The University has once again asked the Union to agree to raise the wage rates of small groups of workers based on the marketability argument. The Job Evaluation Committee is concerned about the implications of such an argument. In our last set of negotiations, the University wanted to single out a small group of people at the upper end of our classification structure and pay them more. The argument used by the University at the time was that they could not keep people in these positions because more money was being offered by other employers. We rejected the University proposal on the grounds that our classification structure and changes to it are not based on marketability but rather on the work performed.

According to the AUCE constitution, Section 2.1, our objectives are in part, "To bring about fair wage standards and to assure uniform job classification with equal pay for comparable work..."

The University proposes, in part, to move the Computer Operator Trainee from pay grade 3 to pay grade 4. The new basic requirements for this job would be high school graduation supplemented by two years formal training in computer operations or equivalent on-the-job training. At present the basic requirements for a Library Assistant III are a University degree, or a two year Library Technician program plus 1 year library experience or three years on-the-job training.

If the Union agrees to the University request, in effect, move small groups at the top of the pay scale up one pay grade we would also be agreeing that wage rates should be based on the market place where, as a Union composed largely of women, we know that the market place undervalues the skills associated with women workers. In arguing our general wage increase during that same set of negotiations, we maintained that the work done by our members in the lowest classification is at least as valuable to the University as that of the CPE person who sits in the information kiosk. Canadian Government Statistics reveal that the average wage of a woman in approximately 1/2 the average wage of a man in Canada. A recent study conducted by the OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development) 2004 found that Canadian women are paid less relative to men than women in all other industrial countries, and that part of the earnings difference is attributable to wage rate discrimination. Note that 2/3 of our membership is clustered at the middle and lower end of our pay scale.

It is the view of this committee that our classification structure is a valuable part of our contract but that the wages paid by the University to clerical and technical staff are behind wages paid elsewhere in the Lower Mainland. Our basic monthly rate is $1,130.00 while the base rate for clerical staff paid by the school board in Mission this year is approx. $1,428.00 a month, and in Chilliwack, $1,310.00.

The Job Evaluation Committee therefore asks the membership to reaffirm the Union position taken during our last negotiations to allow piecemeal upgrading of "marketable" jobs and the consequent destruction of the classification structure. In singling out small groups for pay raises because of their marketability the University is reinforcing the Status Quo: clerical and secretarial skills are undervalued. We appeal to the whole bargaining unit (who know that their wages are falling behind) to reject the University proposal.

We furthermore propose these motions to be voted on:
1. That the membership reaffirms its position taken during our last set of negotiations by rejecting any piecemeal upgrading by the University.
2. That a strategy committee be set up at this meeting to negotiate a wage reopener for our members.

A person's job can gradually, over the years, become more complex for many reasons such as a reorganization in a department, technological changes and added responsibilities. If a person can give the University good evidence to convince them that a pay upgrade is warranted, they (the University) are willing to support it.

The proper way to accomplish this is through the job reclassification procedure. Unfortunately, this procedure can only be used if there is a job description position in the contract that reflects what you do in the pay scale, a step higher than you are in. When there isn't a proper job description the University is willing to upgrade the job and keep the same job description. A salary upgrade is very similar to a reclassification therefore the money for the increased wages comes from an operating budget that does not influence the rest of the union's wages during the next contract settlement.

If the University agrees to spend more money on wages by upgrading the pay scale for a group within the union, the union should accept it because it allows for a group of AUCE members to receive a justified pay increase in addition to the contract increases. To turn down such an offer would be foolish.

G. Sawchuk

"Now I found out what they meant by an average 3% rise—clerical workers got 5% and all the others 3%!"

**LETTERS**
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G. Sawchuk
THE OBJECTIVES OF JOB EVALUATION

1. To compare jobs and to determine their level within each occupational group

2. To compare jobs between occupational groups; that is to see whether some are of more value than others

Achieving the first objective is important for promotion, career planning and personal development. Achieving the second objective is one of interest because of wage comparisons. Experience has demonstrated to this union that job descriptions on this campus are often misused. I believe that the main reason for this situation is the traditional approach that both the union and the university have taken towards the development of the present evaluation system.

The present approach to the development of job descriptions has been in use on this campus since 1960. The utilization of such an approach has resulted in a great deal of dissatisfaction amongst employees and supervisors and has proven to be original and sometimes critical to job success.

In summary, the present system works as follows:

- The supervisor and the employee are asked to identify a specific job situation. For each situation the supervisor and the employee are asked to briefly describe the condition which led to the request for the evaluation.
- Upon receipt of both versions, a job analyst from Employee Relations gets together with the employee and the supervisor in order to analyse the responses from both parties and to obtain further information if necessary.
- Once the above procedure has been completed, a position description which contains the pertinent information, is put together and a group of people, exclusive of any union or employee involvement decides if the position should be reclassified.

I believe that the above system gives substantial consideration to the university's internal policies, to the detriment of the employee doing the job. Reasons for this thinking come from the standard responses that individuals are given for not being reclassified.

In summary, the present job evaluation system, its objectives and its limitations have been a great concern to this union. The growing complexity of the university and the rapid proliferation of technological development necessitates a concise, constant and consistent job evaluation system. Since such a system is not implemented at this university, many inequalities have been created. Inequalities in pay grades have resulted in dissatisfaction and grievances. On the individual level, dissatisfaction is evidenced by low morale, and high absenteeism and employee turnover. Such happenings are costly to the university, as they disrupt production and require investment in recruiting and training.

To conclude, I must emphasize that any system of job evaluation on this campus must provide a basis for job incentive. All groups on campus have been pushing for some changes in this area. The university should realize that all this pushing indicates too little leadership on their part.

Marcel Dionne
President
AUCE Local I

CURRENT METHODS OF JOB EVALUATION

Since the formation of AUCE, the university job evaluation system has been questioned at contract negotiations, at grievance levels and in arbitration cases. The present system has been in force since 1960, and I firmly believe it needs some immediate attention.

In 1975, the contract committee negotiated the present modified wage scale. A series of job levels were looked at based on significant differences in skill, responsibility and similar job aspects. This method of comparing jobs has the advantage that people are used to classifying everything. The university as well as the union tend to classify jobs. This method also promotes thinking in terms of job classes (e.g., clerical, technical, manual) rather than individual jobs. Wage negotiations and administration are easier to handle for both the union and the university if jobs are thought of as belonging to job classes and job classes are assigned into pay grades.

This classification system appeared very simple to operate and created little time consumption for the university in the analytical method used. Hardly any input from the union. However, as the university became larger and new technology was implemented, jobs became more complex and their duties changed frequently.

I believe that the major limitation of the pay grade method for the overall assessment of the jobs, the lack of clearly defined criteria for job comparison and the lack of input from the union in the present classification system has resulted in a system that is very difficult to operate because of its serious limitations.

The present system of evaluation tells us whether a job is higher, lower, or equal to another job but it does not tell us how much higher or lower it is than the other job. The difficulty in applying the present system is not in obtaining job descriptions and a list of job duties, but to determine the appropriate use and interpretation of such a system.

Primarily because of the job market, the university is now willing to financially upgrade the value of certain jobs in our bargaining unit. I am strongly suggesting that the membership take a serious look at the university's willingness to upgrade some classifications. I believe that this union has been dragging its feet on the issue of classification rather than taking a leadership role on the subject.

To conclude, I must emphasize that the "I must do something" will always solve more problems than "something must be done". I believe that this union is past due on the "I must do something" and that it is about time that it started recognizing the full value of its membership.

Marcel Dionne
President
AUCE Local I
Letters

When the pay scale of the outside market is higher than at the university, job dissatisfaction occurs and people leave the university for these higher paid positions. Staff turnover escalates, work quality falters and the whole university is affected.

This is happening! HERE! NOW! To a group of our Auce members.

However, after more than a year of concerted effort by this group of dedicated Auce members, the University Administration finally recognized the injustice and has expressed its willingness to bring this group up to parity with their peers outside the university.

The money for this increase will come from the department's operating budget, instead of being spent on some other outlay such as new equipment.

THIS INCREASE WILL NOT, IN ANY WAY, LIMIT OR HINDER THE WAGES OF ANY OTHER UNION MEMBER OR GROUP; NOR WILL STAFF BE CUT.

It is important for every Auce member to stand behind this endeavor as it will undoubtedly set a precedent for other groups to successfully request and receive pay increases in addition to contract settlements, when warranted.

You will have an opportunity to express your feeling in a questionnaire, soon to be released.

Please support this group and open a new door of negotiating for all sisters and brothers.

Notice of Motions

The following resolutions were passed at the 1981 Annual Meeting of the National Action Committee of the Status of Women. I have amended them slightly so that our local could support them as well. If they are acceptable at the May 21st union meeting I will further move they be sent to the Provincial Convention in June.

BE IT RESOLVED that AUCE Local I use its influence to see that Government(s) ensure that each organization or company and the manufacturers of high technology equipment be responsible for applying appropriately upgraded standards of Health and Safety, the Employment Standards Legislation, and all such similar legislation so that workers are employed in safe working conditions.

BE IT RESOLVED that AUCE Local I attempt to join forces with other bodies or develop policy alternatives to deal with potential employment effects of technological change on women's jobs through joint research, policy proposals to government and a massive publicity campaign to inform workers who are most likely to be affected of the changes, layoffs and other potential adverse effects, and to educate employers on the issues and impact of technology on women.

BE IT RESOLVED that AUCE Local I request the Secretary of State to supply funding to the National Film Board, Studio D, so that they can do a film which can be used to alert women to the issues and concerns related to office automation and the associated computer-technology change.

BE IT RESOLVED that AUCE Local I supports the idea of the National Action Committee on the Status of Women to undertake discussions with member organizations to collaborate on a major conference on women and micro-technology to take place within the next two years and further that AUCE Local I express to the National Action Committee on the Status of Women its willingness to participate in such a conference.

BE IT RESOLVED that the foregoing resolutions be forwarded to the Resolutions Committee of the Provincial Association to be passed at its annual convention June 13 and 14, 1981.

Grievance Committee

NOTICE OF MOTION

THAT AUCE Local I take the Clerk III reclassification grievance to arbitration and pay all related expenses.

A Clerk III applied for reclassification and was turned down at the Reference Cmte level. She appealed to the Appeal Cmte and was reclassified to a Clerk III. Both the Grievance Cmte, the grievor and an independent person that reviewed the file feel this person should be reclassified to a IV.

THAT AUCE Local I take the probationary employee dismissal grievance to arbitration and pay all related expenses.

A Clerk II was given an unsatisfactory evaluation report after one month of employment. However there was no shop steward present nor was the seriousness of the report explained to the employee. At the second meeting there was a shop steward but the university had already decided to sever the employee and in fact told her at the second meeting she was fired. A copy of the grievance has been reviewed by the union's lawyer who feels we have a case.
The Benefits Committee report has had one meeting with the University, this on March 29, 1981. People from OTEU, UE were also present. The University’s representatives are H.M. Craven and F. Takenoto from the Finance Department, Erik de Brujin from the Library and W.L. Clark from Employee Relations.

We asked the University for statistics on the participation rate of our membership in the various benefits plans. We are looking at the Medical, Dental, Pension, Long Term Disability and Extended Medical plans. Only last Friday did we receive the requested information.

CU & C has offered to do a cost estimate for our bargaining unit on all our plans. That is, they would advise us if we were getting the best deal possible for the amount of money we are presently contributing, whether they could provide us with a different combination of plans for the same or less money but improved benefits, whether we would be better to have our bargaining unit separated from the other groups for some plans, as well as information on a wage indemnity plan, something we do not presently have. When we receive the above information from CU & C we will be having another meeting with the University.

In the meantime, listed below are some comparisons between MSA, the carrier for our present medical, dental and extended medical plans and CU & C. The carrier for Life Insurance and the Long Term Disability plans is Confederation Life. The University runs the Pension Plan.

Comparison of CU & C vs M.S.A. Standard Plan Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CU &amp; C</th>
<th>M.S.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Examination</td>
<td>not covered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required for Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance Charges</td>
<td>no limit except</td>
<td>specifies Canadian Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall maximum - not restricted to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Hospital or out of province</td>
<td>out of province limited to $1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Limitations and Exclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered</td>
<td>hospital co-insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claims costs incurred in an unlawful act or commission of crime</td>
<td>covered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered</td>
<td>elastic stockings - orthotic devices, arch supports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered for Fertility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-existing condition after three months</td>
<td>not eligible while out of province</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits &amp; Deductibles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU &amp; C reimburses at 100% of eligible expenses when member and/or family expenses exceed $1,000.00</td>
<td>reimburses at 100% when individual exceeds $1,000.00 of eligible expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMPARISON OF CU & C VS M.S.A. STANDARD PLAN BENEFITS

The Benefits Committee report continued -

Claims

- every 90 days - no liability after one year of date of disability
- e.g. January - March 1980 not eligible after January - March 1981
- restricted to age 25 - does not cover mentally or physically handicapped
- includes coverage of co-insurance
- orthopaedic shoes and repair and replacement as required - no limit
- heading aid to age 16 - $300.00 limit in 5 years
- fees of a podiatrist - $200.00 per year - $500.00 per family
- registered nurse for private duty in an emergency out of province as well as in B.C. - no maximum except overall maximum
- Fees of a physiotherapist - no limit - except overall maximum not covered
- fees of acupuncturist - $100.00 per year - no family maximum
- dental treatment for accidental injury
- charges for wheelchair includes electric lift required
- wigs or hair pieces - $100.00 maximum
- no age limit - $500.00 lifetime limit

Mother's Day Poem

PAULINE B. BART

M is for her menopausal problems
O is for her “masochistic” needs
T is for her terror as she ages
H is for the help for which she pleads
E is for the emptiness her life is
R is for the roles that she has lost.
Put them all together: they spell MOTHER
The ones the culture’s double-crossed.
ATTENTION:
The Union has the following people and films that could be part of a union meeting if there is sufficient interest. Please indicate beside each one listed below whether you would like to either see a film or have a speaker at one of our meetings.

H.M. Craven, Assistant Treasurer, Finance Department UBC - to speak on the University Pension Plan

R.L. Robson, Inspector, Occupational Environment Branch, Ministry of Labour - to speak on occupational health and safety as it relates to our working environment at UBC and avenues open to us to have work areas inspected

The Case of Barbara Parsons, NATIONAL FILM BOARD film dealing with a woman that is fired in the work place and how the grievance proceeds

Now the Chips are Down, British Film on the history and introduction of micro-chip technology into our working lives

Please return this completed questionnaire to the Union Office as soon as possible.

Parking Fees

WHEREAS parking fees have increased by 100%,
WHEREAS such an increase represents an unjustifiable hardship, particularly to underpaid AUCE members,
WHEREAS the University’s practice is to issue more parking stickers than there are places to park,
WHEREAS many UBC staff/faculty parking lots are not being maintained or improved,
WHEREAS UBC campus is geographically isolated from major greater Vancouver public transit routes, and from surrounding districts, and
WHEREAS such an increase would subsidize UBC’s capital funds.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:
- that AUCE Local 1 initiate a campaign against such exorbitant parking increases and that we involve other campus unions, students, and the Faculty Association.
- that AUCE Local 1 strike a committee at this meeting to carry out the campaign in the following manner:
  - to encourage AUCE members, other campus unions, and the Faculty Association to withhold the $40 portion of the $96 fee which will be going to "a capital reserve fund for future parkade construction."

At the April 28th union meeting the above motion was passed and a committee was formed. The members of that committee are:

Ann Hutchinson, L.2899
Nancy Wiggs, L.2880
Susan Zagar, L.3792
Lillian Varnals, L.2177

If you are interested in participating on this committee please contact one of the above people.
THROUGH A GLASS, DIMLY

WHY 75 SECRETARIES AT THE UN WALKED OFF THEIR ULTRA-MODERN JOBS

by Gwenda Blair
What the working woman needs is a wife

By ANN SAGI
How to Bargain for A Bigger Paycheck
Minutes

Membership Meeting - Tuesday, April 28, 1981
12:10-2:15 pm.

The meeting was chaired by Marcel Dionne and the minutes were recorded by Wendy Lymer.

Before the agenda was adopted, several changes were made by Marcel Dionne. Under item 3 of the agenda, "Opening nominations, "Alternate" was added after "University, Health and Safety Committee". Also under opening nominations, the position of Union Organizer was added. Under item 8, Executive report, Re classifications of certain groups in the bargaining unit (Questionnaire)" was removed and would be discussed at the next Membership Meeting. It would be replaced by a Microtechnology and Pension Conferences report.

1. Adoption of agenda:
   Moved by Nancy Wiggs
   Seconded by Ted Byrne
   The motion was CARRIED.

2. Adoption of minutes:
   Moved by Suzan Zagar
   Seconded by Cobie Wennes
   The motion was CARRIED.

3. Business arising from the minutes:
   Anna Hutchison referred to the report on proposed increases in faculty and staff parking fees, which were increased by 100%.
   WHEREAS the University's practice is to issue more parking stickers than there are places to park,
   WHEREAS parking fees have increased by 100%,
   WHEREAS such an increase represents an unjustifiable hardship, particularly to underpaid AUCE members,
   WHEREAS the University's practice is to issue more parking stickers than there are places to park,
   WHEREAS many UBC staff/faculty parking lots are not being maintained or improved,
   WHEREAS UBC campus is geographically isolated from major greater Vancouver public transit routes, and from surrounding districts, and
   WHEREAS such an increase would subsidize UBC's capital funds.

   THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:
   Moved by Suzan Zagar
   Seconded by Nancy Wiggs
   The motion was CARRIED.

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

5. Nominations:
   Alternate Provincial Representative - Elizabeth Brock was nominated.
   University Health and Safety Committee (Alternate) - Shirley Irvine was nominated.
   Union Organizer - Carole Cameron offered a brief description of her responsibilities. She indicated that the positions are flexible within the University Office, meaning that the Organizer and Co-ordinator especially have
   interchangeable duties when necessity requires it. The Organizer is responsible for training stewards; for preparing grievances at the stage where a meeting with University reps is necessary; for providing other committees of the union with information; for attending a least one shop steward seminar per year; for standing on the Benefits Committee; and for making herself/himself familiar with the collective agreement.
   Carole Cameron and Helen Glavina were nominated. Nominations will close at the May membership meeting.

Closing

Lid Strand asked if the Provincial Representative position could be settled before delegates to the Convention were discussed. As there was no objection, Kitti Cheema was asked if she would accept the position. She declined. Sheila Rowswell was nominated and accepted.

Delegates to the Provincial Convention (10) - Helen Glavina, Nancy Wiggs, and Murray Adams were nominated and accepted. Joan Treleaven, Richard Malanock, Marcel Dionne, Carole Cameron, Pat House, Cobie Wennes and Kitti Cheema accepted.

Wendy Rice and Connie Poulsen were absent and have not responded otherwise. Ted Byrne declined. Marcel declared the ten delegates who accepted the nomination as elected by acclamation.
Minutes - Page 3

Grievance Committee (1) - Murray Adams and Joan Treleaven were nominated. Carole Cameron indicated that the Grievance Committee would be quite happy to accept both nominees if they were so inclined. Murray and Joan accepted the nominations and were declared elected by acclamation.

Provincial Education Committee - Nancy Wiggs inquired as to the purpose of this Committee. Lid Strand replied that this Committee was in charge of organizing workshops and seminars which was its primary concern. The Committee also involved itself with research. Marcel asked that as no nominations were forthcoming at the meeting, that they be submitted to the Union Office before the next meeting.

Communications Committee (2) - There were no nominations for this Committee. These positions would remain open until the next Membership Meeting.

Wendy Lymer referred the membership to the reverse side of the Financial Statement which contained the figure for the amount owing to the University on the issue of holiday pay for picketers which was a result of last May's strike. She explained, once again, that the figure was much less than the original estimate because the University has proposed a possible settlement. Last Thursday, the hearing dates were rescheduled for May. A short time later the University presented its offer. It appears a settlement will be reached.

A brief statement on job specifications was next in line. Wendy Rice and Carole spent two days last month over at Employee Relations, their sole objective to discover job specifications which were not in the Union's possession. The result was that the Union did not have 399 job specifications. The cost of duplicating these specifications was shared with the University. Since then, they have been filed into binders and are available to any AUCE member who wishes to know their exact job duties.

The motion was CARRIED.

7. Grievance Committee report:

Carole Cameron reported that a reclassification grievance which was scheduled for arbitration had been halted because the University has proposed a possible settlement. Last Thursday, the hearing dates were rescheduled for May. A short time later the University presented its offer. It appears a settlement will be reached. A brief statement on job specifications was next in line. Wendy Rice and Carole spent two days last month over at Employee Relations, their sole objective to discover job specifications which were not in the Union's possession. The result was that the Union did not have 399 job specifications. The cost of duplicating these specifications was shared with the University. Since then, they have been filed into binders and are available to any AUCE member who wishes to know their exact job duties.

The motion was CARRIED.

8. Executive report:

Carole Cameron directed attention to page twenty of the newsletter. Carole read Section F.2 of the proposed By-law changes. The section which was not italicized had already been approved at the last two-hour membership meeting.

Nancy Wiggs felt that the time-limit for which salaried officers could hold office should be reinstated into the new by-laws. She summarized the amendments to Section F.2 thus far: we have approved salary increases; we have changed the proposal for two-year terms of office to one-year. We have protected salaried officers' jobs by doing so. Valuable people have and will pass through the union office and hopefully will pass on their knowledge to other members of the bargaining unit. Nancy then offered an amendment to Carole's proposal.

Moved by Nancy Wiggs
Seconded by Irene MacIntyre

THAT THE MEMBERSHIP AUTHORIZE REIMBURSEMENT OF WAGES LOST BY AUCE MEMBERS AFFECTED BY THE VANCOUVER MUNICIPAL AND REGIONAL EMPLOYEES UNION PICKET ACTION ON MARCH 20, 1981.

A member asked if the reimbursement would require another assessment. Carole Cameron replied that it would not.

The motion was CARRIED.

THAT THE MEMBERSHIP AUTHORIZE REIMBURSEMENT OF WAGES LOST BY AUCE MEMBERS AFFECTED BY THE VANCOUVER MUNICIPAL AND REGIONAL EMPLOYEES UNION PICKET ACTION ON MARCH 20, 1981.

A member asked if the reimbursement would require another assessment. Carole Cameron replied that it would not.

The motion was CARRIED.
not the background to handle that job? Anne urged the membership to keep a perspective on this issue.

Joan Treleaven spoke against the amendment. She felt that experienced office staff would benefit themselves and the membership. The recall procedure was the recourse if the membership wished to express dissatisfaction with a salaried officer.

Shirley Irvine did not favour the amendment. She stressed that the Union needs experienced people in the office. As we must deal with the University almost on a daily basis, our representatives should have the training which is a necessity in handling that kind of situation. That training can only occur if the individual who intends to run for a salaried position is not faced with restrictions on terms of office.

Marcel passed the chair to the Secretary-Treasurer in order to speak on the issue. He was opposed to the amendment. As there were no restrictions on the other Executive positions, he felt there was no justification for restricting salaried officer positions.

Lid Strand opposed the amendment, pointing out that the only way to gain experience to do the job was to do the job. He felt that if an individual likes the work and wants to run again, that person will have the opportunity to do so each year.

Carole Cameron was not in favour of limited terms of office. Anyone in the membership today has the right to decide who will hold office. Elections held annually allow the membership to make that choice. Anyone in the bargaining unit has always had the opportunity to involve themselves in union affairs. Restricting terms of office will discourage members who want to make a go of it for awhile.

Suzan Zagar preferred limited terms of office for salaried staff. Suzan stated that there has been and probably will be a problem in getting more members to participate in union positions, especially if they find themselves up against someone who had a great deal of experience in union affairs. At the last Convention, a motion was proposed which deleted two-year terms of office from the Secretary-Treasurer's position in the Provincial Office. She felt it was extremely undemocratic to have unlimited terms for what could be considered potentially influential positions in the Union Office.

As there was no further discussion, Carole re-read the amendment. The vote was taken.

The amendment was DEFEATED.

Carole then read the F.2 By-law as it appeared on page 20 of the newsletter. Carole pointed out that there were three full-time paid positions in the Union Office. The positions were Secretary-Treasurer, Union Organizer and Union Co-ordinator. At the last two-hour meeting, the membership voted on the umifalised portion of F.2. This By-law would now be voted on as a complete package.

Moved by Carole Cameron Seconded by Cobie Wanos

THAT THE MEMBERSHIP ADOPT SECTION F.2 OF THE BY-LAWS AS CIRCULATED.

Anne Hutchinson asked if there had been discussion on the proposed statement of qualifications and background which would accompany the election ballot.

Carole Cameron responded that nominees would submit that statement as their platform for the particular position for which they were running.

Lid Strand requested that a change be made to paragraph two. He felt that the statement of qualifications and background should appear with the ballot, and not on it.

Moved by Lid Strand Seconded by Suzan Zagar

THAT THE SENTENCE "THIS STATEMENT WILL APPEAR ON THE ELECTION BALLOT," BE CHANGED TO "THIS STATEMENT WILL APPEAR WITH THE ELECTION BALLOT," IN SECTION F.2 OF THE BY-LAWS.

The motion was CARRIED.

Moved by Carole Cameron Seconded by Connie Poisson

THAT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SECTION G.3 OF THE BY-LAWS BE ADOPTED AS CIRCULATED.

Anne Hutchinson inquired if the Secretary-Treasurer should be required to stand as an ex-officio member of the Contract Committee if the Union Organizer and the Union Co-ordinator happened to be away at the same time. She felt that the claim of flexibility amongst the office staff should be made evident in this job description.

Moved by Anne Hutchinson Seconded by Nancy Wiggs


Wendy Lymer spoke against the amendment. If the situation ever arose where the Secretary-Treasurer was in charge of the Union Office, she doubted if there would be any time available to participate in the affairs of the Contract Committee. In the future, perhaps, someone who was more energetic might be able to handle such a responsibility but she was not prepared to take it on at this time due to her other commitments.

Anne responded that her amendment was not intended to create more work but instead was aimed at allowing for more flexibility among the salaried officers.

As there was no further discussion, the vote was taken.

The amendment was DEFEATED.

The original motion was returned to the floor.

The motion was CARRIED.

Moved by Carole Cameron Seconded by Wendy Lymer

THAT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BY-LAW SECTION G.6 BE ADOPTED AS CIRCULATED.

The motion was CARRIED.

At this point, Marcel pointed out that there was no provision for the Secretary-Treasurer being a member of the Executive. He felt that it was important that an amendment be proposed to provide for this.
Moved by Carole Cameron
Seconded by Nancy Wiggs

That the phrase, "shall be a member of the executive and shall be referred to after the Secretary-Treasurer" in the first sentence of Section G.3 of the by-laws.

The motion was CARRIED.

Moved by Carole Cameron
Seconded by Suzan Zagar

That the proposed amendments to by-law Section G.7 be adopted as circulated.

The motion was CARRIED.

8. Executive report:

Carole Cameron gave a brief report on the Microtechnology Conference she attended in late March and early April. It was indeed possible to expect that some of clerical and office jobs could be eliminated by 1990, according to Baroness Nancy Neer, chairperson of the House of Lords' committee on unemployment in Britain. All of the representatives presented at the Microtechnology Conference and the Canadian Pension Conference are enclosed in binders in the Union Office. Government representatives indicated that drastic changes will occur in our type of work, but that they don't know how or when; we must prepare ourselves, though. Carole suggested that if new jobs do not result from technological advancement, the University should then be required to retain us. The University must now give the Union three months notice of technological change. All aspects of existing pension schemes were discussed at the Canadian Pension Conference held in early April. However, no solutions were forthcoming at that conference.

Carole attended the annual University Pension meeting last week. Portability was discussed in great detail. Because of continual changes in staff, it is extremely important that one can transfer her/his pension plan to another employer if that individual changes jobs. Mr. N. M. Craven, the Assistant Treasurer in the Finance Dept., has offered to speak at a membership meeting on the various aspects of the UBC pension plan. Mr. Ralph Robson of the Labour Standards Branch has also offered to speak to the membership on occupational health and safety standards in our work environment. Various films relating to health and safety and technological advancement are available as well. Carole indicated that a questionnaire would appear in the next newsletter to determine membership interest in speakers and films.

Nancy Wiggs asked if, even though we are entitled to notice, the University does not inform us of the notification of technological changes. Carole replied that when word processors are introduced with no immediate loss of employees in a department, the University does not inform us of the change. They simply do not replace employees when vacancies occur in such a department. Carole added that when word processors are introduced, radical changes take place in procedures. That being the case, how, then, are word processors to be classified?

Carole commented that the occupational health and safety aspect of technological change was discussed at the Microtechnology Conference. A clerical union in England has a proviso in its contract which limits the amount of time spent on word processing equipment. Carole intended to write the union to request a copy of its collective agreement.

Lastly, Carole announced that the issue of reclassifications of certain groups within the bargaining unit would be discussed at the next membership meeting. If anyone wished to submit articles to the next newsletter on this topic, the deadline was May 3, 1981.

9. Provincial report:

Suzan Zagar reported that Local 5 had settled for a two-year contract which awarded its members a 14.5% wage increase in the first year and 13% in the second year. Considering that the base rate before the increase was $850 per month, this was quite an improvement for the Prince George local. The Provincial Executive assisted Local 5 financially in several ways: with a $5000 loan, with a $1500 donation, and with a $4500 donation to legal expenses resulting from their strike. Suzan added that Local 5 has affiliated itself with the CCL (the Canadian Confederation of Unions). Such a move sets a precedent in that any AUCE local can make a decision regardless of Provincial regulations. This situation will be discussed at the Convention. The question that arises is, does this development involving one of the AUCE locals jeopardize the lobby campaign to join the CLC?

Suzan next reported that Local 2 is now out of debt, having just paid off two auditors' bills amounting to $12,000. Local 2 will soon make an attempt to increase the monthly dues rate.

The Convention is to be held at Capilano College in June. Richard Melanson and Suzan Zagar will present proposals on Provincial by-law changes. Suzan stressed that if the Provincial was to become a viable organization, we must propose changes to that aim for it is our right to do so.

The Provincial conducted a Shop Steward Seminar which was held last weekend. Carole Cameron was a participant and gave an overview of grievance procedures. It was generally felt by those who attended that the seminar was quite successful. Helen Glavina commented that Sheila Perron was seriously considering organizing more seminars of a similar nature later this year.

Suzan stated that recommendations would be made at the Convention to elect a representative from each Local to the Resolutions Committee.

Suzan drew attention to a woman who had played an important role in AUCE's history. Joan was killed in a car accident on Friday, March 20, 1981. May she rest in peace.

10. Other Business:

Carole asked Richard Melanson if he would consider presenting his proposals for Provincial by-law changes at a special Membership Meeting in May. As Richard disagreed with the idea, Carole asked Nancy Wiggs if she would consider presenting his proposals if, perhaps, one-half hour was set aside at the next Membership meeting. This suggestion was found to be acceptable.

Wendy Lymer made an announcement regarding accommodations for French-speaking students: If you are interested in hosting a Quebecois student for the period May 25 - July 5, 1984, phone the UBC Language Institute, 228-2181, Local 285, and ask for Vera Angelomatis. A daily rate of $11 will be paid if you wish to host a student.

Carole Cameron announced that Labour Studies grants were available for those trade unions or individuals who are involved with union-related matters beneficial to the organization concerned. Application forms are available at the Union Office.

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 pm.
Apr. 10/81 Minutes of the CCCA meeting held March 31/81
Apr. 10/81 News release from the BCGEU re strike notice to the Legal Services Society
Apr. 13/81 Letter of resignation from Nancy Wiggs re shop steward position
Apr. 13/81 Letter and resume from Darlene Goddard re employment in the Union
Apr. 14/81 News releases from the BCGEU re the North Shore Transportation Society's bargaining position
Apr. 14/81 News release from the BCGEU re a Labour Relations Board meeting with the United North Shore Transportation Society and representatives from the BCGEU
Apr. 14/81 Notice on Workshops in Radical Therapy in April, May and June
Apr. 14/81 Announcement of fund-raising events for the Canadian Farmworkers Union
Apr. 15/81 Letter from R. Anderman lodging a complaint of lack of representation against the ruling executive AUCE 2 SFU.
Apr. 15/81 Letter from Sheila Perret enclosing the above letters
Apr. 15/81 Note from Katarina Halm nominating Sheila Rowswell as a delegate to the Convention
Apr. 15/81 Letter from Jane Ericksen with job standards for word processing operators re revising of pay scales
Apr. 15/81 Letter from Sheila Perret, Provincial Secretary-Treasurer, to S.O.R.W.U.C. re referendum ballots on AUCE affiliation
Apr. 15/81 Letter from Sheila Perret to Anne Harvey, OTEU, re referendum ballots on AUCE affiliation
Apr. 15/81 Letter from Sheila Perret to Fred Trotter, OTEU, re referendum ballots on AUCE affiliation
Apr. 15/81 Letter from Sheila Perret to Opal Shilling, OTEU Local 15, re referendum ballots on AUCE affiliation
Apr. 15/81 Letter from Sheila Perret to John Calvert, CUPE National Office, re referendum ballots on AUCE affiliation
Apr. 15/81 Letter from Sheila Perret to Ray Munroe, B.C. Region, CUPE, re referendum ballots on AUCE affiliation
Apr. 15/81 Letter from Sheila Perret to Jack Adams, BCGEU, re referendum ballots on AUCE affiliation
Apr. 15/81 Letter from Sheila Perret to Jess Succamore, CUU, re referendum ballots on AUCE affiliation
Apr. 15/81 Letter from Sheila Perret to William V. Smalley, CLC, re referendum ballots on AUCE affiliation
Apr. 15/81 Letter from Sheila Perret to Dennis McDermott, CLC, re referendum ballots on AUCE affiliation
Apr. 15/81 Letter from Sheila Perret enclosing the above letters
Apr. 21/81 Letter from William Campbell, CUPE Local 561, enclosing a list of GVIRD Council members and offering suggestions for support of their strike
Apr. 21/81 Letter from R. J. Boyd, CUPE Local 386, requesting a donation
Apr. 21/81 Letter from the Development Education Centre, Toronto, recommending the viewing of the sound/slide sequence "On the Bias" which can be seen in Vancouver on April 21, 1981
Apr. 21/81 Letter from the CUHC Health Services Society re a seminar for business agents
Apr. 21/81 Letter from Co-op Radio 102.7 FM requesting support for a fund-raising marathon from May 3 to May 10
Apr. 23/81 Copy of letter from the CUHC Health Services Society received Apr. 23/81
Apr. 23/81 Letter from the Southern Africa Action Coalition requesting an endorsement on the banning of South African wines and liquors in B.C.
Apr. 22/81 Letter from the Human Rights Commission of B.C. giving notice for a meeting on fruit pickers and transients
Apr. 27/81 Letter from R. Anderman lodging a complaint of lack of representation against the ruling executive AUCE 2 SFU.
Apr. 27/81 Letter from the Canada Labour Voice Co. Ltd. requesting a copy of the current collective agreement.
Apr. 28/81 News release from the BCGEU re a sexual harassment clause which now exists in Douglas College's collective agreement.

CORRESPONDENCE CONTINUED

NEXT ISSUE

DEADLINE:

June 3, 1981
The Wage Issue

The story of Windermere and women's wages

LINDA HOSSIE
CITYSIDE

A SECRETARY'S BILL OF RIGHTS
In 1882 E. Cora Hind arrived in frontier Winnipeg. Her application for work as a journalist on the *Free Press* was denied (guess why). But the ambitious (and hungry) young woman was attracted by a new idea—typewriters were for sale in town. Hind rented a machine for a month and taught herself to type. Inquiring which firm had bought one of the new devices, she presented herself for work at MacDonald, Tupper, Tupper, and Dexter, Attorneys, the first woman typist west of the Great Lakes. Later, setting up as a public stenographer, she frequently did work for farmers and farm agents and learned their business as well as her own. Twenty years later, a self-taught and famous expert in agricultural affairs, she returned in triumph to the *Free Press* as agricultural editor and influential advocate for Canadian farmers.
Membership Meeting

Membership Meeting - Thursday, May 21, 1981
IRC 6
12:30 - 2:30 PM.

Article 10 of the Collective Agreement states:

"The University agrees to allow nine (9) two-hour lunch meetings (12:30 - 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."

You are therefore entitled to take time off from work to attend the May 21st Membership Meeting.

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
   Union Co-ordinator
   Closing
   Alternate Provincial Representative (Elizabeth Brock)
   Alternate University Health and Safety Committee Representative (Shirley Irvine)
   Union Organiser (Lid Strand, Carole Cameron, Helen Glavina)
   Provincial Education Committee
   Communication Committee, 2 (Lori Thicke)

6. Secretary-Treasurer's report
7. Grievance Committee report
8. Executive report - Reclassifications of certain groups in the bargaining unit
9. Provincial report
10. Other Business: Provincial By-laws (Proposed changes)