraph to be added to Section M)

*In the event that another bargaining unit located at/or allied to the University of British Columbia engage in any actions that could result in a work stoppage of our Local Association that our support for that action be put to mail referendum and a ballot sent to all local association members.*



3) Section K Dues and Finances (addition of an item '6')

*Proposed donations of an amount totalling \$500.00 to any organization or association be sent to mail referendum for approval by a majority of votes cast.*"

Moved by: Ruby Rudd  
Purchasing Department

Seconded by: Karen Humphries  
Purchasing Dept.

Ruby Rudd motivated her amendments. Then Fairleigh explained that the Labour Relations Board and the Labour Code govern how strike votes are conducted in this province.

Moved by Patricia House  
THAT SECTION M 1. BE AMENDED DROPPING THE WORDING ..... "SECTIONS 48 THROUGH 58 OF THE" FROM THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT.

Seconded by Margie Walley

Before the vote could be taken on the amendment a procedural question was asked. The original by-law amendment was printed in the newsletter with direction that it go to mail out referendum; why is this being voted on at this meeting and not going to mail out referendum? Fairleigh explained that the December 1, 1983 membership meeting had voted not to take these by-law amendments to referendum and had tabled them to a two membership meeting when they could be thoroughly discussed.

Moved by Ruby Rudd  
THAT THE MOTION TO TAKE THE BY-LAW AMENDMENTS TO REFERENDUM BE RECONSIDERED.

Seconded by June Janson

The motion was DEFEATED.

Back to discussion of proposed Section M 1. amendment. After a number of speakers against it on the basis that it is redundant.....

Moved by Leslie Field  
THAT SECTION M STRIKES AND LOCKOUTS NOW READ:

Seconded by Anita Cocchia

A BARGAINING UNIT SHALL NOT STRIKE WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF THE MEMBERSHIP. VOTING SHALL BE BY SECRET BALLOT AND SENT BY MAIL REFERENDUM TO ALL MEMBERS. SUCH BALLOTING SHALL BE IN FULL ACCORDANCE WITH THE B.C. LABOUR CODE REGULATIONS & A MAJORITY OF VOTES CAST SHALL BE NECESSARY FOR A STRIKE TO TAKE PLACE. The motion was CARRIED.

After further discussion, particularly with reference to what happened in November 1983 the main motion was voted on. The motion was DEFEATED.

Then Section M 2. was discussed.

Moved by Marcel Dionne  
THAT IT BE AMENDED TO READ... "IN THE EVENT THAT OUR BARGAINING UNIT OR ANY OTHER BARGAINING UNIT ALLIED TO UBC....." The motion was DEFEATED.

Seconded by Nancy Oikawa

After further discussion, Patricia House pointed out that there was a practical consideration. She asked how the Union Office staff could conduct a mail out referendum when if we were lucky we would get notification of a picket line's appearance the afternoon before it appeared.







CONTRACT COMMITTEE REPORT - FEBRUARY 23RD, 1984

The Contract Committee has delayed somewhat in bringing formal contract proposals to you as we have felt that we needed to wait for more in depth information, such as the University budget from the Provincial Government, what other unions are negotiating, both off and on campus.

We have been trying to develop a uniform approach to the University with the other unions on this campus who are currently negotiating their contracts. As a result this has changed our stance somewhat, however our basic philosophy has remained the same. I would also like to point out that in my last report I stated that other unions had recently settled for a 0 percent increase. I would like to clarify that the 0 percent on wages was for the contract which had expired in March of 1983 and has now just been settled. It is our understanding that that is not what is being sought in the area of wages for the 1984 contract.

We have heard that the University is expecting a 5% decrease in their budget, more or less, depending on how the Universities Council divides up the budget. Past practice has been that UBC has received less money than Simon Fraser University, therefore it would seem that we will be subject to a greater cut back than will SFU. Also, President Pedersen, by way of his radio broadcast, has outlined what the economic outlook for the university community will be.

Well, to sum up, we are still going into negotiations with a limited number of proposals, most of which will be to bring our Contract language equal to the Employment Standards Act. We are still maintaining the position that we will not accept any erosion to our current contract. The only possible additions to what you have already been informed of will be in an attempt to keep our demands equal to what the other unions on campus are negotiating for, some housekeeping



changes to tighten contract language and also include some proposals which the Technology <sup>ical</sup> Change Committee have suggested and which we ~~feel~~ are badly needed in our contract. These are proposals we attempted to negotiate in our last contract without success. Some of the technology <sup>ical</sup> change proposals are having pregnant women temporarily relieved of having to work on VDTs during their pregnancy, and other protections for those employees working on VDTs. We also feel we should maintain a certain degree of confidentiality from the University as it will certainly not assist our cause if the University is able to work up arguments before we even go into negotiations. We have also agreed as a Committee that at this set of negotiations we will have a smaller core of people representing the Union at the bargaining table. This does not however restrict the number of people who sit on the Contract Committee and we certainly welcome any member's input on the Contract Committee.

February 23rd, 1984

ABK/jf