

To Wendy - From Suzan

228-2181

Local 221

P. 21

- I was opposed to the proposed amendment (adamantly!)
- Reference to problem of getting membership participation - I believe my intent was to say that I felt that due to complexity of tasks and high level of responsibility, people interested in assuming salaried positions should gain experience & become familiar with ongoing issues by participation in various committees which are wide open for activity. Such committees are an excellent training ground. I personally would only want to elect those who show interest by being active. Experience is extremely important in dealing with the livelihood of 1400 members.
- Reference to convention - the Convention quite overwhelmingly deleted 2-yr term limitation, providing basically the same arguments presented by people opposed ~~to~~ to this amendment - It was not a controversial issue as the Convention maintained that the salaried position was democratically voted on by the entire membership in a mail ballot, & we function by principle of democracy. I believe I also suggested that this amendment was in contradiction to the convention's decision, as the Convention (Provincial Constitution) governs the "spirit" of Local By-laws.
- I don't believe I made any reference to "potentially influential positions" in the union

②  
Office (I don't personally believe salaried officers are any more or less influential than other Executive positions — each Executive member has one vote & there is much room for debate, controversy, etc.) I have never sensed any influence

(potential, attempted, whatever) from a salaried officer of this union, although I have ~~felt~~ <sup>sensed</sup> "manipulation" by sec-Treas. of Prov. — I believe Lid Strand spoke in favor (not against) the amendment, but you might check this out.

Thanks,

Suzan.