

## President's Message

### We are Creating Hope

Respect for democracy and respect for people. These are two of the values listed in the Values and Ethics Code for the Public Sector developed by Treasury Board. It is ironic to think that, for the past eight years, we have been at odds with a government that has been nothing if not consistent in its blatant disregard for these values. It is a textbook example of a double standard – in other words, a case of “do what I say, not what I do.”

“Treating all people with respect, dignity and fairness is

*Continued on page 2 ►*

## In This Issue

- **President's Message.**  
**We are Creating Hope. ....p.1**
- **Our Locals are Mobilizing! ....p.1**
- **Union Members Flock to Place du Portage! .....p.5**
- **With Three Anti-Union Bills, the Harper Government is on a Witch Hunt!.....p.6**
- **Assessing Performance, Foreseeing the Impact. ....p.8**
- **What Should We Expect During the Next Round of Bargaining? .....p.10**
- **Grievances are Symptomatic of a Deteriorating Work Atmosphere. ....p.11**
- **National Executive Committee .....p.12**
- **National Office Staff .....p.12**

## Bill C-4 and CAPE's Mobilization and Outreach Campaign



*May First march on the streets of Ottawa. Picture PIPSC.*

**C**hanges contained in Bill C-4, the budget implementation legislation known as the Economic Action Plan 2013 Act, No. 2 which received royal assent in December 2013, will have a profound impact on CAPE and its members' rights and forms of recourse under the Public Service Staff Relations Act and the Canada Labour Code.

As detailed in the article “Three anti-union bills”, the following major changes were ushered in by C-4:

1. Changes the definition of “danger” under the Canada Labour Code;
2. Modifies the framework of collective bargaining;
3. Gives the employer the exclusive right to designate which employees are essential;
4. Allows the employer to force members who are designated essential to do

*Continued on page 4 ►*

*President's Message, cont'd from p. 1*

fundamental to our relationship with the Canadian public and contributes to a safe and healthy work environment that promotes engagement, openness and transparency.” Such statements of principle contained in the *Values and Ethics Code for the Public Sector* are persistently ignored by the Harper government.

In fact, the present government's attitude toward public service workers is anything but open and transparent. Embracing the right-wing tendency to denigrate government employees, the Conservatives have painted a picture of an overpaid and underutilized public service that, in their view, stands as an obstacle to economic growth. How can a government hope to obtain quality services when it is always complaining that public servants are incompetent, have “lavish” terms and conditions of employment and are constantly abusing sick leave? In the private sector, an employer indulging in this kind of excessive criticism of employees would likely be accused of harassment.

## Weakening the Public Service

In a study entitled *Leading by Example*, the Public Policy Forum had this to say: “Good public service is the result of good political leadership, not the other way around. [...] Renewal of the public service will not be possible without political leadership, including direct Prime

Ministerial attention and support.”

Good political leadership? Looks like we may have a bit of a problem... Adept at “wedge politics,” a quasi-military divide and conquer tactic employed by the Republican Party in the United States, the conservative government has been picking away at the individual and collective rights of workers since 2006. This same government is also known to have a penchant for putting the interests of its supporters ahead of the interests of the electorate. Not content with creating and nurturing an atmosphere of fear and distrust, the Harper team is doing whatever it can to weaken the public service.

The upcoming round of collective bargaining with Treasury Board is expected to be one of the most difficult in decades. Several factors are militating against us. The government wants to balance the budget before the scheduled election in October 2015. To reduce the deficit, it has already taken \$7 billion out of the pockets of public service pensioners. One thing is certain: it has set its sights on sick leave benefits. And the spin it will put on its image of the negotiations will be one of confrontation between “fat-cat” public servants and Canadian taxpayers who were hit hard by the global economic crisis of 2008.

Our greatest source of concern, however, is that collective bargaining will now be governed by a new set of rules. With the passage of Bill C-4, the *Economic Action Plan 2013 Act, No. 2*, the government has taken away our right to arbitration

**The upcoming round of collective bargaining with Treasury Board is expected to be one of the most difficult in decades.**

and changed the rules for essential services and the right to strike. Also, the government can now invoke Canada's fiscal circumstances to justify its offers, and arbitrators will be required to take those circumstances into consideration.

These regressive measures have set us back 50 years, virtually putting our backs to the wall and giving the government an unfair advantage at the bargaining table. Indeed, in these hunger games, Bill C-4 brings new meaning to the words “may the odds be ever in your favour.” Clearly, the government has stacked the deck, and if I were at a blackjack table in a casino, I would be asking the dealer for new cards.

## Creating Hope

Despite this bleak outlook, I refuse to give up. At CAPE, we are in the business of creating hope. We have one major argument that we intend to present as energetically and creatively as we possibly can in the coming months. We will shout it from the rooftops if we have to: Canadians deserve a properly

equipped, independent and professional public service that can help our government succeed in a highly competitive and interdependent global economy. An effective public service is an investment that will pay for itself – indeed, an investment in Canada’s present and future. And we cannot allow the Conservatives to destroy this precious asset.

One recent initiative has renewed my optimism and fueled my combative spirit: for the first time in 50 years, the federal public service unions are joining forces.

CAPE recently reached a solidarity agreement with more than 15 bargaining agents; under that agreement, we will be collaborating closely, combining our efforts and pooling our resources. In the face of repeated attacks from the Harper government, we stand united as never before. This unprecedented step has generated hope and is sending a clear and very real message out to our members: we will apply every ounce of flexibility and inventiveness we possibly can to the defence of their interests.

In closing, let me remind you

that, as a member of CAPE, you have more power at your disposal than you might think. You have the power that comes from being a union member, a taxpayer and an elector. Don’t forget that. You (and we) should bear in mind, at the dawn of this round of bargaining, that it is important to apply vigour and determination, and in particular to have confidence in the undeniable value of your contribution as a member of Canada’s public service. ●

Claude Poirier



*CAPE President, Claude Poirier, interviewed on May 1st. Picture PIPSC.*



### *Bill C-4 campaign..., cont'd from p. 1*

overtime during a labour dispute.

## **Mobilization Action Plan and Outreach Campaign**

In response to the severe impact of C-4, the National Executive Committee (NEC) developed a mobilization action plan to raise awareness and engage the membership. The action plan would ensure that CAPE members are properly informed of the issues at stake, while encouraging members to contribute to and participate in the joint planning, coordination and delivery of mobilization activities against C-4 with other bargaining agents. The high level of solidarity among federal public service bargaining agents entering the current round of bargaining is unprecedented.

In order to implement CAPE's Mobilization Action Plan and Outreach Campaign, the Association assigned a Labour Relations Officer and an Administrative Clerk to this project for a period of three months from January to March 2014.

A key component of CAPE's Mobilization Action Plan was the

implementation of an outreach campaign to provide guidance and support to Locals, strengthen existing Locals and create new ones. A recruitment campaign was also launched to increase membership levels among ECs, TRs and ROs who were registered as "Rands" (non-members). The recruitment campaign ran for two months through January and February 2014; all of the Locals were involved in the campaign, and the results were very positive. Growing the membership base will bolster the effectiveness of CAPE's communication strategy as we reach out to more members.

## **Mobilization and Outreach Campaign Achievements**

The campaign saw the creation of four new Locals: Environment Canada, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Infrastructure Canada and the Canada Border Services Agency.

The Locals at Justice, Industry, and Transport Canada were strengthened and now have full executives.

Twenty-eight CAPE stewards were appointed during the Outreach Campaign. Training was provided for new stewards in March 2014.

The membership recruitment campaign was very successful. Close

to 200 "Rands" were converted to full member status during the two-month recruitment campaign. The fact that "Rands" pay dues does not translate into automatic membership. ECs registered as "Rands" do not have a voice in CAPE affairs and they are not registered in the CAPE database. In order to become a CAPE member, an employee occupying a position in the bargaining unit must register with CAPE.

The Portage Mobilization Committee is a multi-union initiative involving CAPE, PSAC and PIPSC members and representatives. The Committee was created in late 2013, to mobilize and raise the awareness of union members at Portage following the adoption of Bill C-4. The Committee met regularly to discuss and implement mobilization events and promotional information newsletters. CAPE, PSAC and PIPSC members and representatives participated in walk throughs at Portage on Valentine's Day and St. Patrick's Day, and information pamphlets to raise awareness of Bill C-4 were distributed to federal public service employees in the Portage complex during the lunch period. The walk-through events at Portage were well received by public service workers, and many applauded the unions' presence at these events.

CAPE, PSAC and PIPSC organized a major BBQ event at Portage on May 1, 2014, to serve as an information session and mobilize and engage federal public service employees with regard to the serious impact of Bill C-4. More than 3,000 people showed up for the

**C**hanges contained in Bill C-4, will have a profound impact on CAPE members.

BBQ. Following the BBQ, a march to the Prime Minister's Office and Parliament Hill attracted participants representing numerous unions from across Canada.

Multi-union (CAPE, PSAC and PIPSC) information sessions on the negative impact of Bill C-4 were organized during the Outreach Campaign. These sessions were

well attended by the membership at Public Safety Canada, Elections Canada and Library and Archives Canada. ●

## Union Members Flock to Place du Portage!

*The Place du Portage complex in Gatineau has been a focus of feverish activity since the start of 2014. Members of CAPE, PSAC and PIPSC have been working hard to make federal employees working in and around the complex more aware of several hot-button issues, including Bill C-4 and changes to the collective bargaining process, sick leave, and the forthcoming round of bargaining. Gatherings, information tables and marches to generate awareness attracted quite a bit of attention and enabled interested individuals to learn more about these issues.*

The office buildings in the Place du Portage / Les Terrasses de la Chaudière loop harbour one of the largest concentrations of federal public service workers in North America. Each day, thousands of federal government employees provide qualified professional services to Canadians all across the country from these offices.

To mark International Workers' Day on May 1, members of all three unions stepped things up a notch by organizing an inter-union barbecue at lunchtime. The more

than 3,000 people who attended the event learned a great deal about the threats looming over federal public service workers and their terms and conditions of employment. That evening, hundreds of people marched through the streets of Gatineau and Ottawa in support of the Solidarity Against Austerity movement.

We appreciate the efforts of the men and women who perceived the importance of raising their concerns at the Local level. Three of CAPE's Local Leaders deserve

a special vote of thanks: Emmanuelle Tremblay, President of Local 516 (Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada); Alex Butler, President of Local 512 (Public Works and Government Services Canada) and member of the National Executive Committee; and Neil Burron, President of Local 518 (Elections Canada). Thanks as well to the PSAC and PIPSC officials and members who are also playing vital roles in this continuing unprecedented mobilization effort. ●

## With Three Anti-Union Bills, the Harper Government is on a Witch Hunt

*The Harper government has tabled three anti-labour bills in recent years.*

We knew the government was getting serious about checkmating unions when it passed legislation in June 2011 to put an end to rotating strikes at Canada Post. In the spring of 2012, it announced that it would not hesitate to table special back-to-work legislation if Air Canada's machinists went ahead with their threat to go on strike. In February 2014, it did the same thing when Canadian National employees announced that a strike was imminent.

These various pieces of legislation and strong-arm tactics all had one common objective: to weaken the labour movement in this country. Obviously election-minded, these initiatives are part of a flagrant strategy to appeal to the Conservative Party's grassroots voters who believe that unions are evil incarnate and nothing more than an obstacle to economic growth. These oppressive and discriminatory actions by the government have left us very little room to manoeuvre in the new round of collective bargaining that is to begin shortly.

### Bill C-4: a 50-year Setback

Bill C-4, known as the *Economic Action Plan 2013 Act, No. 2* since its received royal assent in December 2013, constitutes a seismic event of major proportions that has shaken our bargaining power down to its very foundations. This legisla-

tion, which seriously undermines the rights of workers, is the biggest step backwards in union rights in half a century. When it brought in this legislation, the government argued that it wanted to level the playing field for both sides! Instead, the employer has given itself every possible advantage.

In an outrageously unilateral move, without any consultation, the government profoundly altered the rules of the bargaining game with the passage of this legislation. The employer/legislator already had the power to pass back-to-work legislation and impose a collective agreement, but Bill C-4 tipped the scales even further in the employer's favour by enabling it to impose collective agreements with fewer benefits.

Here are some of the changes brought about by C-4:

***These strong-arm tactics have one common objective: to weaken the labour movement.***

**Changes in the rules governing arbitration.** The legislation now prevents us from going to arbitration to resolve disputes in the event of an impasse at the bargaining table. Only the federal government will be able to decide whether a collective agreement will be arrived at through arbitration rather than negotiation. From now on, positions to be designated essential for the purposes of a strike or lock-out will no longer be negotiated by the employer and the union. The legislation gives Treasury Board carte blanche to decide what constitutes an essential service. The designation of essential positions will therefore be left entirely up to the employer. As a consequence of this change, there will be a greater risk of work stoppages if negotiations fail.

**Arbitrators have their hands tied.** The legislation restricts the independence and impartiality of members of Public Interest Commissions (PICs) and their ability to take into account the interests of union members. In fact, PICs and arbitrators will now have to give preponderance to two factors that will distort their determinations: (1) the recruitment and retaining of staff; and (2) Canada's fiscal circumstances relative to its stated budgetary policies. Consequently, even if Canada had sufficient rev-

enue to allow for salary increases, a stated policy making it imperative for the government to pay down the debt would be an overriding consideration. To top things off, arbitrators and PICs will have to consider in their determinations whether something constitutes “a prudent use of public funds.”

**Lower wage increases.** The various imposed changes in the collective bargaining process will also affect wage increases, since the government will be able to invoke Canada’s fiscal circumstances to justify the offers it makes. Arbitration boards will be forced to take this into consideration in making their recommendations. During the crisis in 2008–2009, the employer put a 1.5% cap on salary increases. Now it is rumoured that the government is considering even lower increases, notwithstanding the fact the crisis years are now behind us.

**Less safety in the workplace.** By amending the definition of “danger” to include only imminent threats, the legislation will reduce the level of workplace safety for public servants and for members of the Canadian public who receive services in these places of work. Furthermore, it will now be up to the Minister to decide whether a danger truly exists.

The Public Service Alliance of Canada (PSAC) has filed a constitutional challenge to Bill C-4 in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice. The challenge, which focuses on the measures in the legislation pertaining to the right to strike, freedom of

association and essential services, argues that C-4 violates the fundamental rights of federal public service workers guaranteed under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. PSAC is also challenging the restrictions imposed on unions in the choice of dispute resolution mechanisms, namely the conciliation/strike process or binding arbitration.

### **C-525: An Insidious and Potentially Very Powerful Bill**

More restrictive in scope but also very damaging is Bill C-525, which makes it more difficult for workers to form a union in the public service and also makes it easier to have public service unions decertified.

By making the certification of unions more difficult and facilitating the decertification of unions, the government is trying to force unions, by legislative means, to limit the scope of their operations strictly to collective bargaining and defending grievances. In fact, such right-leaning voices as the CD Howe Institute, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business and the Fraser Institute have been campaigning for a long time to convince union members to protest against any use of their dues for political or lobbying purposes; with

## **With Bill C-525, the government is giving new ammunitions to the political right.**

this bill, the government is adding another arrow to their quiver. In the face of growing protests against the use of political action as an advocacy tool, unions may be tempted to confine themselves to their fundamental roles in order to avoid any attempts at decertification. Furthermore, Bill C-525 is bound to have additional insidious and potentially devastating effects, because if unions cannot negotiate freely in the medium term they will be considered useless by their members who might then be inclined to want to do away with them.

In the spring of 2014, Bill C-525 was in its third reading in the House of Commons and its first reading in the Senate.

### **Unreasonable Demands for Transparency**

Focusing on the “transparency” of labour organizations, Bill C-377 would force unions to disclose the salaries of their directors and employees, and provide detailed information concerning their expenditures on political activities. The Harper government has been using the need for transparency as an excuse to justify this legislation, but without bothering to mention that labour organizations are

**Anti-Union Bills...**, cont'd from p. 7

already required to disclose their financial information to their members. In reality, what the government is trying to do here is identify the resources that unions devote to political activities in order to throw a monkey wrench into the lobbying activities of unions.

In May 2013, CAPE told the Senate Standing Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce

that Bill C-377 was pointless because the Association already discloses its financial information to its members and because its lobbying activities are described fully in its reports to the Office of the Commissioner of Lobbying of Canada. Five provincial governments, the Canadian Bar Association and a number of constitutional law experts have all expressed their

opposition to this bill, the unreasonable information disclosure requirements of which contravene the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

There is one piece of good news amid this rather bleak picture: according to CAPE's sources, Bill C-377 stands a good chance of dying on the order paper. ●

## Performance Assessment: What Will be the Impact on Members?

**P**erformance management has existed in the public service for many years. It was not instituted on May 1, 2014. On that date, however, new measures were brought in that apply to the core public administration as a whole. Most public servants will not be affected by these changes, but others may see them as one more irritant in a workplace where stress is becoming an increasingly present fact of life.

In cases where performance is considered satisfactory or better, the employer will perform a documented follow-up that could serve to justify training, for example. According to Treasury Board, however, the following measures could apply in cases where performance is determined to be unsatisfactory:

1. Development and monitoring at regular intervals of an action plan to improve performance; this plan would include performance objectives, expected beha-

viours and specific milestones to be attained;

2. Withholding of the employee's pay increment;
3. In some cases, demotion of the employee;
4. In cases where there is no improvement in performance, termination of employment.

According to the employer, these measures may be taken at any time during the performance assessment cycle if they are war-

ranted by an employee's unsatisfactory performance. Another change brought in by this directive is the fact that no more than 18 months may elapse between the moment an employee is notified that his or her performance is deemed unsatisfactory and the employee's termination of employment, unless a longer period is justified by the circumstances. The previous standard was 24 months.

### Policy Grievances and Individual Grievances

After the new directive was re-



## **Unions are opposed to the use of the performance assessment process to evaluate the behaviour of employees.**

leased, the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada (PIPSC) filed two policy grievances on behalf of 17 public service bargaining agents. These grievances, brought before the Public Service Labour Relations Board, concern the withholding of pay increments and the management and assessment of employees' behaviours and core competencies.

The grievance on pay increments requests that any mention of withholding pay increments for poor performance be removed from the directive. The second grievance requests that the terms "behaviour" and "core competencies" also be eliminated from the directive.

The goal of these grievances is to get the Board to recognize that managers cannot prevent or delay vertical movement on pay scales that allows employees to move to a higher value increment. Since each job classification in the public service comprises a certain number of salary steps, the unions believe that the wording of collective agreements protects public service workers' right to automatically move up to the next step. Ultimately, it is feared that the employer's position favours a subjective application by the employer of the employee's right to move to a higher salary step.

Unions are opposed to the use of the performance assessment process to evaluate the behaviour of employ-

ees. The unions are concerned that public servants will be penalized twice: firstly through disciplinary measures, and secondly in their performance assessments. That is why the grievance on behaviours demands that the words behaviour and core competencies be removed from the directive and its related tools and guides.

PIPSC justifies these grievances by arguing that the directive leads to confusion, does not respect the collective agreements and is not consistent with the jurisprudence in the case of employment terminations. PIPSC is also critical of the fact that managers have received very little training on its application. The Institute also points to a lack of consultation with the unions.

CAPE wishes to remind you that you have certain rights when it comes to performance assessment. A performance assessment must respect the fundamental principles of labour law; specifically, it must be fair and equitable, done in good faith and without discrimination. Normally, it must be based on the departmental directive and comply with the provisions of the applicable collective agreement. CAPE's labour relations officers will file individual grievances on behalf of members who wish to dispute denials of salary increments under this new directive. In fact, the

PIPSC policy grievance does not prevent public service employees from exercising their rights as individuals. If you are denied an increment, contact your labour relations officer immediately.

The jurisprudence also indicates that the employer must establish clear and reasonable standards, communicate those standards to the employees and provide the supervision and training necessary to obtain an acceptable level of performance. The assessment must be in line with the job, and the employer must inform those who do not meet the employer's expectations.

### **Further Reading**

Additional information on performance assessments is available in the FAQs section of the CAPE website. ●

## CAPE's collective bargaining

# What Impact Will Bill C-4 Have on This Round?

*The members of the collective bargaining committees for CAPE's three groups (EC, TR and LoP) met in late 2013 to start discussing the next round of collective bargaining that would be starting in 2014. Since a certain amount of preparation time is required, the teams began considering the issues to be addressed in the forthcoming negotiations and preparing input questionnaires to find out members' expectations and priorities.*

CAPE's collective agreements expire on the following dates: EC group (June 21, 2014); TR group (April 18, 2014); and LoP group (June 15, 2014).

Usually, the negotiating team conducts a membership survey for each bargaining unit to identify the priorities for the next round. Based on those priorities, a set of proposals is developed to outline the group's demands to the employer. When the set of proposals is ready, the bargaining agent sends the employer a notice to bargain in order to indicate that the bargaining agent is ready to start the bargaining process. This notice is issued during the four months leading up to the expiration of the collective agreement. Included in the notice is the choice of a dispute settlement mechanism, as determined by the members of the bargaining unit, in the event that an agreement cannot be reached with the employer at the bargaining table. The choice is between two possible alternatives: arbitration and conciliation.

## A Break with Tradition

In February of this year, Treasury Board decided to break with tradition by issuing a notice to bargain for the EC group at the end of February, and a similar notice

for the TR group in early March. The employer has also adopted legislative tools that will allow it to impose new rules on the collective bargaining process. Under Bill C-4, which received royal assent in December 2013, arbitration will no longer be an option for bargaining units unless 80% of their members are engaged in work which the employer has deemed essential, or unless the employer and the bargaining agent agree in writing to opt for arbitration. Groups that do not meet either of these criteria have no choice but to take the conciliation/strike route.

On April 24, the TR group held its first meeting with the employer during which proposals were exchanged. The EC group, meanwhile, met with the employer on March 20 simply to discuss the bargaining process and its time-frame. The EC group's exchange of proposals should take place around mid-June. In both cases, the employer indicated its rather pressing desire to negotiate an agreement as quickly as possible.

In the case of the Library of Parliament group, however, no mention has been made of bargaining quickly. Like the EC and TR groups, the LoP group began meeting to prepare for the up-

coming round of bargaining. An input questionnaire was sent out to members in February. Based on the responses to the questionnaire, the team members started preparing their set of proposals. Barring any unforeseen circumstances, the exchange of proposals with the employer will take place this fall.

When the TR Collective Bargaining Committee met with the employer, the two sides outlined what their priorities would be during this new round of bargaining. The representatives of the TR group were able to present the priorities identified by members in the input survey, namely performance objectives, performance management, telework, videoconference and teleconference interpretation, and the maintenance of long-standing benefits such as the parliamentary leave system and sick leave. Not surprisingly, Treasury Board stated that its top priority was the sick leave clause and how it would apply following the implementation of a short-term disability plan. Although this plan is not included in collective agreements, its eventual implementation could affect several collective agreement provisions, particularly those pertaining to sick leave. ●

## Grievances are Symptomatic of a Deteriorating Work Atmosphere

**G**iven the current context of budget cuts and austerity measures in the public service, it is not surprising that the work atmosphere continues to deteriorate, that remaining employees in departments and agencies are being forced to assume a larger workload, and that a climate of general dissatisfaction has set in.

As a result, the number of cases requiring the involvement of CAPE's labour relations officers is increasing. Four principal types of complaints make up nearly one third of labour relations officers' caseloads: disciplinary measures, performance assessment, harassment complaints, and accommodation needs.

We can anticipate that some types of files, such as performance assessment and disciplinary measures, will be affected as the statements made by Treasury Board President Tony Clement in recent years come to pass. For example, Mr. Clement wants to increase the dismissal rate in the public service from 0.06% to nearly 10%, which is the rate that exists in the private sector.

While Mr. Clement's idea of a constructive approach is to set "targets," we have yet to hear him explain why it is so important to reach these levels or how this will improve the public service. Don't firing quotas seem to contradict the very essence of a helpful, supportive and collaborative approach to achieving satisfactory performance? Before threatening people with dismissal, which is the ultimate sanction, wouldn't it make sense to look at other options?

### Double the Number of Complaints

Complaints filed by CAPE members concerning performance assessment

literally doubled between 2011 and 2013, and we expect to see an even greater increase in the coming months following the official establishment of a performance assessment system – the government's tool of choice for making cuts to the public service.

At the same time, there has been a proportionate reduction in the number of harassment complaints during this same period. This is really not surprising, since many scientific studies indicate that performance assessments for no constructive purpose can, among other things, foster individualization, put an end to collective mutual assistance and destroy workers' spirit of cooperation. It is therefore easy to understand how putting up with personal harassment might be considered the only option by some workers in such a pressure-cooker atmosphere.

Could the reduction in the number of harassment complaints be ascribable to worker isolation, the loss of solidarity among employees, or even the fear of reprisals? Faced with difficult working conditions marked by harassment, an employee who only wants support could encounter indifference from fellow workers and be saddled with a negative label by workplace colleagues who have now become competitors (Gollac, 2005, p. 212). Such an employee might feel the axe looming – might be afraid that his

or her position is one of those about to be cut – and therefore would rather keep quiet than file complaints about unacceptable behaviour.

Most workers undergoing an assessment try to show themselves in the best possible light (Adréane Lévesque (2009), Crow (1995), De Gaulejac (2005), Gosselin and Murphy (1994), Rhéaume et al. (2000), and St-Onge (2000)): the resulting race to individual excellence is detrimental to group performance and to the productivity of the organization as a whole, which depends on the contributions and creativity of individuals to achieve a common purpose. So who comes out ahead?

The growing concern about performance assessments should not be detrimental to the solidarity of workers and their ability to stand united, particularly with the aid of the tools offered to them by their union. Cases of abuse and harassment are severely underreported as it is, and it would be sad to see them reported even less. ●

1. Gollac, 2005, p. 212.

2. Adréane Lévesque (2009), Crow, (1995), De Gaulejac (2005), Gosselin and Murphy (1994), Rhéaume and al. (2000), and St-Onge (2000).

## Canadian Association of Professional Employees National Executive Committee

Minutes of all CAPE committee meetings can be found on the CAPE website at [www.acep-cape.ca](http://www.acep-cape.ca)

Claude Poirier  
Riley Brockington  
André Picotte

CAPE President  
EC/LoP Vice President  
CAPE TR Vice President

Ben Black  
Jean-Luc Bourdages  
Alexander Butler  
Cindy Creran  
Sandra Gagnon  
Nick Giannakoulis  
Loïc Haméon

EC Director  
LoP Director  
EC Director  
EC Director  
EC Director  
EC Director  
TR Director

Salma Jaroudi  
Ann Kurikshuk-Nemec  
Stephen Mullen

EC Director  
EC Director  
TR Director

Gregory Phillips  
Claude Danik  
Jean Ouellette  
Donna Martin

EC Director  
Executive Director of Policy  
Executive Director of Operations  
Manager of Administration Services

CAPE  
Statistics Canada  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Translation Bureau  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Library of Parliament  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Justice Canada  
Canadian International Development Agency  
Public Health Agency of Canada  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Translation Bureau  
Agriculture & Agri-Food Canada  
Statistics Canada  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Translation Bureau  
Statistics Canada  
CAPE  
CAPE  
CAPE

**CAPE Locals:** The names of the members of your Local Executive may be found on the **CAPE** website under the Local leaders / Stewards tab. Every effort is made to always keep the information on these pages up to date.

## Canadian Association of Professional Employees National Office Staff

Claude Poirier  
Claude Danik  
Jean Ouellette  
Donna Martin  
Hélène Paris  
Lionel Dionne  
Deborah Fiander  
Brigitte Richard  
Pierre Lebel  
Liana Griffin  
Julie Courty  
Sylvie Francoeur  
Sandra Wensink  
Mark Courty  
Sandra Patry  
Claude Archambault  
Anita Bangiricenge  
Isabelle Borré  
Karen Brook  
Isabelle Germain  
Bertrand Myre  
Isabelle Petrin  
Yves Rochon  
Lionel Saurette  
Claude Vézina  
Véronik Guy  
Chantale Lebel  
Patrick O'Reilly  
Malinda Provost  
Sharon Wilson

President  
Executive Director of Policy  
Executive Director of Operations  
Manager of Administration Services  
Research Officer  
Research Officer/Negotiations  
Communications Officer  
Communications Officer Assistant  
New Media and Outreach Officer  
Procurement Coordinator  
Services Coordinator  
Services Coordinator  
Finance Officer  
Finance Officer Assistant  
Finance Officer Assistant  
Labour Relations Officer  
Labour Relations Officer  
Labour Relations Officer  
Labour Relations Officer  
Labour Relations Officer  
Labour Relations Officer  
Labour Relations Officer  
Labour Relations Officer  
Labour Relations Officer  
Administrative Clerk  
Administrative Clerk  
Administrative Clerk  
Administrative Clerk  
Administrative Clerk (Membership)

[cpoirier@acep-cape.ca](mailto:cpoirier@acep-cape.ca)  
[cdanik@acep-cape.ca](mailto:cdanik@acep-cape.ca)  
[jouellette@acep-cape.ca](mailto:jouellette@acep-cape.ca)  
[dmartin@acep-cape.ca](mailto:dmartin@acep-cape.ca)  
[hparis@acep-cape.ca](mailto:hparis@acep-cape.ca)  
[ldionne@acep-cape.ca](mailto:ldionne@acep-cape.ca)  
[dfiander@acep-cape.ca](mailto:dfiander@acep-cape.ca)  
[brichard@acep-cape.ca](mailto:brichard@acep-cape.ca)  
[plebel@acep-cape.ca](mailto:plebel@acep-cape.ca)  
[lgriffin@acep-cape.ca](mailto:lgriffin@acep-cape.ca)  
[jcourty@acep-cape.ca](mailto:jcourty@acep-cape.ca)  
[sfrancoeur@acep-cape.ca](mailto:sfrancoeur@acep-cape.ca)  
Agente des finances  
[mcourty@acep-cape.ca](mailto:mcourty@acep-cape.ca)  
[spatry@acep-cape.ca](mailto:spatry@acep-cape.ca)  
[carchambault@acep-cape.ca](mailto:carchambault@acep-cape.ca)  
[abangiricenge@acep-cape.ca](mailto:abangiricenge@acep-cape.ca)  
[iborre@acep-cape.ca](mailto:iborre@acep-cape.ca)  
[kbrook@acep-cape.ca](mailto:kbrook@acep-cape.ca)  
[igermain@acep-cape.ca](mailto:igermain@acep-cape.ca)  
[bmyre@acep-cape.ca](mailto:bmyre@acep-cape.ca)  
[ipetrin@acep-cape.ca](mailto:ipetrin@acep-cape.ca)  
[yrochon@acep-cape.ca](mailto:yrochon@acep-cape.ca)  
[lsaurette@acep-cape.ca](mailto:lsaurette@acep-cape.ca)  
[cvezina@acep-cape.ca](mailto:cvezina@acep-cape.ca)  
[vguy@acep-cape.ca](mailto:vguy@acep-cape.ca)  
[clebel@acep-cape.ca](mailto:clebel@acep-cape.ca)  
[poreilly@acep-cape.ca](mailto:poreilly@acep-cape.ca)  
[mprovost@acep-cape.ca](mailto:mprovost@acep-cape.ca)  
[swilson@acep-cape.ca](mailto:swilson@acep-cape.ca)

Ce document est également disponible en français. Vous pouvez télécharger une copie du site web de l'ACEP, sous l'onglet « publications ».