

A HISTORY OF THE ASSOCIATION OF PART-TIME PROFESSORS
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA
1986 - 1996

(c) Paul C. Byam, 1997

(c) The Association of Part-Time Professors
of the University of Ottawa, 1997

PREFACE

This work was undertaken in 1996 as a project to write the History of the Association of Part-Time Professors of the University of Ottawa (APTPUO) on its tenth anniversary as a bargaining unit. The suggestion was made at the Annual General Meeting in December 1995 that there was need for a clear historical record of the union's progress to date. Subsequently, the Board of Directors of the APTPUO adopted the idea and a three-person History Committee - namely, Esther Senneville, Najwa Garzouzi and René Chiasson - was struck in order to supervise and guide the project from start to finish. The project was therefore proposed and reviewed by the APTPUO Board.

This history constitutes a record of the collective memory of the membership. A significant amount of the historical information was obtained through personal interviews. This method was especially important for the formative years of the union for which the body of written documents is relatively limited in size and scope. Although most of these interviewees were past presidents of the union, other members were also approached and encouraged to make their own contribution to the project. The tendency was, however, that those who felt that they had little to contribute since they had played very limited roles within the union, said little at all or politely declined the invitation to participate in this particular endeavour.ⁱ The views and interpretations of those who did participate were invaluable to the smooth progress of this exercise, especially for the early years of the union when it was Local 10 of the Canadian Union of Educational Workers (CUEW).

This work embraces no complex dialectic or ambitious academic purpose beyond the provision of a clear, accurate record of the foundations and progress of the union movement for part-time professional teaching staff at the University of Ottawa over the past ten years. It is hoped, however, that this case study will be a modest contribution to the understanding of labour concerns among teaching professionals who have worked in the Province of Ontario over the past decade.

In the writing of historical case studies such as this one, the researcher needs to consider the competing visions, contending interpretations and different aspirations of all the parties concerned. They must all be incorporated into one comprehensive account of the subject at hand. If at times the commentary seems to focus more heavily on certain individuals, this is the result of the weighting placed on specific events in the union's history and does not constitute an attempt to make any person seem more important than her or his counterparts. It is not a history written in the "great man" or "great woman" tradition, but the very nature of the information does underline the importance of both individual and collective decisions made and actions taken by the members.

I wish to congratulate the union on its tenth anniversary and to thank all those who have been of assistance in providing data and general information on the union, through interviews, the electronic mailing system and in granting access to documents. In particular, I extend my

appreciation to the members of the History Committee who have supervised this project and the 1995-96 and 1996-97 Boards who have been generous with their time and their counsel.

To the former and current Administrative Assistants, Christine Fontaine and Eliane Comtois, who helped me assuage the potential nightmare of document retrieval and put me in contact with a number of the people whose names appear in the following pages, I owe a huge debt of gratitude. Last but not least, I wish to thank Bianca Sherwood, Geraldine Arbach and Charles Emmrys for their comments on the manuscript.

INTRODUCTION

Unionsⁱⁱ are by their very nature "the principal institution of workers in modern capitalistic societies."ⁱⁱⁱ For those who believe in the beneficial effects of unions in the economy and as a political force, the existence of the average bargaining unit is seen as conducive to creating and maintaining a body of skilled labour. As such, the existence of a viable union also obliges management to be more concerned with matters of efficiency in conducting its affairs or operations. The union also provides a conduit for the exchange of information "on the shop floor", improvement in morale in the workplace and protection for workers against arbitrary decisions made by the employer.^{iv}

Detractors from this view see unions in a less positive light, especially as regards what managers might deem inflexibility in their operations stemming from union rules and the ability of unions to disrupt work, thereby affecting productivity. They may also cite the increase in the wages of unionized workers at the expense of unorganized labour and the functioning of the economy itself as marks against unions. Ultimately, "the extent to which a union is a liability or an asset depends crucially on how management responds to it."^v

Over time, what was primarily a development within the industrial sector became a commonplace tradition for most categories of workers in other sectors as well. This pattern of expansion has led to greater debates on the role that unions should play and to the complexities of labour-management relations in the latter half of the twentieth century. In order to situate the

History of the APTPUO within the broader Canadian context, a brief overview of the Canadian labour history since the Second World War is needed.

Although the history of the Canadian labour movement dates from a much earlier period, the Canadian workplace underwent a very distinct change after 1940.^{vi} It was in this period that hundreds of thousands of Canadian industrial workers were unionized. Postwar bargaining between most of these unions encouraged standardization and simplification of wage rates. Procedures for negotiating wages and protecting the rights of newly formed unions were also regularized. There were, to be sure, severe limitations on the workers' newly acquired collective bargaining power in favour of the rights of the employer ("management rights") and official unions in that period tended to enter into an era of compromise with management wherein they tended to "police" their membership. This was particularly the case in the "Cold War" era where the state intervened in a decisive way to curtail the militancy of the working class.^{vii}

Much of this so-called compromise fell apart in the 1960s when many industrial workers, facing the challenges of a more unstable economy globally and a rapid rise in the rate of inflation, challenged the very leadership of their unions. They engaged in illegal strikes and became far more vocal on the shop floor. The New Democratic Party was able to benefit from the political "fall-out" of this industrial unrest in some regions of Canada.^{viii}

Similar concerns with the "bureaucratic insensitivity of a highly centralized management" brought workers in the public sector into the industrial relations system. They succeeded in

getting federal and provincial governments to pass legislation that extended to white-collar workers the same rights to organize and bargain collectively as their blue-collar counterparts. When full-fledged unions superseded the former government employees' bodies, the state ceased to be an external mediator: its participation became central to the system. By the 1970s, public sector unions were representing almost all state employees and para-public sectors such as schools and even hospitals found that their professionals were becoming "militant unionists", and workers from government offices, hospitals and schools were seen with increasing frequency on the picket lines.^{ix}

Moreover, with the growing strength of the feminist movement and the growing numbers of full-time women employees, women became a more conspicuous entity in the labour relations battles of the 1970s.^x Women became the fastest growing group of Canadian workers and unionists, having entered the full-time labour force in ever increasing numbers since the 1960s. Their entry revitalized unions and provided the overall labour movement with new avenues for union activity. The unions themselves had to respond to the rapidly changing needs of their membership, realizing that their priorities "[could] no longer be limited to the bread-and-butter issues of white male breadwinners."^{xi} The female workforce has itself changed over time to reflect renewed concerns. Whereas young, single women once dominated the work force outside the home, over the better part of the past decade, the growth in the female work force has been among married women who found it somewhat easier to enter the work force once there were offers of daycare facilities and tax breaks.^{xii}

In the 1970s, changes to labour legislation generally did make it easier for workers to form unions and members gained new laws to protect their safety and health while on the job.^{xiii} Be that as it may, the effects of inflation continued to provide the basis of dialogue and confrontation between labour and management in Canada. This and other issues remained pressing concerns in the early 1980s.

By the early 1980s, union organization had intensified in Canada, whereas it had declined in the United States of America.^{xiv} There was a "serious rethinking" of what membership in a union meant. For years workers had simply expected to receive good wages and benefits through the collective bargaining process in exchange for their payment of dues; however, in the face of new challenges, a number of unionists sought to enrich union culture by adopting "new approaches to labour education and cultural life." Courses to teach collective bargaining skills became more commonplace and this approach was expanded in the 1980s to include courses in economics, sociology, labour law and labour history, women's rights, racism and occupational health, to name a few.^{xv}

Within the same period some provinces enacted legislation to weaken trade unions' bargaining rights as well as their right to organize. At the same time and in virtually the same spirit, the federal state began to promote "new forms of consultation" between labour and management in order to bypass the entire collective bargaining process. In so doing, the tendency was to suspend or restrict the rights that workers had won many decades earlier.^{xvi}

It was in this climate that the part-time professors' union was formed at the University of Ottawa. It began simply as a movement to secure better pay and benefits, in keeping with the earliest, most basic goals of the Canadian labour movement and expanded its outlook over time to secure recognition for its members and itself as a vital part of the University's everyday life.

The Association of Part-Time Professors of the University of Ottawa is an independent bargaining unit representing part-time professional teaching staff in most departments.^{xvii} It came into existence in 1986 as Local 10 of the Canadian Union of Educational Workers (CUEW) because of an overwhelming need for a collective voice for part-time teachers at the University in matters of equitable treatment and conditions of work. Its primary responsibility is the maintenance, advancement and improvement of the interests of its members and the conditions under which they function at the University of Ottawa and affiliated campuses. In so doing it contributes to the quality of life and education on the University campus as it strives for excellence in teaching and seeks to promote a better understanding with management and other groups on campus. As agreeable as this description may sound, that mandate has not always been an easy one to realize and the union itself has not always enjoyed the status it now has.

The union's official title and role might conceal its near-tumultuous history since its inception as a local bargaining unit within the now defunct Canadian Union of Educational Workers (CUEW) in the mid-1980s. The story of this union - the initial struggle to form a bargaining unit, the early years of Local 10 of CUEW, the secession from CUEW and the

formation of an independent body - is a compelling one that adds additional colour to the general struggle and continuing relevance of labour associations within Ontario.

From its inception the union has sought to gain the proper recognition within the University community for the work done by part-time professors and to have much of this enshrined in a meaningful way in its constitution and in every collective agreement negotiated with the University of Ottawa administration. It has not sought the disruption of university affairs in pursuing its principal aspirations; rather, its intention as a collective entity has been to promote its interests as an integral part of an institution that sets high goals for itself in the areas of teaching and research, in much the same way that the Association of Professors of the University of Ottawa (APUO) has striven to maintain respect for its members on campus through a high degree of professionalism.^{xviii}

The history of the APTPUO has not only been defined by its relationship with management. Its very existence as an independent body is the result of a change in vision and a redefinition of interests between itself and the now defunct national body, CUEW. This "dual" history can conveniently be reviewed in four major phases, each of which discusses a different stage of growth and new challenges for the union within the general overarching framework of labour/management and interpersonal relations.

The first phase addresses the repeated attempts to improve working conditions on the campus for part-time professors, culminating in the formation of Local 10. It was a phase of

militancy on the part of the union organizers, given the fact that they were opening new ground in a relatively conservative university atmosphere. It was in this period that the "pioneers" of union activity for part-time professors made a concerted effort across the campus to introduce themselves to one another and to gain recognition from the University administration.

The second phase addresses the progress and setbacks experienced by the newly formed union from 1986 to 1992. It marks the maturing of the union as both the general membership and the executive committees (later, executive boards) grew accustomed to asserting their collective interests and reached out actively to promote a stronger body at both the local and national levels.

The third phase explores what might be termed "the war of secession": that is to say, the Local's struggle to extricate itself from entanglements with the National union, by seceding from that entity after a relatively bitter struggle. Indubitably, this phase marked both the low point of the union's existence as well as its coming of age as a fully articulate entity, outside the CUEW umbrella. This phase receives the most attention in this history, as the struggle to disaffiliate from CUEW constitutes a history in itself that readily distinguishes the APTPUO from other unions with similar interests in Ontario. The collective memory of this period and the attendant divergence of opinions on the prudence and justification of the union's actions, continues to influence the APTPUO's decisions at many levels.

The fourth phase considers the history of the union since that time and the future of the union as perceived by a membership facing economic challenges in the Province of Ontario. It

suggests a recovery from the rifts that almost saw the disappearance of the union in the early 1990s and a return to the main preoccupation of a labour union - the rights and welfare of its members in the face of decisions taken by management. In so doing, the union has generally shifted in outlook (in so far as a clear, single philosophy might be identified in the current climate) to assume an assertive, rather than a militant posture, as a professional association. It has always desired and sought a cooperative but firmer relationship with management, and has continued to press on in this spirit.

THE FIRST PHASE

Well before the union was established at the University of Ottawa there had already been a long, important tradition of part-time instruction. The University administration employed many contractual workers in this capacity, but accorded precious little recognition to the true value of this body of skilled workers and its contribution to the quality of education on the campus. Part-time professors received no benefits beyond their salaries (which were not much to brag about), and they enjoyed no guarantees with regard to hiring, longevity or adequate provisions for the proper execution of their duties. This situation resulted from the fact that the University had devised few standard or straightforward policies regarding these members of staff.

It is to be understood that there were many who were reasonably content with what they had as part-time professors for as long as teaching opportunities were regular and other wage-earning and funding options were available. Be that as it may, the lack of a policy to regulate the University's dealings with part-time professors in a fair and open way became a pressing concern for many members of staff. As the already lax system became even more irregular over time, and the general economic situation became more unpredictable in the short term across the Province, it became increasingly important for workers at all levels to secure better pay and working conditions for themselves. This was the major concern of a number of part-time professors during the mid-1970s, and they approached the administration in their different departments in the hope of finding a sympathetic ear and a helpful change in policy. A

number of departments became "hotbeds" of activity in this regard. These included the Department of Sociology, where the official unionizing drive originated at the University of Ottawa, and the Departments of Religious Studies, Music, Modern Languages and the Second Language Institute.

Some early examples of the concerns that caused part-time teachers to press for better conditions can be drawn from what took place at the Second Language Institute. At the Institute, there had been at least two attempts at improving working conditions for part-time professors on campus in the 1970s.^{xix} These had been earnest attempts to impress upon the University administration the need for improving the deplorable conditions of work that part-time professors were facing at that time. Unfortunately very little came of the first attempt at such redress and in 1977 another struggle commenced. On that occasion, the question of seniority became the key issue.

A special programme had been commenced within the Institute for the training of some Venezuelan students and additional staff had been hired for that purpose. Delighted at the success of that programme, the very next year, when the special training was over, the then Director of the section within the Institute attempted to retain as many of the new instructors from that programme as possible. This required a major adjustment in the re-apportioning of courses, giving everyone, new and old, at least one course. For the staff from the Venezuelan programme, this was a favourable development, but for those who had been at the Institute for many years, the limited distribution of teaching opportunities was an affront. Most seemed to expect that

previous patterns of course allocation would have been maintained, especially for those who felt they deserved special consideration for their longevity or seniority within the Institute.^{xx}

It was at this point that discussions were held on a broader scale within the Institute itself with a view to regularizing the assignment of course responsibilities and instituting a policy that acknowledged the principle of seniority. At that point there was still no true union movement among part-time professionals, but the basic concerns were already being enunciated. These initial attempts at improving conditions at the Institute were barely successful at all, but the desire to improve working conditions was not suppressed.

In the 1980s part-time teachers at the Second Language Institute resumed their efforts to improve working conditions on campus. The Institute was one of the most logical places on the campus for such a combined effort to take root as the part-time professors there did a good measure of "team teaching" and conversed with each other on a very regular basis.^{xxi} The old problems of poor working conditions, no benefits and irregular policies on the awarding of teaching contracts remained. The teachers at the Institute were eager to resume the effort and a number of them eventually rose to the forefront of the union. Two of these teachers who later became co-presidents of the union were Bianca Sherwood and Patricia Balcom. Their attempt to achieve greater recognition for the role of part-time teachers ushered in a new phase of the union's "pre-history".

At the Second Language Institute, a number of part-time teachers wished to have some voice in the making of policy and other areas as well, given that they had been making a significant contribution to the Institute. On the basis of respect and equality, Patricia Balcom requested at a departmental meeting that part-time teachers be given the right to vote. Both full-timers and part-timers supported the request, but the then Director of the Institute did not.^{xxii}

Even on relatively minor but feasible matters, the part-time teachers often met with opposition. Such was the case in 1985 when Patricia Balcom and Bianca Sherwood approached the Director of the Institute with a request for an additional typewriter since there was only one available for the use of eighty professors. Their request was bluntly refused on the grounds that the University was not buying typewriters.^{xxiii} Such overtures were not received very well, especially as there was no mechanism at that time for the inclusion of part-time teachers within the decision making structure.

It was at that point that Bianca Sherwood, Patricia Balcom and Debbie Nash approached Dr Patrick Babin who at the time was in charge of a programme dealing with the quality of education and who put out a publication in this regard several times a year. Dr Babin also ran seminars which dealt with improving the quality of teaching on campus, and so they explained some of their problems to him. These included having only one day to plan one's course, having no access to information on what textbooks were available, or what the latest research was on the subject area, and not knowing what the class size was at an early enough date.^{xxiv}

They came to an agreement that working conditions did affect the quality of education and so Dr Babin agreed to publish a document that they could write to express these concerns in his quality of education magazine. Ms Sherwood submitted a three-part text. One part was a poem called "The Unknown Part-Time Teacher", a "take-off" as it were, from W.H. Auden's "The Unknown Citizen". Another part was composed of just a few paragraphs explaining a number of aspects of part-time teaching, including the fact that most part-time teachers (at the Institute at least) were women. In this piece she explained that if excellence was what the University was really after, it should not put people second to economic considerations.

Dr Babin published the document and the next day, it was reported that he received calls from the Rector, the Dean of Arts and the head of Ms Sherwood's department. The effective message was that he should desist from publishing such articles, that the material was subversive and had nothing to do with the quality of education. So when they returned to see Dr Babin, he had been "much chastised" and could barely speak to them as he was very upset about the entire affair.^{xxv} The teachers involved were dismayed by what had taken place but they continued to speak about improving working conditions among themselves. According to Bianca Sherwood, there was not a strong union incentive at that time. Rather, they were "looking at, not so much trying to form a union, as trying to get a better sense of being integrated into the university community."^{xxvi}

The concerns outlined above were not unique to the Second Language Institute; they represented the kinds of problems that part-time teachers were facing in many departments. The

genesis of an explicit unionizing drive took place within the Department of Sociology, where three part-time professors, Béatrice Miguelez, Mario Samedy and Chris Southcott, had been looking at this issue from a "campus-wide perspective". It was they who took the first steps towards transforming the general drive for improved working conditions into an effort to form a bargaining unit, and organized the first public meeting.^{xxvii} The organizing committee that they set up comprised members from various departments.

The major drawback for the part-time professors stemmed from the fact that they did not form a cohesive unit on the campus or even, at times, within their own departments. Although they had some limited indication as to the existence of a number of colleagues of similar status across the campus, they were unaware of who they were or what they had been doing in order to improve conditions in their respective departments. What was needed was a coordinated attempt by members in the various faculties and departments to form a united body that would be strong enough to make the administration take notice. In this way, the disjointed effort that was taking place at a few centres of "pro-union" activity, could be combined into one formidable drive to improve working conditions for all part-time teaching staff at the University of Ottawa.

Consequently, the leaders of the unionizing drive came principally from the ranks of those departments mentioned above. The unofficial membership was quickly swelled by other eager participants from across the campus. Dismayed by the lack of adequate working conditions and the low rate of pay that then defined the position of part-time professors, two principal currents of activity had become one. One had been striving to discover the true size of the

part-time membership with a view to forming a strong, representative bargaining unit on the campus. The other, while not necessarily averse to the idea of a union, had been seeking the amelioration of working conditions within its sector.

Béatrice Miguelez recalls that the situation was extremely awful for part-time professors at that time. There had not been the least raise in pay for about ten years, and other conditions of work were deplorable as well within her department. In general, the cost of living had continued to climb while the situation of part-time professors had not improved. Together with Mario Samedy and Chris Southcott, she decided to do something about improving the situation, ultimately with a view to gaining representation through a union on the campus. As she recalls: "On a commencé lentement mais fermement."^{xxviii}

Chris Southcott became involved in the unionizing movement in September 1985. Having discussed the formation of a union for several months, Béatrice Miguelez and Mario Samedy had approached him within the Department of Sociology as they were seeking someone who was more comfortable speaking English than they were. They believed that this would enhance communications with anglophone members and with CUEW, whom they had already contacted for information. They decided to continue discussions with CUEW and to hold a meeting in October 1985 in order to determine how much interest there was for a union.^{xxix}

The three proponents (and indeed, founders) of the union were quite shocked when more than sixty people showed up at the October meeting. This was especially remarkable as the three

organizers did not have the resources necessary to do much advertising. They had simply intended to introduce the idea of a union at the meeting and fully expected to meet some opposition; however, they received a unanimous vote in support of the idea after a speedy decision to request a vote on whether an organizing campaign should be launched.^{xxx} A more broadly-based organizing committee was formed soon thereafter and Mr Southcott became its president. Patricia Balcom later succeeded him as president of this committee.

There was some early opposition during the campaign, but it resulted from legal considerations that might have been applied against certain members of staff joining unions, such as those who worked in the School of Medicine or the Faculty of Law.^{xxxii} Their very traditions of professional association predisposed them to remain outside trade unions. This problem never posed any serious threat to the organizing drive, even though the administration sought to define the bargaining unit as narrowly as possible.^{xxxii}

The major problem for the Organizing Committee of Part-Time Teachers at the inception of this movement was adopting an effective strategy to discover the true size of the part-time teaching staff and exactly who they all were. There was no comprehensive list in existence within the faculties or on satellite campuses for consultation in this regard. Although some departments were forthcoming with the desired information, many faculties and departments were very secretive and unhelpful, guarding such information as veritable secrets of state, arguing that the lists were confidential. Obtaining the lists of part-time professors became a major challenge as no progress towards the establishment of a union could be achieved without it. Part-time professors

on the campus hardly knew one another by virtue of the very limited time they spent on campus outside their actual contractual obligations.^{xxxiii}

In order to obtain the lists of part-time professors, Béatrice Miguelez explains that they were obliged to resort to several "ruses".^{xxxiv} From its inception in the Department of Sociology the process took roughly a year while different forms of resistance were applied as they went from department to department in search of this vital information. It helped to some degree, that they did have an informal network, whereby individual professors and support staff passed the message on to friends who in turn informed other individuals about what was taking place.^{xxxv} On one occasion, they even received some assistance from an official at another university which had a more facilitating attitude towards its part-time staff and where such lists were more easily obtainable.^{xxxvi} Eventually the administration revised its position and released the lists to the nascent part-time teachers union movement.

The members of the Organizing Committee worked long and hard until very late at night to make the membership drive a success. Representatives from CUEW were also invited to provide assistance to the movement in its early stages and well into the early years of Local 10. There was also a lawyer on retainer whose services were invaluable to the fledgling union movement.^{xxxvii} The union itself could not have been formed as a credible body without the help of those who were already steeped in procedure, labour laws and other such experience. There were a few people within the general membership (small though it was at the start) who had some experience in this regard, but a good measure of the expertise that galvanized the

movement came from the CUEW representatives of CUEW who came to Ottawa to offer assistance with reasonable frequency. Not only did CUEW President, Laurel Whitney, come to Ottawa a number of times to assist with the organizing campaign, but a full-time organizer was also provided in the person of Jeff Taylor. Moreover CUEW gave the Organizing Committee \$8,000 to finance its campaign.^{xxxviii} The main problem that the organizers faced in this period in their dealings with CUEW was simply that CUEW left them "high and dry just before certification and during much of the early bargaining."^{xxxix} As a new union about to negotiate its first collective agreement, more support was expected in that crucial period.

CUEW was a national body representing part-timers in several locals within Canada. The early union movement at the University of Ottawa selected CUEW over other entities (such as the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE), to offer one example) on the grounds that CUEW seemed dedicated to the cause of part-time teachers and that the membership of the University of Ottawa part-time body had much in common with other part-time teachers within CUEW, such as the membership at York University. CUEW seemed to understand the situation and had the same interests as the part-timers at the University of Ottawa.^{xl} As Chris Southcott recalls:

We decided to go with CUEW because they were the first union we contacted. They were quite receptive and sent down their president, Laurel Whitney, to talk to us. We were aware that we

could have gone with other unions but we liked the idea that it was a small, specialized union.^{xli}

A community of interests was more easily identified with CUEW whose members also shared the militancy of the early Local 10 organizers. This same community of interests would be sought out in later years when Local 10 became actively involved in encouraging part-time teachers elsewhere in Canada to establish their own CUEW local.^{xlii}

Of their own volition and resolve, and with the encouragement of the CUEW professionals who offered invaluable advice in this period, those who were involved in the founding of the union adopted more of the methods and mentality of a collective bargaining unit at the University of Ottawa. Very few people showed up at the first organizing drives, but the few who did became the nucleus of a movement that would grow in strength in a matter of months. Little by little, the problem of numbers was overcome and several "general assembly" style meetings were held by the organizing committee to outline and discuss the interim objectives and the ultimate goals of the union movement.

As stipulated by the regulations of the Ontario Labour Relations Board, the organizers of the drive were required to obtain a certain percentage of signed membership cards before advancing to the final stage for establishing a collective bargaining unit - the vote. The organizers therefore, began a campaign to encourage part-time staff to sign membership cards as a certain percentage of the part-time staff was required for the establishment of a legitimate bargaining unit. Thus began a concerted membership drive to consolidate and expand the union movement.

This drive moved quickly - more quickly than the organizers had themselves expected - and within a short period of time the organizers had obtained the percentage of membership cards necessary to proceed with the next stage of the unionizing movement.^{xliii}

Eventually enough cards were signed to justify the formation of a viable bargaining unit. The evidence of a widespread desire to form a union^{xliv} was presented to Ontario's Labour Relations Board, a necessary step, prior to the formation of a union in this Province. As sufficient membership cards had been signed to demonstrate the will of the part-time professors to form a bargaining unit, the organizers moved ever closer to official certification. The certification vote was held in April 1986^{xlv} and the University of Ottawa bestowed recognition upon the *fait accompli*. A bargaining unit representing part-time professors at the University of Ottawa had finally come into existence.

THE SECOND PHASE

The union that was formed in 1986 became Local 10 of the Canadian Union of Educational Workers (CUEW).^{xlvi} A joint presidency was established with Bianca Sherwood, Pat Balcom and later Pierrette Landry fulfilling this role. Esther Senneville became the vice-president and sat on the CUEW National Executive Meetings, and Leslie MacDonald became the union's first treasurer. A number of other women part-time professors were also key players in the union, thereby earning the later appellation of "founding mothers".^{xlvii} Once formed, Local 10 could now negotiate with the University of Ottawa administration concerning certain benefits that seemed long overdue to many who had been part-time professors on the campus for several years. Certainly a pay raise was in order, but even beyond that, there were the other pressing concerns as to hirings and seniority. There was the need to regulate these areas within a mutually binding agreement between the University and the part-time staff represented by CUEW in a collective agreement.

As there had been no explicit or even implicit policy on hirings and re-hirings the fledgling union sought to correct this situation. Seniority had certainly not been the watchword within most departments. The union now had to hone its skills in negotiating with the employer. Here too, CUEW sometimes sent assistance in the form of different representatives.

It was clear at the outset that the University administration was very uncomfortable with and distrusting of the union. Bianca Sherwood, who had been the key negotiator for the union for most of the first negotiations recalled the nature of the early negotiations with the administration. With the exception of the University's lawyer, Mr. D. Grandbois, the representatives of the University administration said very little and avoided eye contact with the union's negotiating committee. The University's chief negotiator at that time would let the University's lawyer do most of the talking. She recalls that even when the chief negotiator made the occasional intervention, he did not look directly at the union representatives.^{xlvi}

This was perhaps mostly due to the entire novelty of the situation for all concerned, since the administration had as little experience dealing with the part-time teaching staff in the context of formal labour negotiations as the negotiating committee of the union had in performing its newly acquired duties as an elected body. When Dr John Cowan assumed responsibility for much of the negotiation procedure on the part of the administration the union representatives felt that they would be dealt with in a firm but fair manner by the administration.^{xli}

In this period, the union made gradual but significant gains in its goal to improve conditions of work and pay for the general membership, slowly validating the efforts of the organizers who had worked long hours into the night to contact colleagues and conduct campaigns for the signing of the membership cards and the final enabling vote. Although, as is to be expected, most members seemed to have had only a casual interest and fleeting contacts with

the union once it was finally in existence, Local 10 of CUEW waxed stronger as successive executive boards faced the usual challenges that are the basis of union activity.

In 1986, CUEW hired Mr Anh Tuan Truong to be the Administrative Assistant of Local 10. When Mr Truong assumed his responsibilities, Local 10 was already at the end of negotiations for the first Collective Agreement, with J. Brian Scott assuming the role he had inherited from Bianca Sherwood as chief negotiator. By the next round of negotiations for the second Collective Agreement, Mr Truong as Administrative Assistant, had assumed the chief negotiator's mantle, and the union membership proceeded to rewrite almost the entire collective agreement. At those negotiations, many impressive gains were achieved or improved upon. Mr Truong recalls that Local 10 received the highest percentage pay increase in the country among all its other counterparts. This was in part a show of the union's new-found strength and in part attributable to the fact that salaries for part-time professors at the University of Ottawa were dismally low.

Members of Local 10 were again guaranteed medical benefits such as sick leave, pension benefits, and tuition fee credits. Part-time professors also gained access to services such as several department facilities. A "clearer, fairer hiring procedure" was pursued and the grievance and arbitration procedures were strengthened. There was an increase in compensation for class size either through pecuniary means or by assigning marking assistants to the class and there was an improvement in academic development benefits.¹

During part of Patricia Balcom's presidency and that of Pierrette Landry, Mr Truong served as a liaison officer between the union and the university administration. This position is traditionally important in maintaining amicable relations and an easy channel of communication with the administration. As well, the administrative assistant played an obvious role in liaising with the general membership and the executive board of the union. Part-timers, to be certain had (and, inevitably, continue to have) many obligations outside of their teaching and union obligations, and so there was need for the post of administrative assistant to provide more service during regular daytime working hours. This facilitated communication between and among all parties concerned. Mr Truong held this post for approximately six years.

Charles (Chuck) Emmrys assumed the presidency of the union after Patricia Balcom and Pierrette Landry had moved on to other engagements. He was pursuing his doctorate in Clinical Psychology and was a part-time professor in the Department of Psychology. He had been actively involved in the union before assuming the presidency, especially in pursuing matters related to student part-time professors.

He recalls that students had played an important role in the union from the early years. Yet students are also subject to the University's jurisdiction in academic matters. A major concern for students within the union structure therefore, was to have their rights guaranteed and upheld as employees. It was in this capacity that Charles Emmrys came to the forefront of union matters during consultations on key matters being negotiated. He feared that it had become difficult for students to gain teaching opportunities as seniority had been given such a very heavy

weighting. He led a "group of dissenting voices" in favour of special consideration for students, and the Collective Agreement was not ratified until changes were made to provide students with certain guarantees.^{li}

Charles Emmrys reports that he had not at first intended to run for office in the union structure. Anh Tuan Truong had suggested that he might consider playing a bigger role in the union given that a number of the outgoing executive committee members' terms were drawing to a close and most had indicated that they had no desire to seek re-election. It was a virtual exodus and CUEW was considering stepping in to direct the local itself. He and other "new blood" ran for office and became the new committee.

Mr Emmrys recalls that he inherited a very old office on Laurier Street with "no real structure to the union and no real direction". He explained that a number of his predecessors were, to their credit, "starters" and most of them had, quite naturally, moved on to face other challenges in life.^{lii} Their successors had to become "maintainers", filling the void that was created as so many leaders made their exit at the same time, and a new course was charted for the union.

The union moved office from an old building on Laurier Street to the current office on University Private and from there the restructuring of the union itself began. During Mr Emmrys' presidency a whole new body of by-laws was created to permit consistency and structure for future executives. Manuals were drawn up to simplify the Collective Agreement and stronger

links were made with departments; the committee members virtually sold themselves "almost like marketing" strategy to the membership^{liii} in order to strengthen the means of communication and continuity.

They had also established a pattern, whereby the president would not be on the negotiating team but would remain to liaise with the membership, keeping them informed and preparing them for a strike, if necessary. The vice-president would negotiate instead. This negotiating plan allowed for greater flexibility and avoided the likelihood of the union's interests being compromised unnecessarily.

In this period too, the union continued to make strides and to mature as a bargaining unit. For most, it was an ongoing learning experience, and each newly elected executive board gained something from its predecessor and from its exchanges with the national body and other locals across the country. It in turn left a short legacy of net gains for its successors. Up to that point, the most significant battles had been with the University administration over grievances and re-negotiating the Collective Agreement. This, however, was the normal situation for any union that had to deal with "management" in the context of a conservative university structure. The historical moment that would define Local 10 as unique among its counterparts would involve a protracted battle to disaffiliate from CUEW itself. That struggle is the central focus of the Third Phase which follows.

THE THIRD PHASE

For all the advances that the union experience had brought, things began to go sour in the relations between Local 10 and CUEW. CUEW's first administration had been very helpful to the Local but as time passed, this tradition did not hold and the relationship with CUEW became a drain on the union in Ottawa. This phase of the union's existence saw some of the most acrimonious debates between the union representatives in Ottawa and the national body in Toronto. Its legacy would be reflected in part in the new APTPUO constitution and in some of the internal debates that persist within the union.

During the presidency at CUEW of Charles Doyon, the national body (hereafter, the National) and Local 10 enjoyed a healthy working relationship where cooperation was the key. The fact that Local 10 had a bilingual mandate posed no serious problem for the National as the Local 10 member who sat on the National Executive at that time used to ensure that Local 10's dues to the CUEW remained at an acceptable level so that bilingual services could be paid for without any untoward strain on the Local's budget. A motion to preserve the bilingual character of CUEW was voted on and passed each year at the National General Assembly. It also helped that Mr. Doyon and the representatives at the National Executive Meeting were bilingual.^{liv}

As occurs within many organizations, the representatives from the main body and the local organizers of the movement were not always of the same vision. Over time, the community

of interest that had been acknowledged between the Ottawa local and its counterparts within CUEW, began to dissipate as successive executive boards of CUEW were increasingly composed of teaching assistants who gradually moved into very influential positions in the National structure. These teaching assistants tended to be considerably younger, on average, than most of the part-time professors at the University of Ottawa.^{lv} They also tended to move on after only a few years of involvement with the union, once their studies were concluded, whereas most of the regular membership of Local 10 tended to have already completed their studies and remained very involved in university affairs for ten years or more.^{lvi} Although the membership of the union in Ottawa includes student professors, the union does not represent teaching assistants or research assistants.^{lvii}

As a result, it appears that the community of interest that had previously existed began to evolve in ways that encouraged Local 10 to chart its own course, first as a quasi-autonomous, and later on as a separate entity. A few people perceived this distinction from the inception of Local 10, but the distinction had very little significance then. It came to serve as a probable source of conflict from Local 10's perspective. Local 10 and the CUEW Executive would come to espouse different philosophies by the early 1990s and their contending interests came to a heated debate over the issue of the amount of dues paid to the National and the question of bilingual services.

The dispute between the Local and the National was a delicate but protracted affair that unfortunately taxed the energies of many individuals and ended much of the good will that both parties had had towards each other in previous years. Over time both camps came to interpret the

other's actions as impractical, inflexible or hostile approaches, thereby reducing the likelihood of any reconciliation between Local 10 and the National.

Increasingly, the executive committee of the Ottawa local determined that despite the huge sums it was paying to CUEW, it was receiving less and less service. The legal assistance that was often sent from Toronto was assessed by the executive committee as being of precious little use - a severe departure from the early days of the union - as very inexperienced legal counsel was sent from Toronto to assist with matters.^{lviii} Furthermore, the Local 10 executive committee realized that despite an earlier agreement to meet the needs of a bilingual local, the National had begun to overlook this particular responsibility to the union.

On a number of occasions officers from the National were unable even to address the membership in both languages when they attended meetings. Local 10 was paying for its own translation of material that continued to arrive from Toronto, written exclusively in one language.^{lix} There were also specific demands of francophones in different departments at the University of Ottawa that needed to be addressed and it had become clear that CUEW could not assist in this regard. The local body was, quite naturally, much more familiar with the details of its own circumstance in Ottawa and had gradually learned to rely on its own strengths in defending its interests.^{lx}

Over time, the executive committee of Local 10 determined that CUEW had become negligent in some aspects of its relations with the Ottawa local and many thought that it had

become inefficient in the general management of its own affairs. Charles Emmrys describes it as "a place ripe for ideologues" who had ceased to act in the best interests of their members. Only "lip service" was paid to bilingualism and on the matter of employees salaries, CUEW had imposed contractual terms concerning the hiring of employees that were "impossible to work with". It was proposed that union employees, regardless of post or job description were all to be paid the same, "exorbitant" sum, well in excess of \$40,000 a year. For that reason, Local 10 could not easily afford to hire a secretary to deal with the additional work that needed to be done. Moreover, the by-law that prevented past members of the Executive Board from becoming employees of CUEW was repealed during one particular president's term in office. It was stated that she applied to be an employee shortly thereafter and was hired. The result was that a number of students were seeking office in CUEW. Once elected, they could be employed by the union later on, when they got out of school.^{lxi}

It was in the midst of a number of important developments, including the negotiation of another collective agreement that other matters^{lxii} obliged Charles Emmrys to resign his position as president of the union, to be succeeded in the interim by Jean Beauregard. He did not withdraw from union activity however, and was still well placed and ready to assist when the full-fledged struggle with CUEW got under way.

Thereafter, Charles Emmrys teamed up with Jean Beauregard and Denis Cooney to pull Local 10 out of CUEW. They needed to find the strongest argument possible for secession. The main strategy was to dwell on the biligualism argument since CUEW had clearly failed to fulfil

its obligations in this area. Local 10 had already proved that it was self-sufficient, whereas many other smaller locals were weak.^{lxiii} It was thought too, that the speed of resolving grievances would be improved by separating from CUEW which had ceased to be of much help in this area.^{lxiv}

In December 1990, Charles Emmrys sent out a special letter to all the members about a Special Membership Meeting to seek a mandate for a general strike, as the new round of negotiations was also under way. A motion was passed which ensured that the president of Local 10 must be bilingual, and a second motion was presented to discuss the reduction of dues to CUEW at the upcoming meeting in January 1991. Denis Cooney was nominated to a telephone committee to encourage members to attend the Special Membership Meeting to which approximately eighty people came - the highest turnout in a very long time.

CUEW sent officers to that meeting and they were taken aback at the high turnout. In the midst of the acrimonious debate that followed, a member made a motion on the decision to reduce dues paid to CUEW. Subsequently, a referendum committee was struck, with Denis Cooney as its chairperson, and Christian Jaekl, Jean Beauregard and Charles Emmrys completing its membership. An Executive Committee Meeting followed the Special Executive Committee Meeting and Denis Cooney was appointed vice-president of Local 10.^{lxv}

Initially, Denis Cooney could not assume the role of president of Local 10 as, by virtue of his own motion, he was not bilingual and could not assume that position on the executive. Local

10, from that point on, until its disaffiliation from CUEW would be led first by its interim president, Jean Beauregard, and then by its vice president, Denis Cooney. Members such as Denis Cooney, Jean Beauregard, Béatrid Néri de Lourtioux, Jim Boyd, Milan Nosko and Christian Jaekl would henceforward be the ones who attended various meetings with the CUEW executive board until disaffiliation was finalized.

The executive committee then consulted with several lawyers for help with organizing the referendum. Raj Anand suggested that they make a referendum ballot. On the ballot, six important issues were placed before the membership, each requiring either a yes or no vote.

The first question stressed the role assumed by Local 10 since its foundation, as having sole responsibility for the successful negotiation of the Collective Agreement in French and English, without receiving financial or strategic assistance from the National in Toronto. The second recognized Local 10 as being solely responsible for "planning, coordinating, directing, controlling and financing all Local 10 resources, activities and services" to the membership in both of Canada's official languages. The third issue took note of the National's inability "to provide legal and educational services to Local 10 in both official languages". The fourth maintained that Local 10, and not the National, was paying for educational services. The fifth recognized that CUEW needed to establish "a viable National Strike Fund", and proposed that Local 10 limit its annual contribution to that fund to a maximum of \$10,000. The sixth and final item voted on was the proposal that Local 10 stop paying membership fees if the "National Convention 91 of CUEW does not reduce with satisfaction the membership fees paid by Local 10

for lack of the above-mentioned services".^{lxvi} On each count, those who voted in the referendum supported the proposals by over 90 percent in each case, and the average in favour of reducing fees was 93.78 percent.^{lxvii}

At the National Convention, the dues were increased, whereas in the referendum 93.78 percent of the membership voted to stop paying dues to CUEW. In July 1991, Denis Cooney and the executive committee began to work out a game plan for the now inevitable separation from CUEW. In August 1991, Deloitte and Touche did an audit on Local 10's books. Local 10 "needed to have the audit done before declaring war."^{lxviii} Mr Cooney explained that Local 10 invited CUEW to write a rebuttal to the referendum if they wished. It is not clear that they ever did so, and they appeared to pay little attention to the referendum itself at that point.

Even at this point, Local 10 was talking about "sovereignty association" rather than complete disaffiliation. They proposed to continue paying for their own bilingual expenses and would pay a smaller membership fee to CUEW. In September 1991, a second Special Membership Meeting was held to report on the results of the referendum and what took place at the National Convention. The membership was asked to grant the Executive Board permission to conduct a referendum on sovereignty association, which Denis Cooney surmises was "rhetoric" at that time. The membership gave the executive a mandate for disaffiliation - that is to say, complete separation - from CUEW. In October another referendum was conducted for this purpose and the process of disaffiliation was under way.^{lxix}

Technically, secession was still "illegal" and the battle waged on. Denis Cooney resolved the virtual conundrum in part, by placing Local 10 in trusteeship with Douglas Adams (a lawyer in Ottawa) before CUEW could do the same, while Mr Raj Anand was retained as legal counsel for Local 10.^{lxx} CUEW appointed its own trustee, Mr Richard Mendonca, and for a while, the question of which trustee was entitled to jurisdiction over Local 10's property became a major source of debate^{lxxi}, with the National even proposing an arrangement whereby there might be joint signing authority over the funds held by the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce (CIBC) in Ottawa.^{lxxii} Mr Cooney recounts that the National tried to occupy the office but the trustee was able to keep them out. The payment of dues to the National were cut off. He explains that Local 10 eventually won out as it had "the moral upper hand".^{lxxiii}

This moral upper hand was made especially clear to the membership when it was reported that representatives of the National had approached the Bank of Commerce in Ottawa where Local 10's account had also been placed in trusteeship, insisting that the bank hand over the funds to them. This effort proved doubly futile. The bank did not yield on the grounds that the account had been placed in trusteeship and the membership were convinced that CUEW was not operating fairly with them, as it was interpreted that the National Constitution stated "plainly" that the money belonged to the members. This coalesced most of the membership, since up to that point, the entire membership had not exactly been clear about what had been taking place. Subsequently, 98.2 percent of the members present voted for disaffiliation.^{lxxiv}

The prolonged debate over Local 10 is no less engrossing from the National's point of view. For its part, the National expressed concern about the deteriorating relationship with Local 10 and did seem to be interested in taking concrete steps to meet the needs of the Ottawa Local. At the National Executive Board (NEB) meeting of 12 and 13 January 1991, it was argued that the National had "no written records of past agreements between Local 10 and Charles Doyon" and that the National had been unaware that Local 10 needed bilingual services until six months previously. The NEB proposed that the National pay for simultaneous translation at a meeting with Local 10 scheduled for 26 January 1991 and that the fight over Local rights and National rights be ended in favour of a decision on what the National's true commitment to bilingualism was. Local 10 was urged "to suggest concrete changes rather than simply expressing displeasure with current and past practices" and those present were asked to clarify whether "bilingualism" meant "functional" or "official" bilingualism. It was suggested that a policy be set on what should be translated and a timetable should be established "to implement changes to current practices."^{lxxv}

Addressing the meeting as an individual member, Mr Cooney indicated the complexity of the situation at Local 10. He explained that there were political divisions along "bilingual, bicultural, and bi-provincial lines" but that it was still possible to establish a common mandate. He urged that the National Executive Officers who were going to Ottawa for the meeting later on that January prepare themselves "to listen and not be heavy handed." The representative of Local 9 stressed that no local could stand alone given the reality of "increasing attacks on higher education" by various levels of government and by the university administrations themselves. In

his opinion, CUEW "should be ready to support Local 10 in return for their partnership". Yet another member suggested that a "Francophone Caucus at the National level" might be a good way to deal with "the specific needs of Francophone members of the Union."^{lxxvi}

A motion to develop a series of proposals with the Ottawa local for functional bilingualism was withdrawn after discussion as those present felt that the representatives of the National needed first to talk with Local 10 directly and find out what they required.^{lxxvii} It was reasonably evident at that point that the National could see that a crisis was looming in Ottawa, but its Executive had not yet lost hope of gaining control of the situation before it could grow worse.

In a letter to the staff representative of the CUEW National Office, legal counsel offered an opinion on matters arising out of the Local 10 imbroglio. It was suggested that Local 10's by-laws, especially Article 19, wherein affiliation with CUEW could be terminated by a simple majority of Local members voting by ballot on an original motion passed by a two-thirds majority, were inconsistent with the National Constitution. It was suggested, among other things, that the National revoke Local 10's charter and place the Local under trusteeship. The letter urged caution on the part of the National in adhering strictly to its Constitution, stressing that certain actions were to be taken by the National Executive Board and not the National Executive Officers. The letter also stated that although it appeared that bargaining rights resided with the National, "it is clear that collective agreements have always been negotiated and signed exclusively by the Local."^{lxxviii} It had become evident that CUEW would have to act

expeditiously in order to win the day, but first it would have to determine exactly what the membership of Local 10 was hoping to achieve.

Clearly things did not proceed as smoothly as the National had been hoping. By March, it was suggested at the NEB meeting that the latest proposals by Local 10 "were an ultimatum not a negotiations proposal". It was stated that Mr Cooney's letter of 15 February was not considered an accurate account of what had taken place at the January meeting in Ottawa. There was also some concern that Local 10 wanted to "take over all aspects of bilingualism" whereas there were many other francophone members at other locals "and we all have a responsibility to bilingualism". The suggestion that Local 10 wanted to reduce its dues to \$3400 a year was interpreted as a desire on the part of that local to remain CUEW in name only.^{lxxix}

The NEB found that Article 19 of the Local 10 by-laws was in violation of the National Constitution, and discussed whether it should delay repealing the by-laws until they had resolved negotiations with Local 10. The NEB was also somewhat undecided as to whether the National should call a referendum on Local 10's proposals or whether Local 10 should do so itself, especially as the National was equally undecided on whether or not it should ask Local 10 to offer new proposals for negotiations.^{lxxx}

It was also at that NEB meeting that one of the National's officers informed the NEB that one of their members (Mr Hykaway) had actually filed charges against the Executive and Negotiating Committee of Local 10 for having violated the National Constitution of CUEW. The NEB was not comfortable with this line of action and passed a motion against the suspension of

Local 10 members so charged in Mr Hykaway's letter of 01 March 1991. A subsequent motion was passed to get Mr Hykaway to drop these charges by 08 March 1991, and if this were not possible that a conference call be set up for the NEB on 08 March to deal with the charges. It was suggested that a Trial Board not be convened until after the General Membership Meeting at Local 10 on 15 March 1991, and that Local 10 should participate in it.^{lxxxix}

The situation did not improve. The Local and the National became opponents with seemingly irreconcilable differences. The referendum to disaffiliate from CUEW was managed by the auditors, Deloitte and Touche. It was they who called and chaired a General Meeting of the membership to announce the result of the referendum, which was overwhelmingly in favour of disaffiliation. They then called for motions from the floor. The first, when carried, resulted in the members declaring themselves an independent collective bargaining unit - the APTPUO. The second motion, which was also passed, involved the acceptance of the new constitution which Denis Cooney had written while Deloitte and Touche had been tallying up the referendum votes. Yet another motion was passed to hold elections for the Executive Board of the APTPUO and nine people were elected to this first Executive Board.^{lxxxix} The auditors were asked to forward their invoice for services rendered to the union and the union, in turn, sent the bill on to the trustee.^{lxxxix}

Charges were officially laid (sworn before a Notary Public) against Local 10 in October 1991, on the grounds that the local's Executive Board had violated the National Constitution.^{lxxxix} The resulting tumult lasted for months but eventually the contending parties came to an

agreement by 09 March 1992, pending ratification by Convention of CUEW in May 1992. In the agreement, CUEW recommended acceptance of the disaffiliation of APTPUO, accepting thereby that the APTPUO would retain all bargaining rights that had so far been held by CUEW and/or APTPUO with respect to the University of Ottawa Bargaining Unit. This included the release of all claims to dues held by the University of Ottawa since 01 September 1991, as outlined in the Letter of Understanding that was appended to the Agreement.^{lxxxv}

The APTPUO agreed to transfer the sum of \$77,000 from the funds that were then held by the CIBC, the University of Ottawa, or Douglas Adams into an interest bearing account that would be jointly administered by the treasurer of the APTPUO and the trustee appointed by CUEW (Richard Mendonca). Upon ratification, funds remaining in the new trust would be released to CUEW.^{lxxxvi} Documents confirming the employment of Mr Anh Tuan Truong by the APTPUO as of 24 November 1991 were also to be forwarded to CUEW within ten working days of the signing of the Agreement. It was obvious that the transfer of power was virtually complete. Upon ratification, the former CUEW/SCTTE Local 10 was officially replaced by the new entity, the Association of Part-Time Professors of the University of Ottawa (APTPUO).

CUEW eventually folded a few years after Local 10 disaffiliated and most, if not all, of its locals at that time joined the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE). It is difficult to identify all the factors that contributed to the disbanding of CUEW without doing a thorough case study of that union's history, but some observers believe that with the departure of a huge local such as Local 10, which had provided a considerable amount of money to the CUEW

budget annually through local dues, CUEW was no longer as viable a body as it had previously been. At that time 2.25% of gross salary was collected from members and 1.75% was paid to the National union in Toronto.^{lxxxvii} It is also to be assumed, however, that CUEW had finally been encouraged to realize one of its own goals from an earlier period, that of becoming an affiliate of CUPE.^{lxxxviii}

During this difficult episode, the University administration acknowledged the fact that Local 10 had been placed in trusteeship. It however assisted the Local by allowing it to continue to enjoy chequing privileges against the monies that had been "frozen" until the situation with the National could be resolved.^{lxxxix} The Local was therefore able to function at a minimal level, while awaiting the final outcome of deliberations with the National.

The gains for the APTPUO were considerable in that the new bargaining unit had virtually uncontested control of its affairs in name and in deed. Monies that were originally sent to the National in Toronto now remained in the APTPUO's own accounts to help pay for all the expenses that Local 10 had usually paid for with less. By extricating themselves from the control of a big union, it was believed that more meaningful attention could be paid to the needs of members by those who were in Ottawa without the interference of those who were based far away and were not sensitive enough to the particular problems faced by the membership in Ottawa and its environs.

The demerits of disaffiliation from CUEW without seeking affiliation to another national union were also significant. By choosing to remain a completely independent union, the APTPUO lost much of its voice in the labour movement through its previous membership in the Canadian Labour Congress while it was part of CUEW, to cite one example. By becoming a smaller, discrete entity, it was no longer as powerful or influential as it might otherwise have been as part of a larger union or a federation of unions. Moreover, while the union was part of CUEW, its union dues went towards subsidizing smaller locals elsewhere (such as the CUEW local in Thunder Bay), which could not have supported themselves very effectively because their own membership was quite small.^{xc} For those who saw the union as playing an important role in the general labour movement, this was a major concern.

At the point of disaffiliation, the merits of being an independent, officially bilingual union seemed to outweigh any arguments that could be brought against the final decision of the membership. The members had voted overwhelmingly in favour of disaffiliation from CUEW and CUEW had conceded defeat in the legal battle to keep Local 10 within its fold, avoiding a bitter court battle in the process. The APTPUO had made its mark as an independent bargaining unit and, in so doing, had made "history".

As Mr Cooney explains, the APTPUO became the sole representative of the part-time professors at University of Ottawa with a new constitution designed to eradicate some of the problems that had arisen in the latter years of the CUEW experience. Among other things, an "oligarchy" was created in the person of the Board of Directors (executive board) which is

elected by the membership. The Board then selects the president and other officers from among its own numbers. The Board cannot appoint members to the Board, cannot change the dues base and cannot change the constitution. That all rests with the membership at the General Membership Meetings.^{xci}

Once the membership had accepted the new constitution, the union was set to enter the next phase of its development. It would have to redirect its energies away from the now outmoded CUEW question, back towards the basic issues that justified its existence in Ottawa. This redirection and recuperation would be the challenge of the Fourth Phase.

THE FOURTH PHASE

The union entered a new phase of its history as the APTPUO and, once again, had to strengthen its profile at the University of Ottawa. The process of disaffiliating from CUEW had been difficult enough, but the union passed through some of its most difficult years in the aftermath of that struggle. The very membership of the union declined as the university offered fewer contracts owing to government cutbacks and the union found itself undergoing another period of stark transition at this point. Although it was not "broke" the APTPUO faced a decline in its revenues following the settlements with both CUEW and the former Administrative Assistant who had been a CUEW employee and CUPE union member himself before becoming the APTPUO's first Administrative Assistant.^{xcii}

Christian Jaekl, current and former president of the APTPUO remembers the difficult state of affairs that existed at that time. He had himself got involved in the union around 1990 when the union had "slipped into disaffiliation", had been placed in trusteeship, and had its affairs governed by the Joint Council.^{xciii} He first became a departmental steward within the union structure, and had actually served as a delegate to the National Convention of CUEW. He eventually agreed to become part of the new APTPUO Executive Board as its Secretary.^{xciv}

Mr Jaekl recalls that it was almost impossible to function in the office because the APTPUO had lost its Administrative Assistant and with the absence of someone who had the

specific charge of keeping files in order and up to date, the members of the board went on "research trips" to locate files and arrange documents in an appropriate order.^{xcv}

Mr Jaekl had been secretary for only a short period of time when Mr Cooney resigned as president and was succeeded by Mme Néri de Lourtioux. Mme Néri de Lourtioux recalls that she had no interest in actually becoming involved in the union at the administrative level when she first got involved in the union. She, like many others, became more interested in the union at the time that Local 10 was trying to separate from CUEW, and was eventually recruited "d'une façon spontanée"^{xcvi} at one of the meetings. Eventually she became president of the APTPUO, heading an Executive Board that was composed of relative newcomers to the union's affairs.

She recalls that in that period it was simply "une question de survie et pas de finances".^{xcvii} For the first six months of her presidency, there were roughly five members on the executive board holding things together at the office who were joined later on by other interested members.^{xcviii} A handful of people effectively did multiple jobs, working extremely hard to keep the APTPUO's affairs running as smoothly as possible. Whoever was in the office at the given moment would deal with whatever issue arose at that time.^{xcix} It was also in this period that the union reduced its membership dues in order to alleviate some of the strain that the membership was experiencing as a result of widespread economic problems.

Eventually Mr Jaekl succeeded Mme Néri de Lourtioux as president but he insisted that he be considered an "interim" president as he wanted to move on after putting a new team

together within the union. He persuaded a number of people to run for office, and even encouraged a few of them to consider assuming the presidency in his stead. During this first presidency Mr Jaekl tried to revive the tradition of having department stewards as the number of stewards had dwindled over time. He also tried to get the APTPUO Bulletin circulating again in order to enhance communication with the membership. He was also chief negotiator for the Collective Agreement that expired in August 1996, but he resigned before the formal end of negotiations^c and was replaced by Mrs Aïda Hudson, who in turn did a great deal along with the rest of the executive board to raise the profile of the union.^{ci} It was also in this period that a new administrative assistant was hired,^{cii} thereby releasing a number of dedicated individuals from daily trips to the office to attend to the sorting of documents and other matters as well.

WHITHER THE UNION? A GENERAL ASSESSMENT

As a bargaining unit, whether as an affiliate of a larger national body or as an independent entity at the University of Ottawa, the APTPUO has made commendable progress over the past ten years. The union has not enjoyed an unqualified success, but given how difficult conditions were before it was formed, the bargaining unit has come a long way over the past decade. A number of members believe that the true measure of this success lies in the strength of the Collective Agreement in upholding members' or workers' rights and in providing support for any grievances that have been won over the past few years. The way in which these victories have in turn helped to strengthen the Collective Agreement emphasizes the strength of the union in the face of a very powerful university administration.^{ciii}

One clear example of a curious inequity that has so far been retained in each successive Collective Agreement is the rate of remuneration for language teachers at the Second Language Institute and the Department of Modern Languages. They receive seventy-five percent of the basic rate of pay that is accorded to their colleagues in other departments.^{civ} It has been argued that this difference in salary for language teachers results from a traditional failure on the part of many people (not only the employer) to appreciate fully what is required in proper language instruction.^{cv} Old prejudices are upheld whereby language teachers are considered as being something other than "real professors" and old myths continue to suggest that all that is required

for the teaching of a language is the ability to speak it, a book, some tapes or some sophisticated software.^{cvi}

It may be that language teachers at the University of Ottawa, as a distinct group, might not have possessed as many higher-level degrees as their colleagues in other disciplines; yet, it is also noteworthy that a very high percentage of language teachers are women. As such, their struggle for recognition might be interpreted as part of the ongoing struggle to recognize the full value of work done by women, while not discounting the attenuated disdain meted out towards language teachers, regardless of their gender.

Clearly, the resolution to such problems lies in how well and how quickly the professional community, and indeed, society as a whole can be re-educated about the value of certain kinds of work (language teaching being only one of many in this regard) and the dignity that should be accorded everyone on the basis of courtesy and respect towards fellow human beings. While a number of problems are indeed systemic within the university structure, other problems are the reflection of unresolved debates going on in the society at large.

Definitely one of the proudest moments in the history of the APTPUO arrived when it was announced that the part-time professor of the year award had been established and then APTPUO president, Aïda Hudson, triumphantly introduced Professor Wexuan Li of the Department of Computer Science at the official lecture and conferring of the award on 26 September 1996.^{cvii} It was clear that the APTPUO had earned itself yet another important

milestone in its quest to attain the respect and recognition due the members of the bargaining unit who are indeed part and parcel of the University itself. Professor Li, a renowned scholar, addressed the gathering with the authority and enthusiasm of a professor - part-time or otherwise.

Yet a number of other basic improvements still need to be made, both within the union and between the union and the employer. Communication needs to be continually upgraded between the executive board and the membership. At the same time, all categories of members should begin to take greater interest in what is being done and how the bargaining unit functions in the interests of all concerned. In this way, the members can help to ensure that the union remains fully accountable to them.

Turnout at the General Membership Meetings is dismally low compared to the huge membership that the union boasts.^{cviii} The apparent disinterest on the part of the membership might suggest a general sense of contentment on the part of the members, or perhaps it is simply a collective mood of indifference. Either way, it is clear that very few members actually take an active part in the democratic process of the union^{cix}. Increased participation on the part of the membership is likely to strengthen the mandate and the resolve of the executive boards, even if it were to present a bigger challenge to the smooth and timely conduct of meetings.

It is understood that the Collective Agreement has to be strengthened over time. The University has included too many loopholes which still lead to a number of irregularities. First, there are the categories in which professors may be placed: A, B and C categories, which affect

the hiring policy. Second, the possibility remains for the University to use "discretionary" reasons for assigning categories. Third, a number of the articles are too vaguely formulated throughout the Collective Agreement. Fourth, the union has to remain vigilant to guard against attempts by departments and the administration in general "to play favourite games and circumvent seniority points".^{cx}

Moreover, there is a general need for a more strategic approach towards the administration in defence of the union membership. The administration must be reminded at every opportunity that both part-time and full-time professors are integral parts of the University community. It is quite simply a question of respect. Many more members need to become involved with the union to strengthen this resolve.^{cx}

For the following decade, the APTPUO must be able to respond to the concerns of its membership with even greater vigour and must defend those interests before the employer with even greater vigilance. At the same time, the Association must remain cognisant of changing relationships in the wider Canadian society, of which the University of Ottawa is only one small part - a modified microcosm of the outside world at best. If the APTPUO's history is to have any practical value, future executive boards and the general membership must be prepared to acknowledge mistakes and rivalries of the past and make concerted efforts to mend broken lines of communication.

The Association certainly cannot satisfy the goals and desires of every single member; its scope is limited by labour legislation, the power and influence of management and other practical considerations. Nonetheless, like the proverbial chain that is only as strong as its weakest link, the union will only remain strong if it continues to increase its efforts to defend the basic rights of each member, and to appreciate its own potential to function legitimately in a wider context that makes its existence relevant to Canadian society as a whole. In order to do so effectively, it must remain grounded in its immediate environment and must at the same time forge new links with similar entities across Ontario and the rest of Canada; it must remain stable and sure of purpose, but must be willing to grow and reassess the ways in which that purpose can be fulfilled.

The challenge is perhaps much more easily stated than done, but given all the other challenges that the union has faced since the mid 1980s, the hurdles involved should not be viewed as insurmountable. The union began as a small group of part-time teachers who knew very little about one another in general and knew, collectively, possibly even less about forming unions for professionals involved in teaching. Despite their limitations, the organizers formed a viable bargaining unit within a national union and that bargaining unit grew to take full responsibility for its own affairs as an independent union. Therein lies a wealth of experiences, both positive and negative, and a level of accomplishment that should serve as a valuable guide for yet another decade.

LIST OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE/BOARD MEMBERS 1986-1996

Included below are the lists of members who served on the Organizing Committee, the Executive Committees and the Board of Directors. The author extends profound apologies to all those who may have been inadvertently omitted from the following lists, which have been compiled as faithfully as possible from the extant documentation and discussions with members. The offices held by each individual have not been mentioned next to the names since the members usually paid more attention to the actual work that had to be done than to their actual rank within the union.

Identifying the complete membership of the Part-Time Teachers' Organizing Committee has been an especially elusive goal given the dearth of information that remains regarding this body. It is abundantly clear that Béatrice Miguelez, Mario Samedy and Chris Southcott were the pioneers of the organization drive. In this effort, they were joined by the following individuals who are listed in alphabetical order:

Geraldine Arbach	Patricia Balcom	Cécile Catalfo
Claude Danik	Joan Glidden	Sally Horrell
Richard Isaac	Pierrette Landry	Lise Lefebvre
Sheila Redmond	Esther Senneville	Bianca Sherwood

The Executive Committees of Local 10 included the positions of President, Vice President, Secretary/Treasurer, Membership Officer, Grievance Officer, and Chief Steward. Below, in alphabetical order, is a list of those who served on the Executive Committees, often in more than one capacity, from 1986 to 1992:

Geraldine Arbach	Patricia Balcom	Agueda Bazán
Jean Beauregard	James Boyd	Helga Collette
Denis Cooney	Claude Danik	Claire Descamps
Chantal Dion	Charles Emmrys	Shirley Griffith
Marlene Hutchins	Pierrette Landry	Leslie MacDonald-Hicks
Michelle Morin	Joanne Norman	Marti Pierce
Felix Quinet	Dwayne Schindler	J. Brian Scott
Esther Senneville	Bianca Sherwood	Alysse Weinberg

In 1992, the APTPUO was officially acknowledged as the successor to Local 10 of CUEW. The APTPUO has been governed by a Board of Directors since then, which currently includes the positions of President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer, Grievance Officer (English), Grievance Officer (*français*), as well as members at large and the position of Past President.

The following members, listed alphabetically, have served on the APTPUO Board of Directors since 1992:

Jean Beauregard	Deborah Bowen	Marie-Josée Bourget
James Boyd	René Chiasson	Denis Cooney
Claire Descamps	Julie Fenwick	Najwa Garzouzi
Mona Gauthier	Dorothy Howard	Aïda Hudson
Christian Jaekl	Maureen Korp	Yvon Malette
Jean K. Messiha	Michelle Morin	Béatrid Néri de Lourtioux
Milan Nosko	Corinne Paollilo Lessard	Robert Paquette
Michelline Pellerin	David Powell	Esther Senneville
Victoria Walker		

In addition to the members of the Executive Committees and Boards since 1986, three different Administrative Assistants have worked in conjunction with the leadership of the Association. They are Anh Tuan Truong, Christine Fontaine and Eliane Comtois.

SOURCES

I

In order to establish a broader historical framework for this project, the following books and articles were consulted.

Freeman, Richard B. and James L. Medoff, What Do Unions Do? New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1984.

Herman, Edward E., Determination of the Appropriate Bargaining Unit by Labour Relations Boards in Canada. Ottawa: Canada Department of Labour, Economics and Research Branch, 1972.

Heron, Craig, The Canadian Labour Movement: A Brief History. Toronto: James Lorimer & Company, Ltd., 1996.

Heron, Craig and Robert Storey, "On the Job in Canada," Craig Heron and Robert Storey, (eds), On the Job in Canada: Confronting the Labour Process in Canada. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1986, 3-46.

Kealey, Gregory S., "Labour and Working-Class History in Canada: Prospects in the 1980s," David J. Bercuson (ed), Canadian Labour History (New Canadian Readings). Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman Ltd., 1987, 232-256.

Morton, Desmond, Labour in Canada. Toronto: Grolier Limited, 1982

_____, Working People: An Illustrated History of the Canadian Labour Movement. (Toronto: Summerhill Press, 1990)

Parr, Joy, "Women Workers in the Twentieth Century," W. J. C. Cherwinski and Gregory S. Kealey (eds), Lectures in Canadian Labour and Working-Class History. St John's, Newfoundland: Committee on Canadian Labour History and New Hogtown Press, 1985, 79-88.

II

The following documents and articles were consulted in conjunction with the personal interviews as authoritative sources of information on Local 10, APTPUO, and labour laws in the Province of Ontario.

APTPUO/Local 10 Records, 1986-1992.

Collective Agreements between the University of Ottawa and the Association of Part-Time Professors of the University of Ottawa, 1986-1996.

CUEW/SCTTE National Executive Board Meeting, Minutes, January - March, 1991. Collection located in archives at CUPE Local 3902, College Street, Toronto, Canada.

The Government of Ontario Labour Relations Act: Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1980, March 1990.

Le Droit, Ottawa-Hull, mercredi, 18 décembre 1991.

III

Personal interviews and e-mail correspondence were conducted with the following individuals:

Geraldine Arbach, 04 December 1996
Patricia Balcom, 30 November 1996
Jean Beauregard, 21 August 1996
M. Bubis, 17 January 1997
Denis Cooney, 17 and 20 September 1996
Rhoda Diebel, 15 November 1996
Charles (Chuck) Emmrys, 03 November 1996
Christian Jaekl, 21 March 1997
Pierrette Landry, 08 November 1996
Béatrice Miguelez, 12 November 1996
Béatrid Néri de Lourtioux, 13 November 1996
Milan Nosko, 07 November 1996
Esther Senneville, 29 May 1997
J. Brian Scott, 09 October 1996
Bianca Sherwood, 08 October, 1996
Chris Southcott, 22 April 1997
Anh Tuan Truong, 17 January 1997

ENDNOTES

-
- i. Conspicuously absent from the list of past presidents who have been interviewed for this work, is Mrs Aida Hudson. Although Mrs Hudson has been extremely supportive in this venture, she felt obliged to decline any direct participation in the project while she was president of the APTPUO and chief negotiator for the bargaining unit.
- ii. The term "union" is to be understood as "trade union" or, in the American context, "labour union".
- iii. Richard B. Freeman and James L. Medoff, What Do Unions Do? (New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1984), 3.
- iv. Ibid., 3-4.
- v. Ibid., 3, 5. It has become typical in recent times of economic restructuring and depression to overemphasise the negative considerations as regards unions and wage increases. This overlooks the fact that many unions have accepted wage freezes, cuts and limited lay-offs in such a climate.
- vi. Gregory S. Kealey argues that the periodization of Canadian working-class development is thus: "pre-industrial capitalism to 1850; industrial capitalism, 1850 to the mid-1890s; monopoly capitalism, 1890s to 1929; and crisis and reconstruction, 1930 to the present." See, Gregory S. Kealey, "Labour and Working-Class History in Canada: Prospects in the 1980s," David J. Bercuson (ed), Canadian Labour History (New Canadian Readings). (Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman Ltd., 1987), 237.
- vii. Craig Heron and Robert Storey, "On the Job in Canada," in Craig Heron and Robert Storey, (eds), On the Job in Canada: Confronting the Labour Process in Canada. (Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1986), 21-22.
- viii. Heron and Storey, "On the Job in Canada," 22-23.
- ix. Heron and Storey, "On the Job in Canada," 23-24.
- x. Heron and Storey, "On the Job in Canada," 24.
- xi. Craig Heron, The Canadian Labour Movement: A Brief History. (Toronto: James Lorimer & Company, Ltd., 1996), 143.
- xii. Joy Parr, "Women Workers in the Twentieth Century," W. J. C. Cherwinski and Gregory S. Kealey (eds), Lectures in Canadian Labour and Working-Class History. (St John's, Newfoundland: Committee on Canadian Labour History and New Hogtown Press, 1985), 84-86.

xiii. Desmond Morton, Labour in Canada. (Toronto: Grolier Limited, 1982), 87.

xiv. The labour movement in the United States had been significantly enfeebled by the 1980s. Barely eighteen percent of its work force was organized. In Canada, "union density" was about twice that rate. See Desmond Morton, Working People: An Illustrated History of the Canadian Labour Movement. (Toronto: Summerhill Press, 1990), 319.

xv. Craig Heron, The Canadian Labour Movement: A Brief History. (Toronto: James Lorimer & Company, Ltd., 1996), 151. Unions, as well as provincial federations and labour councils had actually been organizing educational programmes for decades. For example, every summer, the Canadian Labour Congress (CLC) sponsored a six-week Labour College in Ottawa for local union executives and shop stewards. The late 1970s and the 1980s, however, marked a period in which such programmes increased their scope, as Heron indicates. In 1977, autoworkers were the first union in Canada to win clauses in their contracts that provided members with paid educational leave to attend an extensive programme at Port Elgin.

xvi. Heron and Storey, "On the Job in Canada," 25.

xvii. The bargaining unit includes staff employed in "the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, Stormont-Dundas, Renfrew North, Prescott and Lanark Counties." See Collective Agreement between the University of Ottawa and The Association of Part-Time Professors of the University of Ottawa, September 1, 1994 to August 31, 1996, Article 2, Paragraph 2.1.1. Part-time professors within the Faculties of Law and Medicine, for reasons of other traditions of professional association, are not included in the APTPUO. In fact, in Canadian labour relations statutes at both the federal and provincial levels, certain categories of employees are specially identified as being ineligible for certification. These include, among others, confidential and managerial staff and doctors and lawyers. See Edward E. Herman, Determination of the Appropriate Bargaining Unit by Labour Relations Boards in Canada. (Ottawa: Canada Department of Labour, Economics and Research Branch, 1972), 29.

xviii. The history of the APUO awaits its own researcher, but suffice it to say here, that the very existence and success of the APUO has certainly been a factor that has aided the cause of the APTPUO in a number of ways, especially with regard to setting the precedent of unionizing teaching staff on campus.

xix. Geraldine Arbach, personal interview, December 1996.

xx. Geraldine Arbach, personal interview, 04 December 1996. It is noteworthy that when negotiations were finally concluded for the first Collective Agreement in 1986, it was conceded that seniority would only be counted from 1981.

xxi. Bianca Sherwood, personal interview, 08 October 1996.

xxii. Patricia Balcom, e-mail to author, 30 November, 1996.

xxiii. Patricia Balcom, e-mail to author, 30 November, 1996.

xxiv. Bianca Sherwood, personal interview, 08 October 1996.

xxv. Although I have not been able to hold an official interview with Dr Babin on this issue, during a telephone conversation with him in October 1996, he did confirm his meeting with Ms Sherwood. He recalled the consternation on the part of the administration that followed the publication of Ms Sherwood's piece in his magazine.

xxvi. Bianca Sherwood, personal interview, 08 October 1996.

xxvii. Bianca Sherwood, personal interview, 08 October 1996 and Béatrice Miguelez, personal interview, 12 November 1996.

xxviii. Béatrice Miguelez, personal interview, 12 November 1996. Translation by author: "We began slowly, but firmly."

xxix. Chris Southcott, e-mail to author, 22 April 1997.

xxx. Chris Southcott, e-mail to author, 22 April 1997.

xxxi. Chris Southcott, e-mail to author, 22 April 1997. The Government of Ontario Labour Relations Act: Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1980, March 1990, Chap. 228, Art. 1 (3) (a) and (b) stipulates that:

Subject to section 90, for the purposes of this Act, no person shall be deemed to be an employee,

- (a) who is a member of the architectural, dental, land surveying, legal or medical profession entitled to practise in Ontario and employed in a professional capacity; or
- (b) who, in the opinion of the Board, exercises managerial functions or is employed in a confidential capacity in matters relating to labour relations.

These restrictions are mirrored in the exclusions from the bargaining unit included at Article 2 of the Collective Agreement between the University of Ottawa and the Association of Part-Time Professors of the University of Ottawa. See Collective Agreement for September 1, 1994 to August 31, 1996.

xxxii. Patricia Balcom, e-mail to author, 30 November 1996.

xxxiii. Béatrice Miguelez, personal interview, 12 November 1996.

xxxiv. Béatrice Miguelez, personal interview, 12 November 1996.

xxxv. Pierrette Landry, personal interview, 08 November 1996 and Esther Senneville, personal interview, 29 May 1997.

xxxvi. J. Brian Scott, personal interview, 09 October, 1996. Mr Scott reported that this official was understood to have telephoned her counterpart at the University of Ottawa, berating him for not being more supportive of his part-time staff in this effort. It should be noted, as well, that the University was under no obligation to release any such list to the Organizing Committee, but only to the legally constituted and recognized union that would subsequently be established.

xxxvii. Bianca Sherwood, personal interview, 08 October 1996 and Patricia Balcom, e-mail to author, 30 November 1996.

xxxviii. Chris Southcott, e-mail to author, 22 April 1997.

xxxix. Patricia Balcom, e-mail to author, 30 November 1996.

xl. Béatrice Miguelez, personal interview, 12 November 1996.

xli. Chris Southcott, e-mail to author, 22 April 1997. Mr Southcott goes on to explain that CUEW had recently been in the news concerning a strike at York University, whereas, in the same period, there had been "rumours about complaints relating to CUPE's role at Carleton".

xlii. This was the case in Athabasca, Alberta for example.

xliii. Rhoda Diebel, personal interview, 15 November 1996.

xliv. There was the occasional voice that remained cautious of the unionizing drive and there are always a handful of people who are uncomfortable about the consequences of pre-union activity for future employment. Despite that, there was an overwhelming response in favour of forming the union. Rhoda Diebel, personal interview, 15 November 1996.

xlv. The certification vote was held on Tuesday, 08 April and Wednesday, 09 April 1986 at Morisset Hall, on the Ottawa campus, at Windmill Point in Cornwall and at 315 Pembroke Street East, Pembroke at varying times on both days. The inside scrutineers for the Organizing Committee at Morisset Hall were Patricia Balcom, Claude Danik, Pierrette Landry, Leslie MacDonald, Béatrice Miguelez, D. Nash and Bianca Sherwood. The outside scrutineers for the same location were Patricia Balcom, Cécile Catalfo, Joan Glidden, Sally Horrell, Richard Isaac, Lise Lefebvre, Esther Senneville and Bianca Sherwood. Sheila Redmond was the scrutineer at the certification vote held in Cornwall and Claude Danik was the scrutineer in Pembroke. Letters

from Patricia Balcom, President, Part-Time Teachers' Organizing Committee to Representative, Ontario Labour Relations Board, 08 April, 1986, APTPUO Certification and Disaffiliation Records, 1986-1992.

xlvi. Syndicat Canadien des Travailleurs et Travailleuses en Education (SCTTE) in French.

xlvii. This term was employed by Denis Cooney (personal interview, 17 September 1996) and was also employed by others, with minor variations in word choice.

xlviii. Bianca Sherwood, personal interview, 08 October 1996.

xlix. Bianca Sherwood, personal interview, 08 October 1996, J. Brian Scott, personal interview, 09 October 1996, and Anh Tuan Truong, personal interview, 17 January 1997.

l. Anh Tuan Truong, personal interview, 17 January 1996.

li. Charles Emmrys, personal interview, 03 November 1996.

lii. In part, this might have also resulted from a conflict between two camps within the union. Student part-time teachers and "regular" part-time teachers continue to have some divergence of interests despite the many interests that they share.

liii. Charles Emmrys, personal interview, 03 November 1996.

liv. Esther Senneville, personal interview, 29 May 1997.

lv. Bianca Sherwood, personal interview, 08 October 1996, J. Brian Scott, personal interview, 09 October 1996, and Patricia Balcom, e-mail to author, 30 November 1996. Patricia Balcom and J. Brian Scott noted that the representatives from the National were mostly teaching assistants; thus some of the issues were different from very early on.

lvi. Béatrid Néri de Lourtioux, personal interview, 13 November 1996.

lvii. While this project was being researched in 1996, a new unionizing drive for teaching and research assistants was underway at the University of Ottawa. In 1997, a brand new union for teaching and research assistants (a Cupe local) was formed.

lviii. Jean Beauregard, personal interview, 21 August 1996 and Béatrid Néri de Lourtioux, personal interview, 13 November 1996.

lix. Jean Beauregard, personal interview, 21 August 1996. Similar accounts were also provided by Denis Cooney, personal interviews, 17 and 20 September 1996, Béatrid Néri de Lourtioux, personal interview, 13 November 1996, and Anh Tuan Truong, personal interview, 17 January

1996.

lx. Béatrid Néri de Lourtioux, personal interview, 13 November 1996 and Jean Beauregard, personal interview, 21 August 1996.

lxi. Charles Emmrys, personal interview, 03 November 1996.

lxii. In particular, a sensitive matter concerning the representation of a member had, inadvertently, placed Mr Emmrys in what appeared to be a conflict of interests. Although a number of people wanted him to stay on as president of Local 10, he thought it appropriate to resign at that point, until the matter could be settled properly. He remained involved with the union, even becoming a vice president later on, but resigned from that position as well, to undertake other professional duties elsewhere in Canada.

lxiii. Charles Emmrys, personal interview, 03 November 1996.

lxiv. Milan Nosko, personal interview, 07 November 1996. In a document entitled "The Creation of an Independent Union?" prepared for the General Assembly Meeting of 26 January 1991 by Jean Beauregard (who, over a short period of time, had served as chief negotiator, vice president, interim president and grievance officer for Local 10), a number of problems were specified. The document cites among other things, the absence of a bilingual representative, the absence of a negotiation specialist for the renewal of a collective agreement, the absence of a specialist or instructor as regards administrative questions such as accounting, managing and budgeting, and the lack of cohesion and long-term vision within the National Executive, as shortcomings of the National. APTPUO Certification and Disaffiliation Records, 1986-1992.

lxv. Denis Cooney, personal interview, 17 September 1996.

lxvi. Referendum (Local/Section Locale 10), March 22, 1991, Ottawa, Ontario, APTPUO, Certification and Disaffiliation Records, 1986-1992. The document was prepared on 22 March, and the members were asked to return their completed ballots no later than 30 April 1991.

lxvii. Referendum (Local/Section Locale 10), March 22, 1991, Ottawa, Ontario, APTPUO, Certification and Disaffiliation Records, 1986-1992. The ballots were counted on 06 May 1991 by Denis Cooney, Jim Boyd, Jean Beauregard, Krishna Chaudhary, and Christian Jaekl. There were 271 responses and another 17 ballots received after 30 April 1991, which were not counted.

lxviii. Denis Cooney, personal interview, 17 September 1996.

lxix. Denis Cooney, personal interview, 17 September 1996 and letter from Denis J. Cooney, Acting President [Local 10] to Dr John S. Cowan, Vice Rector, Research and Planning, University of Ottawa, October 1, 1991, APTPUO, Certification and Disaffiliation Records, 1986-1992.

lxx. See letter from Denis J. Cooney, Acting President, Local 10 to Dr John S. Cowan, Vice Rector, Research and Planning, University of Ottawa, October 1, 1991 and letter from Raj Anand, Scott & Ayles Barristers and Solicitors, to Dr John S. Cowan, Vice Rector, Tabaret Hall [University of Ottawa], October 24, 1991. APTPUO, Certification and Disaffiliation Records, 1986-1992.

lxxi. The following (abridged) excerpt of an affidavit by Richard Mendonca identifies the property in dispute between the Local and the National:

3. To date, no access to Local 10 premises has been granted to me. I verily believe that in the Local 10 premises are computers which are the property of the National Union, financial records, grievance records, membership records, files and correspondence which relate directly to the affairs of the Local Union as well as to the National Union. Without access to the premises on a regular basis I am unable to carry out the mandate granted to me by the National Executive Board to administer the affairs of the Local.... This equipment and these records are being detained unlawfully and I am being denied access despite my requests and my proper authority as temporary administrator of the Local.

4. In addition to the property outlined in paragraph 3 above, I verily believe that \$20,800.00 is currently being held by the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce in Ottawa, which moneys [sic] were on deposit by Local 10 and which are being held pursuant to the agreement outlined in my affidavit of November 8, 1991; that \$57,000.00 in Guaranteed Investment certificates is currently in the possession of Douglas Adams, having been conveyed to him by the executive of Local 10; that the University of Ottawa is currently holding \$34,837.34 in dues deducted from members of the bargaining unit but not remitted to the Union due to the dispute between the Local and the National Union; and that between \$15,000.00 and \$20,000.00 are in a trust account of the solicitor for Local 10 having been conveyed there for the purpose of financing litigation between the Local or the newly formed "ATPUO" [sic] and the Canadian Union of Educational Workers.

Further Supplementary Affidavit of Richard Mendonca, (03 December 1991). Court File No. RE 2026/91, In the Ontario Court, General Division, Between: Richard Mendonca, Mark Satterly, Therese Brabant, Suzanne Carroll, Dorothy Chitty, Matt Decoursey, Diane Dixon, Geoffrey Ewen[,] Nancy Johnson, Matt Sendbuehler, Natalie Sharp, Claudia Vicencio, and Brenda Austin-Smith on their behalf and on behalf of The Canadian Union of Educational Workers, Applicants - and - Denis Cooney, Jean Beauregard, James Boyd, Charles Emrys [sic], and Michelle Morin in their own behalf and on behalf of the Canadian Union of Educational Workers, Local 10; Douglas R. Adams, and the University of Ottawa, Respondents. APTPUO Certification and Disaffiliation Records, 1986-1992.

lxxii. Letter signed on behalf of Richard Blair [signature unclear], Calvazzo, Hayes & Shilton, Barristers and Solicitors to Raj Anand, Scott & Ayles, Barristers and Solicitors, October 16,

1991. A proposal to have the CIBC-held funds placed under joint signing authority is found in letter signed on behalf of Richard Blair [signature unclear], Cavalluzzo, Hayes & Shilton, Barristers and Solicitors to Annette Nicholson, Perley-Robertson, Panet, Hill & McDougall, Barristers and Solicitors, October 16, 1991. APTPUO, Certification and Disaffiliation Records, 1986-1992.

lxxiii. Denis Cooney, personal interview, 17 September 1996.

lxxiv. Denis Cooney, personal interview, 17 September 1996. See also "Professeurs à temps partiel de l'Université d'Ottawa: Le Syndicat unilingue est mis à la porte," Le Droit, Ottawa-Hull, Mercredi 18 décembre 1991, 8:

Insatisfaite des services offerts par le syndicat national, l'APTPUO a tenu un référendum sur le campus d'Ottawa afin de consulter ses membres. Sur quelque 400 voteurs, 98.2% ont voté en faveur d'une dissociation du syndicat.

lxxv. CUEW/SCTTE National Executive Board Meeting, Minutes, January 13, 1991, 2,3.

lxxvi. CUEW/SCTTE National Executive Board Meeting, Minutes, January 13, 1991, 3,4.

lxxvii. CUEW/SCTTE National Executive Board Meeting, Minutes, January 13, 1991, 4,5.

lxxviii. Letter from Richard A. Blair, Cavalluzzo, Hayes & Lennon Barristers and Solicitors, to Mr Jim Keatings, Staff Representative, Canadian Union of Educational Workers, National Office, January 15, 1991. APTPUO Certification and Disaffiliation Records, 1986-1992.

lxxix. CUEW/SCTTE National Executive Board Meeting, Minutes, March 3, 1991, 6.

lxxx. CUEW/SCTTE National Executive Board Meeting, Minutes, March 3, 1991, 7.

lxxxi. CUEW/SCTTE National Executive Board Meeting, Minutes, March 3, 1991.

lxxxii. Denis Cooney, personal interview, 20 September 1996.

lxxxiii. Denis Cooney, personal interview, 20 September 1996.

lxxxiv. Letter from Mark Satterly, Chair, National Affairs, CUEW/SCTTE to Denis Cooney, CUEW/SCTTE Local 10, October 7, 1991, APTPUO, Certification and Disaffiliation Records, 1986-1992.

lxxxv. Béatrid Néri de Lourtioux, personal interview, 13 November 1996. See also Agreement [between the] Canadian Union of Educational Workers National and Canadian Union of Educational Workers Local Ten Association of Part-Time Professors of the University of Ottawa, March 09, 1992, APTPUO, Certification and Disaffiliation Records, 1986-1992,

lxxxvi. Agreement [between the] Canadian Union of Educational Workers National and

Canadian Union of Educational Workers Local Ten Association of Part-Time Professors of the University of Ottawa, March 09, 1992, APTPUO, Certification and Disaffiliation Records, 1986-1992.

lxxxvii. Denis Cooney, personal interview, 17 September 1996.

lxxxviii. It is for this reason in particular that many members of the APTPUO who recalled the difficulties they experienced with CUEW, remained very hesitant and even objected vehemently to the prospect of affiliation with CUPE on a number of occasions.

lxxxix. Béatrid Néri de Lourtioux, personal interview, 13 November 1996.

xc. Patricia Balcom, personal interview, 30 November 1996.

xc. Denis Cooney, personal interview, 17 September 1996. The term "oligarchy" is used here to refer to a body that has a collective mandate or collective responsibility for carrying out the wishes of the membership as outlined at the AGMs. The alternative, in this specific context, seemed to be a body where each individual elected directly to a position, might consider herself or himself as having a separate mandate from other elected officials and might choose to act independently of the rest of the Board.

xcii. Mr Truong's dismissal was the subject of a long grievance which he eventually won. The circumstances are too delicate to present in this work, but suffice it to say that there was, among other things that have not been disclosed, disagreement as to the direction that the newly-formed APTPUO would take and the role that Mr Truong would play in the union's future.

xciii. The Joint Council was a structure set up under the CUEW umbrella, whereby the executive committee and the stewards from the various departments could meet and take important decisions between general assemblies. Given that few documents are extant for the early years of the union, it is difficult to ascertain how often this particular body met and what kinds of decisions it took in the period 1986 to 1989.

xciv. Christian Jaekl, personal interview, 21 March 1997.

xcv. Christian Jaekl, personal interview, 21 March 1997.

xcvi. Béatrid Néri de Lourtioux, personal interview, 13 November 1996. Translation by author: "spontaneously".

xcvii. Béatrid Néri de Lourtioux, personal interview, 13 November 1996. Translation by author: "even more than finances, a question of survival."

xcviii. The members of the Board of Directors in this period included Béatrice Néri de

Lourtioux, Marie-Josée Bourget, Christian Jaekl, Milan Nosko and Micheline Pellerin. Najwa Garzouzi, Corinne Paollilo Lessard and Michelle Morin joined their ranks later on 09 May 1993. For quite some time Béatrid Néri de Lourtioux was both president and treasurer. When she resigned, Christian Jaekl became president, Michelle Morin, secretary and Najwa Garzouzi, treasurer. When Michelle Morin left, Corinne Paollilo Lessard replaced her as secretary.

xcix. Béatrid Néri de Lourtioux, personal interview, 13 November 1996.

c. Christian Jaekl, personal interview, 21 March 1997.

ci. Denis Cooney, personal interview, 20 September 1996 and Christian Jaekl, personal interview, 21 March 1997.

cii. Christian Jaekl, personal interview, 21 March 1997.

ciii. This view has been expressed, with modifications, by a number of individuals including Jean Beauregard, personal interview, 21 August 1996 and M. Bubis, personal interview, 17 January 1997.

civ. See Collective Agreement between the University of Ottawa and The Association of Part-Time Professors of The University of Ottawa, September 1 1994 to August 31, 1996, Appendix D, Paragraphs 2.2 a) and b).

cv. Pierrette Landry recalls that a member of the administration once referred to what language teachers did at the Second Language Institute as "show and tell". Pierrette Landry, personal interview, 08 November 1996.

cvi. Wendy Feldberg, e-mail to author, 14 May 1997.

cvii. The event was held in the Alumni Auditorium in the University Centre (85 University) and Professor Li's lecture was entitled, "How Can I Make a Cup of Tea Faster?: An Introduction to the Critical Path Method of Scheduling".

cviii. Upon personal observation, the turnout at AGMs and Special Membership Meetings has seldom surpassed forty people at best in recent times, yet the union has a membership of approximately one thousand part-time teachers.

cix. The same is often true of the electoral process at the federal and provincial levels of government.

cx. Christian Jaekl, personal interview, 21 March 1997.

cxi. Christian Jaekl, personal interview, 21 March 1997.