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Association of University and College Employees,
Local #1,
2162 Western Parkway,
Vancouver, B. C.,
V6T 1V6.

Dear Mr. Galbraith:

In response to your letter dated November 26, 1980 on the subject of A.U.C.E. Local No. 1's mailing address for your new location in the University's Armory building, I would advise you as follows.

For incoming, off-campus mail:
A.U.C.E. Local No. 1,
No. 202 - 6383 Memorial Road,
The University of British Columbia,
Vancouver, B. C.,
V6T 1W5.

For on-campus mail:
A.U.C.E. Local No. 1,
No. 202 - 6383 Memorial Road,
Campus.

A.U.C.E. incoming and outgoing first class Canada Post mail, as well as on-campus mail, will be handled in the same manner as that which we do for any University department. That is: one (1) delivery and one (1) pick-up per working day. Large on- or off-campus mailings must be delivered to the Campus Mail Room. Mailing will continue to be scrutinized to ensure that they fall within the category agreed upon in the collective agreement.

Yours truly,

S. C. Potter
Director Campus Mail

new address

As reported in the last issue of "On Campus", we are moving. As of January 1, 1981 our on-campus and off-campus addresses will be as set forth in Mr. Potter's letter. Hopefully, our telephone numbers will remain the same (224-2308/9). Should they change you will be promptly notified. In the meanwhile, please use our current telephone numbers and the new address.
WORKING CONDITIONS - Article 24.01

The University agrees to maintain good working conditions in the employees' work areas. It is understood that adequate heat control (including air conditioning where adequate natural ventilation does not exist), noise control, washroom facilities, lighting and space between employees are necessary to the well-being and health of employees. The Workers' Compensation Board regulations shall constitute the minimum standards for safe working conditions and it is understood that changes beyond such minimum standards may be requested.

Recently a member of the bargaining unit suffered a severe back injury on the job because the employer insisted she lift heavy boxes although it was not part of her list of job duties and she had told them on several occasions she could not and should not lift heavy loads as she had a history of back problems. It would have been best if the union had been called in, that is one of our roles, to protect workers from unreasonable demands on the job. The question of doing duties not part of your regular working requirements is a very serious one. In this case a worker is now going through the lengthy process of claiming with the Workers' Compensation Board. She has been advised by her doctor not to return to work but cannot afford to not work. This situation also focuses on our very inadequate sick leave and disability plan at UBC. When a person, such as in this case, needs time off work with pay we have no adequate coverage. I am printing the regulations of the WCB below for your attention. Please, if you have any question about work you are requested to do that you don't think you should be doing, call the Union Office. And please don't call us second, after you have called the University! Call us first!

Industrial Health & Safety Regulations - Workers' Compensation Board

Work restrictions

8.24 (1) No person shall carry out or cause to be carried out any work process or operation or cause to be operated any tool, appliance or equipment when that person has reasonable cause to believe that to do so would create an undue hazard to the health or safety of any person.

(2) Pursuant to clause (1) a worker who refuses to carry out a work process or operate a tool, appliance or equipment shall forthwith report the circumstances of the unsafe condition to his supervisor or employer.

(3) The supervisor or employer receiving a report made under clause (2) shall forthwith investigate the matter and:

(a) ensure that any unsafe condition is remedied without delay; or,

(b) if in his opinion the report is not valid he shall so inform the person who made the report.

(4) When the procedure under clause (3) does not resolve the matter and a worker continues to refuse to carry out a work process, the supervision or employer shall investigate the matter in the presence of the worker who made the report and in the presence of:

(a) a worker representative of the Industrial Health and Safety Committee; or,

(b) a worker who is selected by a trade union representing the worker; or,

(c) when there is no Industrial Health and Safety Committee or the worker is not represented by a trade union, any other reasonably available worker selected by the worker.

(5) When the investigation under clause (4) does not resolve the matter and a worker continues to refuse to carry out a work process or operate a tool, appliance or equipment, both the supervisor, or the employer, and the worker shall investigate the matter without undue delay and issue whatever orders he deems necessary.

(6) No worker shall be subject to disciplinary action because he has acted in compliance with this regulation or an order made by an officer of the Board.

(7) Temporary assignment to alternative work at no loss in pay to the worker until the matter in clause (1) is resolved shall be deemed not to constitute disciplinary action.
November 28, 1980

Dean Peter Lusztig
Faculty of Commerce
Henry Angus Building
CAMPUS MAIL

Dear Dr. Lusztig:

A most alarming matter has been brought to the attention of this Union.

One of our members, while working in the Real Estate Division, was asked to do work, not part of her regular List of Job Duties, that involved lifting heavy materials. The woman explained, on several occasions to John Hicks, the Assistant Director, that because of a previous back injury she had been instructed by her physician not to lift heavy material. She was advised, by another staff member, that Mr. Hicks did not appreciate her complaints. Further, this employee explained her reasons for not wishing to do the requested work to Fred Sillars, Assistant Director of Commerce. She also phoned the Workers’ Compensation Board who referred her to the Employee Relations Department at UBC who advised her that she could refuse to do the work but that she would not have a job anymore if she did.

This woman therefore chose to do the requested work. She began to have spasms in her back to the point where she could not sit or stand. She phoned her doctor but had a two hour wait until she could see him. She decided to lay down in the staff room, where a staff member advised her she would have to go up to the 7th floor of your building to fill out a Workers’ Compensation Board form. Obviously this was not an acceptable request for the employee and finally shortly before she had to leave to see the doctor, Gail Robertson, an administrative person, came down and brought a WCB form. The employee’s doctor subsequently diagnosed a herniated disc for this woman.

It is quite appalling to us the ignorance that exists in your Faculty with respect to the Workers’ Compensation Board. We await a response from you in this regard.

Yours truly,

cc: John Hicks
Jane Strudwick
AUCE Newsletter
Donella Oliver

Carole Cameron
Union Organiser
AUCE Local 1

Robert Grant
Director
Employee Relations Department
CAMPUS MAIL

December 4, 1980

Dear Mr. Grant:

An employee by definition of the Labour Code “means a person employed by an employer, and includes a person engaged in police duties, and a dependent contractor included in an appropriate bargaining unit under Section 48, but does not include a person who, in the opinion of the board, (i) is employed to exercise the functions, and does exercise the functions, of a manager or superintendent in the direction or control of employees, or (ii) is employed in a confidential planning or advisory position in the development of management policy for the employer, or (iii) is employed in a confidential capacity in matters relating to labour relations or personnel, or (iv) is a teacher as defined in the Public Schools Act”.

Article 8.02 of the collective agreement, Meeting the University, states that “when the University wishes to discuss dissatisfaction with the work of an employee which may lead to disciplinary action, the employee shall be accompanied by a steward.” The University as mentioned here, does not pertain to one person who is in the bargaining unit and in a senior position, discussing a matter of discipline with another bargaining unit person. No bargaining unit person can be in this position by virtue of the above Labour Code definition. In conjunction with this, bargaining unit people cannot have the responsibility of hiring or firing employees.

The senior Standard Job Descriptions, as agreed to by the Union and the University, include the following wording only:

“generally responsible for the co-ordination of several clerical and stenographic positions”
“co-ordinates the work of an office of up to twenty employees”
“acts as a liaison between senior officials and staff members”
“supervises and co-ordinates the work-flow related to the provision of office services”
“ability to plan and supervise the work of a clerical office”
“takes care of administrative details in area of delegation”
“performs work of an advanced administrative clerical nature”
“ability to supervise others”
“advises on selection of personnel and matters concerning subordinates for consideration of Administrative Head”

… continued …
UNION OFFICE STAFF - YEAR END REPORT

This year has been a very eventful one for AUCE. The following represents some thoughts the office staff have developed as a result.

Continuity within the Union office is very important in terms of the equality of representation to all Union members. It takes time to learn the tools of serving a Union membership and once these tools are learned, the membership should take advantage of them by keeping experienced, knowledgeable people on staff. The more expertise the Union office staff attains, the more valuable we are to the Union. This job requires a lot of expertise. This takes time and effort to acquire and we need to be encouraged to gain all of the expertise we can. The more experienced and experienced we are, the better able we will be to organize within AUCE.

The demands of the work being performed by the office staff are greater than those of the classifications we were in at the University, although we receive the wages of our former classifications. All of the people working in the office are not even paid at the same rate, since they seldom come from the same classifications. We believe this to be unjust, since we are all performing the same level of work.

We believe that the Union staff should not be prevented from continuing to work for the Union if they are willing to do so, and, most importantly, if they are doing their job to the membership’s satisfaction. This means they should be permitted to stand for re-election each year. This would allow the membership, on an annual basis, to express their feelings about the paid staff’s performance. Why shouldn’t a person be permitted to work for the Union on a continuing basis if they are capable and qualified? Other people choose various professions with no stigma attached, but somehow the idea of a person choosing to represent Union members is considered in a bad light. Fear exists that they will sit back on their laurels, that they will become incompetent or too far removed from their membership. We personally consider it extremely important and honourable to work to represent individuals of our bargaining unit in dealing with management. We enjoy this type of work and feel we are good at it. We feel it would be in the Union’s best interest to have us continue this type of work, to have the benefit of our experience continue.

Over a period of time, while working for AUCE, we have seen recurring patterns emerge from our employer. Whenever our office staff changes, we are at a great disadvantage, as the University’s staff does not change as ours does. During this time, unless there is a person left in the office who has been around for some time, these recurring patterns are not noticed and the University often gets away with flagrant violations of our contract. This happens with hiring, promotion, lay-off, and with other areas of our contract, including exclusions from the bargaining unit and reclassification requests.

The AUCE Union office staff have the worst working conditions on campus. In addition to this, they are not paid adequately for the hours they work, for the stress they work under, nor for the responsibility they handle. They also have no job security other than that, at the end of their term, they can be returned to a job with the University in their former classification. They give up their seniority with the University to work in the Union office. They have no possibility of promotion while working for the Union, as they would have had if they had remained with the University, and they actually take a drop in salary when they return to work with the University. This is because the University does not recognize the annual step increase a person gets in the Union office, so these people drop down a step when returning to work at UBC.

It is thus apparent that the Union membership, which is the employer of the Union office staff, does not treat it’s own employees as well as the University does. And we don’t think many of you have all that great an opinion of the University as an employer.

It would be a great asset to the membership of AUCE Local I to take advantage of the growing expertise of the office staff and encourage rather than discourage these people from continuing to benefit the membership as a whole, by improving our working conditions and removing our disability to continue to run for re-election.

The Union has always gone into negotiations with the University asking for equal pay for work of equal value. We cannot expect the University to begin to treat us seriously when we do not even pay our own staff in this way. It would be a good example to hold up to the University - that this policy began with our own Union office staff.

VOTER NEWSLETTER NEEDS YOUR CONTRIBUITIONS:

"On Campus" is the official newsletter of AUCE Local I. It serves as one of the main forums for discussion and development of issues. It serves as a method for increasing membership involvement and feedback.

Any and all members of this local may submit letters, articles, etc. on relevant concerns.

Any time you wish to express yourself and share it with others, please send contributions to:

Communications Committee
C/O AUCE Local I
Campus Mail

Submissions should be signed either individually, or by a group and represent the views of the contributor.

Kindly type or hand-write clearly the article including your name, work place, division and date.

NEXT ISSUE
DEADLINE:

JANUARY 26
A.U.C.E.
Local #1
2162 Western Parkway
Vancouver, B.C.
Dear Sisters:

Repeal 251 Committee
517 East Broadway
Vancouver, B.C.

As you are aware, Canadian women’s access to therapeutic abortions is under attack. Recently, two B.C. hospitals -- Surrey Memorial and Royal Jubilee -- have disbanded their therapeutic abortion committees, and the continued existence of such committees at many hospitals in the province, and across Canada, is threatened. The attitude of the provincial Minister of Health towards women’s right to abortion is negative; no assistance can be expected from that quarter. Nor has the federal government any intention at present of changing the Criminal Code regulations on abortion, which were set up in their present form in 1969.

The NDP Women’s Committee believes that it is necessary to fight back. We believe that an essential step in winning women’s right to safe, legal abortion is the removal of abortion from the Criminal Code. To that end we are organizing a major Rally calling for the repeal of the anti-abortion laws for Sunday 8 March 1981, International Women’s Day. We want this Rally to be as large as possible, and as fully representative as possible of the many individuals, groups and organizations who support women’s right to choose. We believe that such a public action, along with other similar actions across Canada, will make the repeal movement more visible and will strengthen it. The action will also put pressure on both the provincial and federal levels of government to act for change in the laws.

We know that your organization supports women’s right to choose on abortion. We ask you now for a formal endorsement of our Rally for removal of abortion from the Criminal Code. We would like to use such an endorsement publicly in our campaign literature as part of the process of gathering further endorsements and building support for the Rally.

Yours for repeal of the anti-abortion laws

Dixie Pidgeon
Chairwoman

LETTERS

Nicaragua Literacy Committee
4360 Main St.
Vancouver, B.C.
November 10, 1980

Dear Sisters and Brothers,

On behalf of the Nicaragua Literacy Committee I wish to thank the members of the Local who gave money to the Literacy Crusade at the meeting on October 23. A total of $83.34 was raised.

Our Committee channels all funds raised through the Canadian Catholics For Overseas Development and Peace (CCODP), which is registered with the Canadian International Development Agency and thus all the funds which it sends to Nicaragua are matched 3 to 1 by CIDA. By the time it reaches Nicaragua the local members contribution will amount to $253, and all of it goes to the Literacy program of the Government.

In solidarity,
Roger Annis

Nicaragua Literacy Committee
4360 Main St.
Vancouver, B.C.
November 10, 1980

A.U.C.E. Local #1
2162 Western Parkway
Vancouver, B.C.

Dear Sisters and Brothers,

On behalf of the Nicaragua Literacy Committee I wish to thank the members of the Local who gave money to the Literacy Crusade at the meeting on October 23. A total of $83.34 was raised.

Our Committee channels all funds raised through the Canadian Catholics For Overseas Development and Peace (CCODP), which is registered with the Canadian International Development Agency and thus all the funds which it sends to Nicaragua are matched 3 to 1 by CIDA. By the time it reaches Nicaragua the local members contribution will amount to $253, and all of it goes to the Literacy program of the Government.

In solidarity,
Roger Annis
A REPORT

Secretary-Treasurer's Report

Section J-13 of the AUCE By-laws states:
"The annual fiscal meeting of the Local Association shall be the December membership meeting. At this meeting a projected budget shall be presented, debated and approved. Any major change in the categories, priorities, and amounts outlined in the budget in the ensuing year must be reported to and receive the approval of a membership meeting for which notice of the budgetary decisions to be made has been given to the membership."

With that in mind, what follows is a projected budget for 1981. It was arrived at by using our 1980 expenditures allowing for 10% for inflation. The one projected expenditure that is etched in stone is the $1.00 nominal sum the University will be charging us for the year's rent at our new location. Salaries, telephone, strike fund, Per Capita Tax to the Provincial and meetings and conferences should for all intents and purposes come within the projected figures. The areas where there may be fluctuations are printing and stationery, professional and legal expenses and office expenses. Should we experience a few unexpected arbitations then the legal expenses can skyrocket.

The total projected budget is $171,801. Should the dues increase pass that should generate approximately $16,000 a month or $192,000 for the fiscal year. In theory, that leaves a cushion of $220,000. Should that cushion exist at the end of the year, and that means that the projected budget is bang on, then we probably would find ourselves transferring an additional $10,000 into the Strike Fund and keeping the remaining $10,000 in our general operating account. The picture could be substantially altered should we encounter any other extraordinary expenses during the year - the "budgetary fat" could quickly dissolve. If the dues increase does not pass then our revenues based on the present dues structure would total $147,000 - we would be into a deficit situation, most likely on a monthly basis. But, we will have to cross that fiscal bridge when we come to it, if in fact we ever do.

Projected Budget for 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>$1,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>59,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing &amp; Stationery</td>
<td>6,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strike Fund</td>
<td>19,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Tax</td>
<td>50,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Legal Expenses</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings &amp; Conferences</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Expenses</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$171,801.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Political protest work stoppage not a strike

...British Columbia... A work stoppage in protest of a Government Bill affecting pension legislation was held not to constitute a strike. The refusal to work was directed not at the employer, but at the provincial government, having a "political" rather than a "collective bargaining" purpose. Nor did the protest directly violate any specific provision of the collective agreement, as the agreement did not contain a "no stoppage of work for any reason" clause. British Columbia Ferry Corporation v. British Columbia Ferry and Marine Workers' Union. (British Columbia Labor Relations Board) (80 CLC ¶ 16,042).

GROUP FOR WOMEN OVER 50

facilitated by Ima Krayanoff

"Women over 50 are often dealing with a profound loss:
- loss of a partner thru death, divorce or separation
- loss of focus by the departure of the last child from the family home
- loss of a job thru retirement
- and the most common loss for women over 50 in this society;
- loss of their youthfulness."

"In a group you will find participants who are struggling with similar or the same problems, that in itself can diminish feelings of loneliness."

limited enrollment of 10-16 women

preregister by calling Vancouver Status of Women at

workshop times in January

either from 2-4:30pm or from 7-9:30
Treasury Board cedes 24.7% to settle clerks' strike

---

B.C. LABOR LAW
By Gordon Hardy

---

reprint
From the October edition of the IHA's "the Barker"
Metro Toronto Library assistants take to picket lines

The Per Capita Tax Affair

Last August, as a Provincial body, we voted to substantially increase our Per Capita Tax per member from $2.00 a month to $3.25 a month. The Per Capita Tax is that amount of money deducted from a member's monthly dues which goes to the Provincial. Per Capita Tax for full-time members was $2.00 a month as indicated above, and, the average monthly total remitted to the Provincial from this Local was (and is to date) $2800.00.

With the new increase, our monthly remittance to the Provincial should have increased to approximately $4300.00 a month. But, there was a catch. Our financial situation prevented us from even considering the possibility of fulfilling our new commitments. More often than not, our monthly expenses exceeded our revenue. The strike and its related expenses had depleted our strike fund and we had just completed a successful referendum to retire a major portion of our outstanding loan with the BCTCU. Our liabilities far outstripped our reserves.

What was confronting us was the necessity of holding two future referenda. The first would be to retire the remaining strike-related expenses and to reimburse the University for the holiday time lost by our picketers for the month of May 1980. The second referendum would be concerned with a dues increase which was needed to cover the new Per Capita Tax, the increasing office expenditures, the building up of our Strike Fund, the increased office staff wages for April 1981, etc.

Against this backdrop, the Executive passed the following motion at its September 9th meeting:

That the Executive oppose the Provincial's apparent decision to make the Per Capita Tax retroactive to August and that should a dues increase be approved by the membership then Local 1 will pay the increased Per Capita Tax from that point in time.

Previous to the motion our Provincial representatives had informed the Executive that the Provincial expected that the Per Capita Tax would be retroactive to August. It was the feeling of the Executive that by the time we had presented the request for a dues increase to the membership that the retroactive Per Capita Tax owing to the Provincial would hover between $6,000.00 and $8,000.00. To repay that would probably necessitate another referendum.

Our primary concern was to have the strike debt retired and to have the dues increase passed — if such a result was in the cards. Armed with those crucial successes, we could then turn our attention to the issue of the Per Capita Tax retroactivity. During this period in September and October it was the hope of the Executive that the Provincial, due to our financial situation, would agree to waiving our paying of the retroactive amount. As the debate continued during these months, the Executive maintained this position — but we did indicate to our Provincial representatives that, at the very least we would take the retroactivity issue to the membership in the form of a referendum. It was our perception that we did not want to torpedo the first two referenda by raising the spectre of a further vote. A constant underlying theme was the possibility that the membership might reject a dues increase. If that occurred then we could not consider paying the increased Per Capita Tax — it was even possible that we might have to forego the payment of our old Per Capita Tax rate when our financial commitments to the Local so dictated.

Impressions, to the contrary, the early stages of the debate were not couched in anti-Provincial terminology, although on occasion we did issue the occasional storm warnings about the Provincial's future. The Provincial Executive was to have attended our October 7th Executive meeting, but that meeting was delayed to the 28th. At the meeting of October 7th, Susan Zagar, one of our Provincial reps, reported that it was her perception that the Provincial would only go so far as to extend an interest free loan to the Local to repay the retroactive Per Capita Tax. Unfortunately, the Provincial Executive did not make it to the October 28th meeting at the scheduled time and the quorum was lost. An informal discussion ensued as well as an exchange of financial information. Those Executive members present reaffirmed the motion of September 9th while the Provincial indicated that they would not waive the Per Capita Tax retroactivity for the August to October 1980 period. The discussion also touched upon some of the anti-Provincial sentiment that existed at our Local.
Minutes

Membership Meeting - Thursday, November 20, 1980
IRC 6
12:30 to 1:10 pm.

Ray Galbraith, the Secretary-Treasurer, explained to the meeting that a chairperson had to be elected from the floor. This was to be done according to Bourinot's Rules of Order, Section 31 - Absence of Presiding Officer. Ray indicated that the President was ill and the position of Vice-President was to be filled at this meeting. Carole Cameron was elected by acclamation to chair the meeting. Ray Galbraith recorded the minutes.

1. Adoption of agenda:
   Moved by Andreas Gingera
   Seconded by Margie Wally
   The motion was CARRIED.

2. Adoption of minutes:
   Moved by Joanne Treleaven
   Seconded by Carol Baisley
   MEETING BE ADOPTED AS CIRCULATED.

3. Business arising from the minutes:
   a. There was no business arising from the minutes.
   b. There was no business arising from the correspondence.

4. Business arising from the correspondence:
   a. There were no nominations for the following Provincial Committees: Provincial Communications Committee, Provincial Benefits Committee (2), Provincial Education Committee, Committee to Investigate Discovery Parks, Cross-Local Committee to Investigate AUCE Salaried Staff, and Cross-Local Superannuation Pension Investigating Committee. Nominations were to remain open for a further month.

5. Nominations:
   a. President - Marcel Dione was elected by acclamation.
   b. Vice-President - Linda Trettak was elected by acclamation.
   c. Trustees (2) - Sharon Newman and Andreas Gingera were elected by acclamation.
   d. Membership Secretary - Joan Treleaven was elected by acclamation.
   e. Provincial Representatives - Susan Zagar and Kitti Cheesa were elected by acclamation.

6. Communications Committee - There were no nominations for the Committee and they were to remain open on a continuing basis.

7. Benefits Committee (2) - Cobie Wennes was elected by acclamation. One position was to remain open until the following meeting.

8. New Business:
   a. Two members - Carole Cameron reminded the members present that the Telecommunications Workers were engaged in selective picketing at the University. She pointed out the Executive had sent a letter to the University bona-fide any picket lines which should appear. The first building to be picketed was Henry Angus and the latest had occurred the day before at Geological Sciences. Carole recommended that if any members had any related questions or if they found their building being picketed, they should contact the Union Office.
   b. Escalating legal expenses - A member, Pat LaVac, asked a question in regards to the matter of escalating legal expenses. The wanted to know whether or not the Executive had discussed the issue. Ray Galbraith replied that the Executive and the Union Office were well aware of the cost of legal expenses, especially in relation to our present financial situation. He added that the Union Office staff planned to prepare for the newsletter which would contain references to the issue and list possible solutions. One of those solutions or suggestions would be to have the Union Office staff advocate for the Union in arbitrations, but only under certain circumstances.
   c. The Membership Meeting - Linda Trettak asked when the meeting in December was scheduled for. Carole Cameron explained that due to exams we were unable as yet to confirm either a room or a date. She said that the Executive favoured using IRC 6 on a continuing basis because it was more intimate. She also announced that there would be a film at the December meeting about the organizing drive at York University by YUSA. Another member, Diane Green, recommended bringing the meeting forward to page 27.
Breaking away from the standard documentary account of the woes of workers, Operation Finger Pinky takes a light-hearted look at what actually happened when university office workers decided they needed a union. The film is based on the stage version of the play presented by the Théâtre Passe Muraille and features the original cast and director.

Job discrimination against women and the labour-management conflict are problems that have been around for a long time. Through the use of over-statement and broad humour, Operation Finger Pinky deals with these issues in a refreshing new way.

Produced by the National Film Board of Canada

notice of motion

Susan Zagar, one of our Provincial Representatives, would like to give notice of motion for the following By-laws change. The motion, if passed, would mean that the two Provincial Representatives would become voting members of our Local's Executive.

E. Local Association Executive
The Local Association Executive shall include the following:

- President
- Vice-President
- Secretary-Treasurer
- Membership Secretary
- Union Organizer
- Union Co-ordinator
- 2 Trustees
- 2 Provincial Representatives
- Chairperson of the Grievance Committee
- Chairperson of the Contract Committee
- Chairperson of the Communications Committee
- Chairperson of the Action and Publicity Committee
- 1 Division Executive Representative from each Division
Membership Meeting

Membership Meeting - Wednesday, December 17, 1980
IRC 6
12:30 - 2:30 pm.

Article 10 - Union Meetings states:
"The University agrees to allow nine (9) two-hour lunch meetings (12:30 to 2:30) in each twelve (12) month period of the Collective Agreement. The Union may arrange when meetings are to be held provided at least ten (10) days advance notice is given."

What that means is that you are entitled to the time off from work to attend the December 17th Membership Meeting.

AGENDA

No Smoking

Motion to seat a member of CUPE 2278 - the Teaching Assistants' Union. That member, if seated, will report on the current state of their negotiations with the University and how it might affect AUCE and other campus unions.

1. Adoption of agenda.

2. Adoption of minutes of the November 20, 1980 Membership Meeting

3. Business arising from the minutes.

4. Business arising from the correspondence.

5. Nominations:
   Closing - Benefits Committee
   Communications Committee
   Provincial Education Committee
   Committee to Investigate Discovery Parks
   Cross-Local Committee to Investigate AUCE Salaried Staff
   Cross-Local Superannuation Pension Investigating Committee

6. Secretary-Treasurer's report

7. Grievance Committee report

8. Provincial report:
   Sheila Perret of the Provincial has requested to speak for ten minutes

9. Other Business:
   Committee reports

10. Film:
    "Operation Fingerpinky" - the organization drive of the York University Staff Association