

## NEGOTIATIONS REPORT

At the opening of the bargaining session of Tuesday, October 26, the Contract Committee made the following statement:

*The University of British Columbia and the Association of University and College Employees, Local 1, have been in negotiations since August 13, 1976. Although the Union has presented each of its proposed articles two or three times on different occasions, only nine of ninety-two proposed changes have thus far been agreed to. All of the more complex and controversial issues remain unresolved.*

*Based on the progress of negotiations to this date, the Union feels that a third party is a necessity to conclude negotiations in a progressive manner. Therefore, we have, this morning requested through the Minister of Labour, the services of a Mediation Officer.*

The Committee suggested that we might continue to negotiate if the University intended to show some positive movement on the many major outstanding issues. The University indicated that, in light of this qualification, they felt there was no point in continuing to meet before the appointment of a mediator. For this reason, negotiations are now considered to be suspended, awaiting word from Victoria.

From the start, the University has shown no interest in negotiating serious improvements to our contract. Their original set of proposals are nothing more than vague, philosophical meanderings, except where they attempt to erode our current contract.

Many of the clauses they want to re-negotiate deal with Security, both Union and Job Security. For instance, they would like to open our Grievance Procedure for re-examination, in anticipation, we assume, of weakening the means for protection that former contract committees have fought to establish. In short, they were prepared from the beginning to offer nothing - nothing that we don't already have. And we are supposed to feel that we have achieved something substantial if we are able to prevent inroads being carved through the contract we won a year ago.

With such an unpromising debut, we were not exactly surprised that their subsequent performance turned out to be less than inspiring. Grant assured us that, while he was on holiday during September, we would be able to negotiate actively and seriously with Wes Clark. In Grant's own words, "We feel we can move during this period." However, it was insultingly obvious after only the first session with Clark that he had been left in the role of baby-sitter, without authority to negotiate any of the major changes proposed by either side. The "proposals" Clark brought to the table in response to ours consisted of the meaty one-liner, "No change from present agreement" or, in cases where the University deemed the article to have a monetary significance, "No change from present agreement; this item falls under the A.I.B. Guidelines." These are perhaps the most infamous examples of the University's "philisophical approach".

Though they obviously did not burn any midnight oil grappling with wording for their proposals, the University has expended considerable breath and time in bargaining sessions to get across the message that they haven't any intention of showing flexibility in their positions. A classic is Clark's definitive comment on the issue of employees being permitted to take courses during working hours. Our proposal would leave up to the department head and employee the number of courses that could be arranged. Clark's reply: "The University's position is singular." And, indeed it is!

Then there was the hour and a half discussion on Human Rights consisting of every conceivable misunderstanding of the Union proposal. The University proposed instead that we agree to abide by the Human Rights Code of British Columbia which does not include some important and progressive areas that are currently covered in our contract.

The University's games and stalling are designed to wear us down personally. Witness just a few: Grant at one point refused to sign a proposal that *they* had given us; it had been presented by Clark a few days earlier. (Grant came round, with a graciousness that melted our hearts!) Grant also benevolently withdrew a particularly obnoxious proposal on vacations - a proposal that they had never made!

The University has shown an admirable, if inconsistent, concern for the privacy and security of their employees. For example, they are bent on preventing the mandatory presence of a steward in discussions between the University and an employee, even when the situation involves a potential grievance. They are terribly concerned for the personal rights of employees who declined to join the Union at the time of certification, but who have enjoyed the same benefits and protection that the Union ensures to members. These employees, according to the University, should not have to compromise their principles by contributing monthly dues.

The University's interest in our welfare falls short, however, when it comes to providing Campus Patrol Escort for employees working late at night. Our proposal to change the word "may" to "shall" (be provided) opened a discussion of the whole article, and not just the relevant alteration. The University would like to back-track on its obligation to provide escort. They tell us the patrolmen are very busy at night guarding Xerox machine money boxes.

Tactics of this sort have been used to heighten our frustration at their unwillingness to move on any important issues. Of the nine items we have signed, the compromises are ours. Within the bounds of the mandate given the Contract Committee by membership meetings, we have attempted to satisfy their objections by rewording and resubmitting proposals time and again. Any movement towards an agreeable alternative has been on our part.

The Contract Committee feels, in the light of these roadblock tactics, it is time we enlisted the service of a mediator. If past performance is an indication, the presence of a third party may provide the pressure necessary to evoke some positive action by the University.

ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE EMPLOYEES LOCAL #1  
GENERAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING  
NOVEMBER 4, 1976

BUCHANAN ROOM 106 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

C O R R E C T I O N

THE GENERAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING SCHEDULED FOR NOVEMBER 18th HAS BEEN RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 4th  
(PLEASE DISREGARD THE NOTICE IN CURRENT NEWSLETTER)

AGENDA

1. No Smoking
2. Discussion on time limits on speakers
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. Adoption of Minutes
5. Business arising from Minutes
6. Correspondence
7. Open nominations for President  
Close nominations for Membership Secretary and Recording Secretary
8. Grievance Report - Kevin Grace  
- Be it moved that the membership of A.U.C.E. Local 1 authorize the grievance committee to take the grievance of Kevin Grace to arbitration
9. Financial Statement - Jeff Hoskins
  - a) Motion for Office Expenses for two months \$1500.00
  - b) Motion to pay per capita tax to the Provincial
  - c) Motion on a paid labelling service
10. Discussion of Dues Assessment Referendum  
- The Treasurer recommends the following: The dues assessment for AUCE Local 1 shall be .75% of each member's gross wages. (Motivation of recommendation in the A.C. issue Sept. 2)
11. Contract Report
12. Anti-Inflation Board Report
13. Petition from Division D
14. Communications Report
15. Status of Women Report
16. Provincial Report - Discussion of Council of Public Sector Unions
17. Other Business