

TO: MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

FROM: ALDERMAN VICTOR V. STUSIAK  
COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE TO G.V.R.D.  
LABOUR RELATIONS COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: LABOUR RELATIONS FUNCTION

Council at a regular Council meeting April 26, 1982 considered a request from the G.V.R.D. Labour Relations Committee with reference to a restructuring of the Labour Relations Function and consequent changes to the Letters Patent. Council resolved as follows:

"THAT consistent with the requirements of the letters patent as they exist at the present time, that this Council do now advise the Greater Vancouver Regional District Labour Relations Committee by letter in the appropriate form the one year serving of notice of Council's intention to withdraw from the Greater Vancouver Regional District Labour Relations Function."

Subsequent to and as a result of Council's decision, a series of events has occurred which should be reported to Council for information and consideration.

The City of Vancouver requested a meeting with representatives of Vancouver and Burnaby Council members to discuss the Burnaby action. A meeting was held in the G.V.R.D. offices May 13, 1982 at 11:00 am. Present from Vancouver were Aldermen May Brown, George Puil, Bruce Yorke and from Vancouver staff Ken Dobell, Deputy Manager. Present from Burnaby were Acting Mayor Don Brown, Aldermen Alan Emmott, Victor V. Stusiak and from Burnaby staff, Mr. M. Shelley, Municipal Manager. Acting as Chairman was Alderman Alan Emmott.

The general thrust of the discussion was directed to questions and concerns expressed from the Vancouver delegation about why Burnaby chose to serve notice to opt out of the function and the implications of this action.

It was reported that the Vancouver Council was going to vote on the restructured Department on April 27, 1982, but then chose to put off the decision when apprised of the Burnaby action pending a meeting with Burnaby.

It was also stated that if Burnaby were not going to be a member then Vancouver would have to consider the merit of staying in this original organization, and it was in fact considering dropping out and going it alone.

As the primary discussion centered on why Burnaby chose to opt out and for what specific reasons, the point was made that Burnaby should be specific about its concerns so that those concerns could be discussed and possibly remedied within the existing structure.

A number of concerns of the Burnaby Council were expressed. It was pointed out that the concerns were an appraisal of the feelings of members of Council and had not been specifically stated as Council resolutions.

From this broad discussion came a request from the Vancouver representatives that the Burnaby Council list the specific concerns and submit the stated and approved concerns to the G.V.R.D. Labour Relations Committee for consideration and possible action. The feeling was that this would possibly lead to some actions by the Committee that would satisfy the Burnaby concerns and prompt an action for reconsideration by the Burnaby Council.

It was also suggested by the Vancouver delegation, although not unanimously, that it was critical that Burnaby should reconsider its decision to opt out of the G.V.R.D. Labour Relations Function.

The members from Burnaby agreed that it would be proper for Burnaby to list its specific concerns, that these concerns should be approved by a Council resolution and that the resolution should be forwarded to the G.V.R.D. Labour Relations Committee for its consideration.

Following the meeting with Vancouver, there was a regular meeting of the G.V.R.D. Labour Relations Committee on May 20, 1982.

Mayor J. Loucks was chairman for the meeting, and most of the members of the Labour Relations Committee were present. The Committee was advised of the status of all the Council approvals of the restructuring of the G.V.R.D. Labour Relations Function.

- The following Councils have adopted the L.R.C. Resolution to restructure:

- |                          |                |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| Coquitlam                | Port Moody     |
| New Westminster          | West Vancouver |
| North Vancouver City     | White Rock     |
| North Vancouver District |                |

- Those rejecting were:

Burnaby Delta

- Not yet voted:

Richmond Vancouver

A full discussion took place basically on the impact of the Burnaby notice to withdraw. Most of the discussion held with members of the Vancouver Council was repeated.

Certain representatives of approving Councils indicated that in light of the Burnaby action they would want their Councils to have the opportunity to reconsider their decision. There were also statements expressed about the need for Burnaby to reconsider the action taken to serve notice to opt out. The L.R.C. requested that the list of specific Burnaby concerns be made available as quickly as possible for discussion and possible action.

For the information of Council the following points were given as the perceived concerns of members of Council and could have been the reasons for the majority vote to serve notice to withdraw from the G.V.R.D. Labour Relations Function:

The bargaining process has become too large and too remote.

There is empire building by a body that is remote or beyond Council control.

What opportunity is there within the system to have bargaining with our own local.

Why was the head of the restructured management function confirmed in the position and not taken through a normal competitive selection process for the position.

As Council has been requested to list and approve specific concerns, I am taking the list indicated above and restructuring same as specific concerns and suggested recommendations.

CONCERN # 1

The bargaining process is too large and remote.

There seems to be no provision for meeting with the unions on a regularly scheduled basis to try to resolve most non-money issues as they arise during the term of the contract. This results in a very long list of items to be discussed at contract renegotiation, which tends to contribute to long and confusing negotiation.

Further, there is no regular meeting process where management and union representatives would get to know each other.

RECOMMENDATION # 1

THAT the G.V.R.D. Labour Relations Department make provision within its structure for monthly or regularly scheduled meetings with the unions during the term of the contract to discuss and, if possible, resolve problems that would arise during the term of the agreement.

The union might or might not agree but the structure should be arranged to accommodate this procedure.

CONCERN # 2

What opportunity is there within the system to have bargaining with our own local.

There have been concerns expressed that on some occasion certain conditions could arise that would make it desirable for technical or strategic reasons for member municipalities to bargain directly with their locals.

RECOMMENDATION # 2

THAT the G.V.R.D. Labour Relations Committee make provision within its structure for a participating member of the Function to request of the Labour Relations Committee the choice to bargain directly with its local. The request should be submitted with reasons for the request. The final negotiated agreement should be subject to the approval of the Labour Relations Committee. The request to negotiate separately should not be unreasonably withheld.

CONCERN # 3

Is there empire building and who is controlling the Department?

What provision is there to monitor the management of the Department?

RECOMMENDATION # 3

THAT the G.V.R.D. Labour Relations Function make provision in its structure for a Management Committee to be drawn from the members of the Labour Relations Advisory Committee. (This is the Committee of Municipal and City Managers). The Administrators are technically experienced and proficient with management process and techniques, and are the logical body to supply the Management Committee. They also constitute the one group of civic officials who remain as a constant link from year to year.

This Management Committee would establish the terms of reference and standard procedures for proper monitoring of functional operations of the Department. This Committee should report directly to the Labour Relations Committee and would be the senior functional authority.

CONCERN # 4

The Labour Relations Committee does not have an executive to deal with problems as they arise between regularly scheduled meetings.

RECOMMENDATION # 4

THAT the G.V.R.D. Labour Relations Committee be restructured to provide for a 5-person Executive Committee.

The above are submitted to Council to be defined as the concerns and recommendations as approved by Council.

Therefore, I recommend that Council confirm by Resolution:

1. THAT concerns 1,2,3,& 4 as outlined in this report be approved, and
2. THAT recommendations 1,2,3, & 4 as outlined in this report be approved.
3. THAT a copy go to Vancouver City Council and the G.V.R.D. Labour Relations Department.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Victor V. Stusiak*

Alderman V.V. Stusiak