Support AUCE

Come To Union Meetings
Minutes

Membership Meeting - August 20, 1981 - Scarfe 100
12:30 - 1:30 pm.

MINUTES

Chairperson: Marcel Dionne
Minutes Recorded By: Wendy Lymer
Announcement: No Smoking

1. Adoption of agenda:
   Two subjects were added under item B: CUPE negotiations and Budget cuts
   Moved by Joan Treleaven
   Seconded by Wendy Bice
   The motion was CARRIED.

2. Adoption of minutes:
   Moved by Pat House
   Seconded by Georgina Smith
   The motion was CARRIED.

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

4. Business arising from the correspondence:
   There was no business arising from the correspondence.

5. Nominations:
   • University Health and Safety Cttee Building Reps
     - There were no nominations. Would re-open at the next meeting.
   • Grievance Cttee - There were no nominations. Would re-open at the next meeting.
   • Local One Trustees - There were no nominations. Would re-open at the next union meeting.
   • Contract Cttee - Judy Blair, Irene McIntyre, Nancy Wiggs and Ray Galbraith were nominated. Judy Blair was not at the meeting; Irene accepted; Nancy and Ray declined.
   • Strike Cttee - Three members from VGH have been elected. Lid Strand was nominated; he declined. Would re-open at the next meeting.

Communication Cttee (4) - There were no nominations. Would remain open until the next meeting.

6. Secretary-Treasurer's report:
   Moved by Wendy Lymer
   Seconded by Wendy Bice
   THAT THE AUCE LOCAL ONE MEMBERSHIP APPROVE THE EXPENDITURE OF $3,910.00 TOWARD THE COST OF A COMPREHENSIVE STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF AND THE IMPACT OF VIDEO DISPLAY EQUIPMENT AS IT RELATES TO THE CLERICAL AND LIBRARY WORKERS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, THIS STUDY TO BE DONE BY THE OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH RESOURCE SERVICE AT SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY.
   The motion was CARRIED.
   + With reference to the Savings 100 Account balance on the financial statement, Richard Melanson asked if the Union would consider another term deposit. Wendy Lymer responded that, barring a CUPE strike, the membership would be asked to approve the purchase of another term deposit at the next meeting.

7. Grievance Committee report:
   + Press release issued re effect of budget cuts on AUCE members; letter also sent to the Administration; notice of bumping rights to members affected by cuts will be sent out.
   + Response to policy grievance on the implementation of revised computer operator and word processing job specs and salaries; University stands by original claim that the Union raised no objections to the proposals; will go to arbitration when an arbitrator is chosen.
   + Tel tech change; employees affected by automation; notice of change and details of changes are required by the Union; response is pending.
   + Motion on page 7 of newsletter
   Moved by Ted Byrne
   Seconded by Joan Treleaven
   THAT AUCE LOCAL #1 TAKE THE PROBATIONARY EMPLOYEE DISMISSAL GRIEVANCE TO ARBITRATION AND PAY ALL RELATED EXPENSES.
   The motion was CARRIED.

8. Executive report:
   + Job freeze: Vice-President Shaw decides which jobs will be filled. AUCE members will be faced with more work and less opportunities for transfer or advancement. The Unions are paying for the faculty settlement.
   + CUPE negotiations: Result of vote on wage proposal (15% and 13% over two years) not yet known; very little information is available.
   + AUCE overtime: Get request for overtime in writing to ensure payment.
   + Seniority: A sessional employee can only bump another sessional employee (with less seniority). Temporary employees have termination dates on their appointment notices; when the job ends, the employee is placed on the recall list; if a temporary employee has one year's worth of seniority, however, that individual has bumping privileges.
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6. Secretary-Treasurer's report (cont’d)
   Moved by Wendy Lymer
   Seconded by Joan Treleaven
   THAT THE AUCE LOCAL ONE MEMBERSHIP APPROVE THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT FOR THE MONTH ENDED JULY 31, 1981.
   The motion was CARRIED.

7. Grievance Committee report:
   + Press release issued re effect of budget cuts on AUCE members; letter also sent to the Administration; notice of bumping rights to members affected by cuts will be sent out.
   + Response to policy grievance on the implementation of revised computer operator and word processing job specs and salaries; University stands by original claim that the Union raised no objections to the proposals; will go to arbitration when an arbitrator is chosen.
   + Tel tech change; employees affected by automation; notice of change and details of changes are required by the Union; response is pending.
   + Motion on page 7 of newsletter
   Moved by Ted Byrne
   Seconded by Joan Treleaven
   THAT AUCE LOCAL #1 TAKE THE SECRETARY II RECLASSIFICATION GRIEVANCE TO ARBITRATION AND PAY ALL RELATED EXPENSES.
   The motion was CARRIED.

Moved by Ted Byrne
Seconded by Joan Treleaven
THAT AUCE LOCAL #1 TAKE THE PROBATIONARY EMPLOYEE DISMISSAL GRIEVANCE TO ARBITRATION AND PAY ALL RELATED EXPENSES.
The motion was CARRIED.
9. Job Evaluation Committee report:

+ Evaluation program is being monitored at SFU by Ted Byrne. No results yet.
+ Volunteers are needed.

Marcel Dionne entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting.

+ Russ Selinger gave notice of motion to reconsider the motion to rescind.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 pm.

 CONTRACT COMMITTEE REPORT
by Murray Adams

The at-large and ex officio members of the Contract Committee have begun to hold regular meetings. We hope that the Division meetings to be held during September will elect Division representatives, so that the complete Committee will be able to start preparing contract proposals.

To date, we have identified five broad areas of concern, and assigned Committee members to draft a membership questionnaire, as follows:

Wages - Susan Bagan - 4578
Benefits - Wendy Rice - 224-2308
Technological Change - Shirley Irvine - 6304
Job Evaluation - Marcel Dionne - 4582
Grievance Procedure - Murray Adams - 2882

Irene McIntyre (5605) was elected to the Committee at the last membership meeting, but has not yet had the chance to "adopt" an area.

She is chairperson of the Job Evaluation Committee.

If you are interested in representing your division on the Contract Committee, please attend your Division meeting. If you cannot attend, send a note to the Union office through Canada Mail indicating your interest.

Please be aware that researching and negotiating a new contract require a considerable investment of time and energy over several months. There will almost certainly be evening and weekend meetings, especially after Christmas.
Because of the recent settlement between the University and the Faculty Association, we can expect to be told by the University that due to the limited financial resources of the University, the clerical and secretarial staff must be prepared to accept wage increases which fall below the rate of inflation or face certain layoffs.

This argument ignores the reality that the University is basically only a bargaining agent for the Provincial Government whose revenues pay our wages. In making this argument, therefore, the Administration and its toadies take the position that the members of our Union must subsidize the provincial treasury or the Faculty Association, or both.

The fallacy of this argument lies in its assumption that the government budgetary guidelines are written in stone. It is to be expected that government budgets will tend to allow for only very modest pay increases so as to avoid undercutting the bargaining position of those who act on its behalf, in this case, the University.

This same tactic was used by the government during the period immediately preceding negotiations between the hospitals and the nurses' union. No doubt, management spokesmen and those within the nurses' union who instinctively adopt the management position in such disputes argued that to grant increases in pay that keep up with inflation and allow for a catch-up for the lost real value of wages would result in massive layoffs.

In the wake of the nurses' 44% settlement, this did not happen. Rather, government guidelines were readjusted to allow for the cost of the settlement, as they certainly would be if our Union were to win a pay increase comparable to that granted to the Faculty Association.

We therefore urge the members of AUCE Local I to pay scant regard to the argument that in the upcoming negotiations the membership is faced with a choice between a decent settlement or job security. There is no reason why we can't have both.

Murray Adams
Suzan Zagar
Wendy Bice
Shirley Irvine
Irene McIntyre

WAGES/JOB SECURITY
NEGOTIATION ISSUES
by
Contract Committee
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GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

The Grievance Committee is very busy these days. We have several ongoing grievances and policy grievances, three ongoing arbitrations, and five pending arbitrations. If anyone is interested in joining this committee we'd be very glad to hear from you. There's never a dull moment!

We are collecting information on the pension plan and problems that members are having obtaining tuition waivers. If anyone has anything to say (opinion, complaint, etc.) on either of these matters, please contact the Union Office.

Orientation/Probation

We would like people to be aware that the orientation period and the probationary period are two very different things. The orientation period applies only to new employees and extends for 3 calendar months, or 66 days. This provision is largely to the benefit of the University. If they find that an employee's performance is inadequate during this period they have the right to terminate them, subject to the collective agreement and the grievance procedure. In such a case the employee has the right to 2 weeks notice, or pay in lieu of notice. A probationary employee has all the rights and privileges of the collective agreement, except where stated otherwise (e.g. 2 weeks notice of termination instead of a month). The probationary period cannot be extended beyond 3 months.

An orientation period also lasts for 3 months. This period applies only to an employee who has been transferred or promoted. This article (22.08) is to the benefit of both the employer and the employee. It allows for the person concerned to be moved to another position if either party is dissatisfied. The employee in such a case would be allowed to choose any vacant position in their former salary range. If no vacancy is available they must be returned to their old job (except where the transfer was involuntary and the old job no longer exists - in this case, a vacancy would have to be found). The orientation period cannot be extended.

At the end of the three month period in both cases, an evaluation of the employee's performance is usually done. This evaluation is not something that the Union has contracted with the University. The only recourse the employer has if the evaluation is not satisfactory is through article 23 of the collective agreement: Employee Files.
NOTICE OF MOTION

The 1981 AUCE Provincial Convention passed the following resolution:

"BE IT RESOLVED THAT Convention urges Local 1 to pay the outstanding per capita tax to AUCE Provincial, and if Local 1 makes such a commitment then,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT AUCE Provincial shall pay a grant of $4000 from the Provincial Strike Fund to AUCE Local 1, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT AUCE Provincial make an interest-free loan of $4000 to AUCE Local 1 repayable in full on or before June 25th, 1982, with the understanding that if the total outstanding amount is less than $8000, then the amount of the local will be reduced."

If this resolution is agreed to by our Local, it will mean the Provincial will make a grant of $4000 which is a donation to Local 1. Local 1 agrees to repay the difference of the outstanding amount ($3862.50) by accepting an interest-free loan from the Provincial. Repayment of this loan shall be made by June 25, 1982.

If the above is acceptable to Local 1, the matter will be considered resolved and settled. It is the recommendation of the Local 1 Executive that the above resolution be accepted.

WHAT WE'RE WORTH, IN DOLLAR TERMS ALONE

September 3, 1981

Robert Grant
Director
Employee Relations Department
CAMPUS MAIL

Dear Mr. Grant:

The Contract Committee is prepared to receive, consider, and put before the Union membership for discussion, any proposal which the University wishes to make regarding wage increases for any or all AUCE Local 1 members.

If such a proposal is to receive the earliest possible consideration by our full membership (at our September 17th membership meeting), we regard it as essential that the proposal be in our hands not later than September 14, 1981.

Please advise the Union Office whether you have a proposal to make, and further whether you are able to make it by the September 14th deadline.

Thank you for your attention.

Yours truly,

Murray Adams
Contract Committee Chairperson
AUCE Local 1
August 31, 1981

The Editor
"On Campus"
AUCE Local 1
#202 - 6383 Memorial Road

Dear Editor:

In discussion with members of AUCE Local 1, it has come to my attention that there is some misunderstanding regarding the significance of a fortnightly, or bi-weekly, pay period. It would seem that many people are under the illusion that they will actually receive more money by having twenty-six rather than the twenty-four pay cheques currently received under the semi-monthly system.

Perhaps this misconception could be cleared up by a statement in your publication to the effect that under the bi-weekly pay system the annual salary remains the same but is divided by 26, not 24.

e.g. Annual salary of $12,000:

- paid semi-monthly = $12,000 = $500 per pay period
  24
- paid bi-weekly = $12,000 = $461.54 per pay period
  26

Yours truly,

Rowena Tate
September 2, 1981

Letters

Erik de Bruijn
Administrative Services Librarian
Main Library
CAMPUS MAIL

Dear Mr. de Bruijn:

AUCE Local 1 is in receipt of copies of Michael Shaw's August 14, 1981 letter to Deans & Coordinator of Health Sciences; President Kenny's August 14, 1981 letter directed to Dear Colleague; your memorandum of August 26, 1981 to Division & Branch Heads and your memorandum of August 27, 1981 to Division & Branch Heads all of which deal with current budget problems the University is facing.

In particular I would like to deal with points made in your August 26th memorandum. You state the following:

"This may require the reassignment of staff members from less essential work."

"Reassignments will be made in accordance with the AUCE agreement."

"The Head should indicate what arrangements can be made within the division/branch to cope, and whether less essential activities can be curtailed."

"Whether a position will be filled through reassignment of staff within the Library."

"If a position is to be refilled by reassignment from another division or branch, a prospective candidate will be selected... If the reassignment is feasible, the staff member will be reassigned until further notice."

The Union wishes to remind you of the differences between involuntary transfer and reassignment. You indicate in your memorandum your intent to transfer AUCE members to vacant positions as needed. Your intent is not reassignment, as you suggest, what you are proposing is involuntary transfer. This can only happen when the position of the person you are transferring no longer exists.

Yours truly,

Carole Cameron
Union Organiser
on behalf of AUCE
Local 1 Executive

Dr. D.T. Kenny
President
University of British Columbia
Campus Mail

Dear Dr. Kenny:

We received a copy of a memo dated August 14th, 1981, from one of our bargaining unit members, regarding the implementation of a hiring freeze on campus. This memo had been directed to Deans and Coordinators of Health Sciences Vice Presidents, from Dr. Michael Shaw. To date, in spite of our enquiries, we have received no notification of the University's intentions, or of the ramifications of this freeze on the employees working at UBC.

AUCE Local I represents 1500 clerical and library workers at UBC. Many of these UBC employees will be affected by the freeze. Consequently, those who have been advised by their department heads and who have been requested to "co-operate" in order to ease the resulting problems due to this directive, have called this office for information and advice.

It would appear to this Union that if the president's office has any concern or consideration for their employees they would see fit to inform the AUCE Executive of any plans which seriously affect AUCE members. The fact that the AUCE office has not been notified of this serious situation which will affect the livelihood of a great many employees on this campus is thoughtless and offensive.

If the University wishes to indicate to the community that they are a progressive institution, and in the interest of good labour relations on this campus, I would suggest that they commence by treating their support staff and the Local 1 Executive with considerably more respect.

Yours truly,

Wendy Bice
Union Co-ordinator
AUCE Local 1

cc: Mr. Robert Grant, Director Employee Relations Department

2162 Western Parkway, Vancouver, B.C., V6T 1V6 Telephone (604) 224-2308
### Contribution Rates for 1981/1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>STC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pension Plan</td>
<td>5% less CPP</td>
<td>10% less CPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Pension Plan (exemption 1400)</td>
<td>1.8% x $14,700</td>
<td>1.8% x $16,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Max $39,900)</td>
<td>(Max $29,400)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Life Insurance</td>
<td>.0033</td>
<td>.0033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Life and Disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Life, A &amp; P (1,2)</td>
<td>.00142</td>
<td>.00518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (4,5)</td>
<td>.00097</td>
<td>.00563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability, A &amp; P (1,2)</td>
<td>.00376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (4,5)</td>
<td>.00466</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>$5.75</td>
<td>$5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Aug/81)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>$11.50</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married +</td>
<td>$14.37</td>
<td>$28.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Care Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>$5.80</td>
<td>$5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Aug/81)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>$11.33</td>
<td>$22.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married +</td>
<td>$16.43</td>
<td>$32.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married + (Faculty)</td>
<td>$29.99</td>
<td>$39.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Care Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>$5.80</td>
<td>$5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>$11.33</td>
<td>$22.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married +</td>
<td>$16.43</td>
<td>$32.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married + (Faculty)</td>
<td>$29.99</td>
<td>$39.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers' Compensation</td>
<td>.0060 x $22,200 (Max $88.80)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LETTERS

I would like to bring something peculiar to the membership's attention. It concerns the union's filling of a grievance and the possibility of it spending perhaps hundreds of dollars in legal fees if this case goes to arbitration in order to roll back about $115 or less per month in wages for the operators. It's astonishing that the union has ended up fighting against pay increases that were effective over a year ago (August 26, 1980) rather than supporting them. Imagine how bewildering this situation is to the 13 AUCE members who are involved.

The whole affair began in February 1980 when the computer operators decided to try to upgrade their salaries. The University was contacted and they advised the operators that their salaries were being discussed with their department head and that recommendations would be made through the bargaining process. The operators then contacted the Contract Committee and in May the membership voted on whether everyone should get a 10% increase and the motion was passed by 96 members. It felt that the computer operators deserved an upgrade but so did everyone else. To have such an "all or nothing" attitude in a 1400 member union is ridiculous. The Committee should have been prepared to suggest ways to address the existing anomalies.

At this point after doing very little from June 1980 to March 1981 the Job Evaluation Committee decided to block this offer by introducing a motion to reject piecemeal upgrades and the motion was passed by 96 members. It felt that the computer operators deserved an upgrade but so did everyone else. To have such an "all or nothing" attitude in a 1400 member union is ridiculous. The Committee should have been prepared to suggest ways to address the existing anomalies.

In a letter dated June 8, 1980, Katharine P. Young, a lawyer who was consulted by the Union said, "The Union seems to have just recognized the problem but has not done anything tangible to solve it.

The Job Evaluation Committee whose function is to communicate with the University any problems and proposals concerning job evaluation and classification offered no help or even showed any interest in the computer operator's situation when they were contacted. In the middle of August 1980 the computer operators applied for a job reclassification. In the months that followed they were interviewed by a job analyst and the job descriptions were changed to reflect the changes that occurred since 1975. The University felt that the changes were great enough to justify a reclassification. The only problem was that the University had to find the money before it could offer to reclassify the operators and in March 1981 the money was allocated from the Computing Centre's operating budget.
have their wage rate changed. The problem, of course, is that a refusal to allow upgrading of the computer operators does not result in other members receiving this money...it is my suggestion that the union negotiate with the university in an effort to gain some advantage from their offer.

Good suggestion! I wish the Union would have taken that wise advice.

G. Sawchuk

VOLUNTEERS

-In the Union Office, there are many time-consuming jobs such as stapling, copying, folding, pasting, etc. which slow projects down and overburden the Union Office staff.
-the Executive wish you would fill in this form and send it to the Union Office:

YES! I WISH I WERE THERE!

NAME ____________________________ DEPARTMENT ____________________________
PHONE ____________________________

I am available to help from 12:00 - 1:00 __________ after work __________
1:00 - 2:00 __________ other __________

NEXT ISSUE DEADLINE:

SUBMISSIONS accepted no later than
SEPTEMBER 29, 1981

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR
EMPLOYEE RELATIONS

Ms. Carole Cameron,
Union Organiser,
A.U.C.E., Local 1,
202 - 6383 Memorial Road,
Campus #617.

Re: Medical Insurance Coverage

Dear Ms. Cameron:

The government has increased the cost for Medical Insurance and the rates have gone up as follows:

Single Coverage - $11.50 per month total
Couple Coverage - $23.00 per month total
Family Coverage - $28.75 per month total

As the cost is shared equally by both the University and the employee, both parties will be paying more for their coverage effective immediately. As the date of August 1, 1981 has been affixed by the government for the increase in the fee structure, this will mean deduction will start with effect in the July paycheque.

We are notifying you of this matter in advance, in order that your members may be informed.

Sincerely,

W. L. Clark
Assistant Director.

LETTERS

N. L. Clark,
Assistant Director.

COPY

RE: Medical Insurance Coverage

July 20, 1981.

Ms. Carole Cameron,
Union Organiser,
A.U.C.E., Local 1,
202 - 6383 Memorial Road,
Campus #617.

Re: Medical Insurance Coverage

Dear Ms. Cameron:

The government has increased the cost for Medical Insurance and the rates have gone up as follows:

Single Coverage - $11.50 per month total
Couple Coverage - $23.00 per month total
Family Coverage - $28.75 per month total

As the cost is shared equally by both the University and the employee, both parties will be paying more for their coverage effective immediately. As the date of August 1, 1981 has been affixed by the government for the increase in the fee structure, this will mean deduction will start with effect in the July paycheque.

We are notifying you of this matter in advance, in order that your members may be informed.

Sincerely,

W. L. Clark
Assistant Director.

LETTERS

N. L. Clark,
Assistant Director.

COPY

RE: Medical Insurance Coverage

July 20, 1981.

Ms. Carole Cameron,
Union Organiser,
A.U.C.E., Local 1,
202 - 6383 Memorial Road,
Campus #617.
MOTION:

That the motion:

"That the motion:

That the membership reaffirm its position taken during the last set of negotiations by rejecting any piecemeal upgrading of jobs by the University.

be rescinded."

be reconsidered.

This motion will be introduced at the September meeting because of the unfairness with which the motion to rescind was defeated.

1. The motion to rescind required that a notice of motion be given. Only I gave a notice of motion so only I should have been able to move the motion. Nancy Wiggs gave no intent to move the motion and had no right to do so.

2. In any case, a motion should only be moved by one who supports it. It is a parody of the democratic system when the only reason someone introduces a motion is to have it defeated as quickly as possible.

3. In its grievance to the University, the Union states:

The union also highly objects to the University's extreme bad faith in not granting the Union's request for an extension of the time limit for the proposals, and to the improper and objectionable manner in which the University has proceeded, in general, in this matter.

This same statement also applies to the Union. Why does the Union expect the University to grant a second extension, when the Union

won't even grant a single extension to its own members?

It is because of the improper and objectionable manner in which the Union has proceeded in general in this matter of upgrades that I am putting forward this motion.

(Signed)

Russ Selinger

"Six boxes of cookies for you, and no arguments."

HAS MANPOWER CUT YOUR TRAINING PROGRAM?

IF SO, PLEASE LET US KNOW.

We want to help you and reverse the Program cuts

Call Jean at Vancouver Status of Women

873-1427
Dear Sir:

I am writing today to inform you of a new plan that we have just put into motion that we feel will help the membership of your Union when they decide to purchase a new car.

We would like you members to come into the head office of JIM PATTISON TOYOTA at 9898 Government Street, Burnaby, at Lougheed and North Road. If they will ask for me, DAWSON GANONG, I will see that they purchase their NEW car or truck at $100.00 over DEALER COST.

I will outline the basic points of this plan:

1.) The car must be purchased at JIM PATTISON TOYOTA in BURNABY.
2.) The price of the car will be $100.00 over DEALER COST.
3.) They MUST PRODUCE THEIR UNION CARD AS SOON AS THEY ASK FOR DAWSON GANONG.
4.) This is an experiment we are trying for the next six months, and if it goes well, we will continue to use this plan.
5.) Information regarding prices can only be quoted in person.

May we ask that you publish this information to all Union Members through your monthly newsletter so they will know it is on-going.

Please reply in writing if you are going to act on this and who we should get in contact with for any further information. Please feel free to call me at 939-6641.

I am looking forward to serving your members.

Yours sincerely,

Dawson Ganong,
Jim Pattison Toyota, Burnaby

Our Business is Keeping Your Business
OUR UNION

A Tragical Morality Play in 5 Acts
by R. Selinger

"There is no expedient to which a man will not go to avoid the real labour of thinking."
Thomas Edison

DEDICATION:
This play is dedicated to Thomas Hobbes for stating:
"A democracy is no more than an aristocracy of orators. The people are so readily moved by demagogues that control must be exercised over speech and press."

CAST:
Job Evaluation Committee - a hard-working, industrious committee with a fondness for pink paper, that wishes it had no work to do.

Comprised of individuals who should like to meet irregularly, publish monthly and argue loudly. No interest or experience in evaluating jobs is required or encouraged.
Motto: THINK PINK

Wancy Niggs - a modern-day heroine. Should believe that democracy and freedom of speech slow things down; likes to see things done expediently (define expediently as 'her way').

Has political aspirations, i.e. may run for President of AUCE Provincial Executive.

Innocent Bystander - every morality play needs one.

Chairperson - a person with a chair as an appendage.

University - the antagonist (the 'bad guys').

Computer Operators - 10 to 14 hardy souls (define that as more 'bad guys') who attempt to disrupt the best laid plans of mice and MAUCE.

SYNOPSIS OF ACTS I AND II

Set at a large university, Act I opens with a group of computer operators who attempt to rouse the rabble by asking for an upgrade in pay. Surprisingly, (and this is not the only surprise in the play) the University agrees to upgrade the operators not because the operators are no longer required to run two computing systems, whereas before they only had to run one; not because the two systems run on two different computers, with two completely different sets of commands, but because the University wants to upset the Union.

The University's ploy worked. In Act II, the Union is upset. They don't want the University paying their members more money; it will divide the Union. The plot thickens, however, as the Job Evaluation Committee sees their opportunity to reduce their workload considerably. So rather than evaluate the changes in the computer operators' job, with one masterful stroke, they push through a motion that will disallow anyone in the Union from ever applying for an upgrade, thereby killing over a thousand birds with one stone. The swiftness and sureness of the JEC's move would have inspired Machiavelli's grandmother, were she alive today.

At this point, to add to the intrigue, the computer operators introduced a motion to rescind the motion of the JEC. Now entering Act III, we have the JEC ready to ruin the motion to rescind. To ensure their success, they have enlisted the help of Wancy Niggs (it has been rumored that a pledge of votes was promised, but we found no basis for the rumor). With this we start Act III.

CAST (cont.):
Chorus - 20 to 80 Union members who occasionally attend meetings where they can see autocracy in action. Some get involved in the lively debate, while others just watch and amuse themselves.

A SPECIAL THANKS to all those little people out there (about 900 of you). Without your payment of dues, your continued support, and your continued absence, we would never get things done as quickly and as unfairly as we do. We wish we had parts for you all, but we hope you'll realize that it would be too time-consuming (besides, you probably wouldn't even spare the time for an audition).
ACT III

This Act should be staged in an open area something like the Areopagus to give the meeting the proper air of respect and judiciousness.

Wancy Niggs: (raises her hand) Uh. Uh.
Chairperson: The chair recognizes Wancy Niggs' hand.
Wancy: What about the motion on page 7? I'm against the motion so I want to move it to see that it gets defeated.
Chair: Then move it.
Innocent Bystander: (raises her hand)
Chair: Ya Innocent.
Innocent: How can Wancy move the motion, if she didn't give intent to move it?
Wancy: (casting Innocent a derogatory look and interrupts the chair) Because delay has hamstrung our Grievance Committee and I want to get rid of the motion, I mean deal with the motion as quickly as possible.
Innocent: But how can this motion be dealt with fairly if the person who intended to move it isn't here and the person who wishes to move it now, doesn't support it?
Wancy: (with her most condescending glance) Are you concerned with fairness or speed? It's people like you who really get my goat. Always want to gab about things for hours and never get anything done. I'm campaigning on getting things done and if that means we have to bend the rules, if that means that everyone doesn't get to speak, or if that means that people like you have to be gagged and bound, then . . .
Chair: Wancy, we'll hear your campaign speech later.
Computer Operator 1: But can't we table this motion till the one who intended to move it is here?
Chair: Are you asking for an extension? (should be said with an incredulous tone in his voice)
Operator 1: Yes.
Wancy: An extension? (in a scoffing tone)
Operator 1: Yes, an extension. Do you want me to spell it for you E, X . . .
Chorus: NO! Mustn't waste time. Mustn't waste time.

(At this point the faint sound of a train chugging along its tracks should be heard in the background)
Innocent: But aren't we grieving the University because they wouldn't give us a second extension and yet we won't even grant our own members a single extension? (said with emphasis)
Chair: Yes.
Wancy: So what. We don't have to treat our members the way we expect the university to treat us.
Chorus: Mustn't waste time. Mustn't waste time.

(The sound of the train should be quite audible now)
Wancy: Question.
Chair: Question has been called.
Innocent: But, I didn't get to speak on the motion.
Chorus: (louder) Mustn't waste time. Mustn't waste time.
Chair: All in favour?
Innocent: But . . .

(Innocent Bystander is taken and gagged and tied to the train tracks as the sound of the train gets louder)
Chair: (loud so as to be heard above the noise of the train) Passed.
Wancy: Ah, democracy in action.

(Curtain falls as the train lets out a deafening whistle)

END OF ACT III

Be prepared for ACTS IV and V.

"God help the nation where self-caricature and satire are verboten." - Evan Esar
### DIVISION A
- Sharon Newman, Physical Education, L.3838
- Penny Hanson, Graduate Studies, L.4556
- Betty Finnsson, Registrar's Office, L.6343

### DIVISION B
- Judith Willcox, Dentistry, L.2112
- Donna Brock, Audiology & Speech, L.5591
- Joan Cosar, Pharm. Sciences, L.3183
- Mary Vorvis, Co-ord. Health Sciences, L.6662
- Rosemary Morgan, Med. Microbiology, L.4726
- Phillip Hall, Woodward Library, L.2882/3
- Richard Melanson, Woodward Library, L.2884
- Murray Adams, Woodward Library, L.2882

### DIVISION C
- Wendy Courtice, Zoology, L.4807

### DIVISION D
- Anneke Maier, Chemistry, L.3266
- Fairleigh Murray, I.A.R.E., L.2731
- Judy Wolch, Commerce, L.2170
- Margaret Nicholson, Commerce (Real Estate), L.6861
- Lexie Clague, Geological Sciences, L.2713
- Janet Otto, Education, L.5346
- Yvonne Scotchman, Education, L.5248
- Joy Korman, Education, L.6502/5808

### DIVISION E
- Judy Blair, Housing, L.2811/2012
- Susanne Lester, Sedgwick Library, L.2406

### DIVISION F
- Helen Glavina, English, L.3122
- Lillian Vernels, Social Work, L.2295
- Lavone Stanfield, Social Work, L.2277
- Marcel Dionne, Purchasing, L.4582
- Bev Westbrook, Canadian Literature, L.2780
- Neil Armstrong, UBC Press, L.3259
- L.6351
- L.3838
- L.3266
- Helen Glavina
- L.3122
- Lillian Vernels
- Social Work
- L.2295
- Lavone Stanfield
- Social Work
- L.2277
- Marcel Dionne
- Purchasing
- L.4582
- Bev Westbrook
- Canadian Literature
- L.2780
- Neil Armstrong
- UBC Press
- L.3259

### DIVISION G
- L.6351
- L.3838
- L.3266
- Helen Glavina
- L.3122
- Lillian Vernels
- Social Work
- L.2295
- Lavone Stanfield
- Social Work
- L.2277
- Marcel Dionne
- Purchasing
- L.4582
- Bev Westbrook
- Canadian Literature
- L.2780
- Neil Armstrong
- UBC Press
- L.3259

### DIVISION H
- Donna Brock, Audiology & Speech, L.5591
- Joan Cosar, Pharm. Sciences, L.3183
- Mary Vorvis, Co-ord. Health Sciences, L.6662
- Rosemary Morgan, Med. Microbiology, L.4726
- Phillip Hall, Woodward Library, L.2882/3
- Richard Melanson, Woodward Library, L.2884
- Murray Adams, Woodward Library, L.2882

### DIVISION I
- Sheila Rowsell, Biomedical Communications, VGH, 873-5441, Local 2568

### DIVISION J
- Wendy Murphy, Prebindery, L.2437
- Kitti Chema, Recon Unit, L.2924
- Pat House, Serials Division, L.4578
- Suzan Zager, Serials Division, L.3192
- Ted Byrne, Catalogue Records, L.4379
- Ray Balbraith, Catalogue Administration, L.3426
- Gwyn Bartram, Space & AV Services, L.4400
- ST. PAUL'S HOSPITAL
- Andromata Phillips
- B.C. Drug & Poison Control Centre
- 682-2344
CORRESPONDENCE

July 29/81 Note from Irene McIntyre accepting nomination for position on Contract Cttee
Aug. 4/81 Letter from Wes Clark re implementation of a new employee record and payroll system
Aug. 4/81 Letter from Robert Grant/ER to Carole Cameron's letter re AUCE's role in alternative postal services
Aug. 4/81 Memo re Carole Cameron to Lynne Warneboldt re severance notice for Jo-Ann Harrison
Aug. 11/81 Letter from Will Carrilho, NABET rep, thanking AUCE for donation
Aug. 11/81 Memo from Dept. of Medicine, VGH, re members to be removed from mailing list
Aug. 11/81 Letter from Mayor Harcourt to Joyce Biggins re housing on the Endowment Lands
Aug. 12/81 Letter from Stuart Rush re Lissett Nelson arbitration hearing on July 8/81
Aug. 17/81 Memo from J. Young/Food Science re mailing list changes for two members
Aug. 20/81 Letter from Joan Treleaven re resignation from the Grievance Committee
Aug. 20/81 Copy of letter sent to dept. heads from President Kenny re hiring freeze and budget cuts
Aug. 21/81 News release from the BCGEU re national report on occupational health and safety regulatory reform
Aug. 26/81 Letter from Wes Clark/ER re Clerk II position description in Registrar's Office
Aug. 26/81 Original letter to Sheila Rowanwell re Executive meeting and her vacation schedule
Aug. 23/81 Original letter to Lynne Warneboldt/Staff Records enclosing appointment notice for Edmund Lee
Aug. 26/81 Memo and list of members at VGH from Adrien Kierans
Aug. 25/81 Copy of memo to Dr. Dirks from Norma Bourne re job transfer
Aug. 28/81 List of contribution rates to Pension, Medical and Dental plans at UBC
Aug. 27/81 Note from C. Rafferty/Women's Labor Project re their questionnaire
Aug. 28/81 Copy of memo to M. Massey/Dept. of Medicine from Barb Grant re job transfer
Sept. 1/81 News release from the BCGEU re Selkirk College (Local 57) picket lines
Sept. 1/81 Memo from Sharon Newman/P.E. resigning from her position on the Job Evaluation Cttee
Sept. 2/81 Memo from Lissett Nelson re publication of shop steward list in newsletter
Sept. 1/81 Letter from Sheila Perrett re 1980 per capita tax arrears resolution
Sept. 2/81 Letter from Rowena Tate re bi-weekly pay system
Sept. 2/81 Memo from Helen Givina re bulletin boards in the Buchanan Building and the Buchanan Tower

 Notices of Motion

1. That AUCE Local One take the L.A. IV leave of absence grievance to arbitration and pay all related expenses.

An L.A. IV with nine years seniority has been denied a leave of absence. The Grievance Committee feels that no effort was made by the University to accommodate this leave as per article 30.01.

2. That AUCE Local 1 take the L.A. IV hours of work grievance to arbitration.

An L.A. IV was denied the right to a four-day week as per article 28.01 of our collective agreement. The Grievance Committee feels that approval was unreasonably withheld, and that the grievance should be pursued to arbitration.

Both of these grievances involve articles of our contract which it is important for us to defend. Our acceptance of the University's position in both of these cases could set a very bad precedent for the future.
A HOUSING STUDY BY DOUGLAS HOUSE BUILDING SOCIETY
(for non-academic staff UBC) May 1980

Personal Variables

Average age of head of household: 38 yrs. of age
Average number of years of full-time employment at UBC: 8.6 yrs. of service
Average number of persons, including self, in residential household: 2.6 persons
Average number of income earning adults in each household: 1.5 persons
Average income per household per annum (to the closest thousand): $20,000 per annum

Current Housing Data and Preference

Percentage of non-property owners: 63%
Percentage of property owners: 37%
Type of property owners:
Owning a house/duplex: 25%
Condominium townhouse: 33%
Condominium apartment: 19%
Co-operative townhouse/apartment: 13%

Legal Form of Ownership/Occupancy

Preferable
Prefers Rental: 32%
Prefers Strata Title: 12%
Prefers Individual Title: 46%
Prefers Co-op: 17%

Size of Housing Required

One-Bedroom: 21%
Two-Bedroom: 35%
Three-Bedroom: 25%
Four- to Five-Bedroom: 14%
Unspecified: 5%

Preferred Architectural Form

Would Be...
Single family: 46%
Duplex: 11%
Townhouse: 32%
Low rise apartment: 16%
High rise apartment: 5%

Additional Data

Reasons for not owning property at present:
Do not wish to own one: 10%
Wish to own but can't afford down payment for an adequate residence: 13%
Wish to own but can't afford monthly payment: 12%
Wish to own but can't afford both down payment and monthly charges: 35%
Others: 10%

A HOUSING STUDY (Cont'd.)

Whether Owned Or Not, the Conditions of Present Residence

Inadequate: 8%
Marginal: 22%
Satisfactory: 54%
Excellent: 16%

Present Home Large Enough For Your Needs?
Yes: 42%
No: 58%

Present Home Near Enough to U.B.C.? 
Yes: 44%
No: 56%

Quality of Construction Of Present Home Satisfactory?
Yes: 41%
No: 59%
Unspecified: 4%

(Total number of questionnaires received: 166)
AGENDA

No SMOKING

1. ADOPTION OF AGENDA
2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES
3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES
4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE CORRESPONDENCE
5. NOMINATIONS: Opening
   University Health and Safety Ctte Building Reps
   Grievance Committee
   Local One Trustee
   Strike Committee
   Provincial Education Committee
   Closing
   Communication Committee

6. SECRETARY-TREASURER'S REPORT
7. GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE REPORT
8. CONTRACT COMMITTEE REPORT
9. EXECUTIVE REPORT
10. JOB EVALUATION COMMITTEE REPORT
11. PROVINCIAL REPORT
12. OTHER BUSINESS