

Canadian Association of Professional Employees



CAPE ANNUAL REPORT 2004 - 2005

Table of Contents

President's Message	1
Dues, CAPE Members and the Future	3
Collective Bargaining	6
Classification Reform: EC and TR	10
Pension Increase Outrageous!	11
The Superannuation Act and the Employer's Increase of Employee Contributions	14
The Pension Surplus Litigation	16
The New Leviathan	17
Public Service Health Care Plan Negotiations	21
CAPE Labour Relations	22
CAPE Committees	26
CAPE Local Leadership	29
Membership Distribution	33
National Office Staff	35

Change and Challenge

This year has been a year of enormous change and enormous challenges. With a new National Executive Committee taking up its position in January, the first and most pressing issue facing us has been the issue of the financial viability of the organization. Finding ourselves in the unenviable position of assuming control of an organization in immediate need of financial stabilization, your National Executive Committee has applied itself to this task in a dedicated and tireless manner.



Meeting Growing Demands on CAPE's Resources

An expenditure review has been underway in order to ascertain where we can save – and likewise to ascertain what we cannot do without. This introspection has included a detailed analysis of the greater demands on our resources resulting from the Public Service Modernization Act, the Public Service Labour Relations Act, and massive changes to the Public Service Employment Act. Treasury Board's review of the EC Classification Standard, and a surprise review of the TR Classification Standard are further taxing our resources. You will see this as a recurring theme throughout this document.

Maintaining a Viable CAPE

Many of you will know that the CAPE National Executive Committee proposed a substantial increase in dues in the summer of 2005, which was finally rejected by a slim majority of the membership. Faced with the prospect of running out of money to carry out our responsibilities as defined in law and by labour tribunals, we are presenting a much smaller proposed increase this fall, in the hopes that the membership will communicate its confidence in the organization by approving the increase so that we can continue to fulfill the requirements, demands and needs of a highly regarded union – the 3rd largest union in the federal public service.

Who We Are and What We Do

I hope that this annual report, its honest evaluations of what CAPE is, what it is we do, what we need to do more of, and what we cannot do without, helps to cement

in our members the understanding that CAPE is a vital federal public service union, one that has taken great pride in providing the best services and representation to its membership – the best that it is capable of. In order to continue, a dues increase is an absolute necessity.

A National Executive Committee that is Dedicated and Committed

Again, your National Executive has worked a long and arduous year. In my capacity as President, I would like to take this opportunity to thank them, and to encourage all of our membership to demonstrate the kind of dedication to the organization that their peers on the National Executive Committee have demonstrated.

Still Serving

It has not all been a struggle, though. We have accomplished much, and many of these accomplishments and the hard work of your organization are reflected in the following pages. Our visibility within the National Joint Council has increased exponentially. Our activism on the Pensions Issues has been unfailing. We have been visible and prominent representatives on issues that matter to our members – again, pensions, classification reform, formal and informal representation of members, consultations and co-development committees, the continuous cycle of collective bargaining, for our EC's, for our members at the LoP, for our TR's collective agreement and for their Financial Incentive Plan. The list goes on and on.

The Uncertain Future

But again, all of this could be in jeopardy without the financial resources needed to maintain the future of the Association. I ask you to read this Annual Report and digest it. In particular I ask you to read the article entitled “Dues, CAPE Members and the Future”. This is a sober and realistic assessment of how we came to be where we are, and what honestly needs to be done to redeem our future.

Together, we will make the Association stronger.

José Aggrey
CAPE President

←TOC Dues, CAPE Members and the Future

CAPE was founded at a most inopportune time. The federal public service was about to undergo major changes that would strain union resources across the federal public sector. The every day manner in which unions relate to public sector employers was about to expand in ways that were anticipated by no one. The Universal Classification System (UCS) was replaced by a classification review exercise that would involve CAPE's EC members, and apparently now its TR members. Moreover, there were rumours of a review of the classification of CAPE members at the Library of Parliament.

But neither the Social Science Employees Association (SSEA) nor the Canadian Union of Professional and Technical Employees (CUPTE) were in a position to choose the timing of their own demise. There were signs at Treasury Board that small bargaining agents would be forced to merge in order to reduce the employer's cost of labour relations. Thus, the merger became a pre-emptive move to ensure that the respective memberships of CUPTE and SSEA would become partners, because they had been allies for so many years on so many issues. Moreover, there was a feeling that a merger could delay an unavoidable increase in dues for SSEA and a possible increase for CUPTE.

Other options were explored. There were informal talks with the leaders of other unions. But these talks never lead to a recognition of a community of interest. CAPE was "launched", so-to-speak, in 2003, and the entire public service labour relations community has been watching, waiting, wondering whether the CAPE adventure would be successful.

Two Years Old

To some extent, the creation of a third "larger" union from the respected organisations that were SSEA and CUPTE was received as a positive development in the labour relations envi-

ronment. Neither SSEA nor CUPTE had been shy in the past to take a stand where the interests of their members required strong advocacy. Both could be team players with other unions. Both organisations were prepared to stand alone if they felt that it was necessary in order to properly defend the interests of their members. Both organisations had long histories of working with management to approach problems rationally and to seek solutions that could mend a work place torn by conflict. However, both organisations were relatively small and had limited impact. To combine with a merger the forces of both organisations in pursuit of shared objectives through shared approaches was seen as having the potential of a great step forward for the respective memberships, and to some extent a positive development for labour relations in the public service.

But the timing, though it was imposed by events, was not good. In addition to changes in labour relations that would strain the resources of the new organisation, 2003 was not a good year to seek and rent new office space. So the founding organisations, which had anticipated manageable deficits and the probability of a modest increase in dues maybe two or three years after the merger, experienced an increase in costs that could not be predicted.

For an organisation of the size of CAPE working with a small revenue base, the increase in costs was crippling.

Options

Before the end of the calendar year 2005, CAPE's members will decide whether CAPE is the best organisation to represent their interests or whether CAPE will come to an end.

The decision will have long term effects on CAPE members. If members decide that they want CAPE to continue to be their bargaining agent, they will do so by agreeing to an increase in their dues. If the dues increase is rejected, then CAPE will have the option to begin winding down operations. The national office will need to organize for an orderly transfer of case files, bargaining table files, and consultation files (eg: classification review). As the wind down progresses, most everything will slow down or need to be put on hold as CAPE lays off staff.

To whom the files are transferred will depend on the choices of each bargaining unit. Each bargaining unit will need to choose either to join another union, or to set up their own union. Of course, joining another union will depend on whether the other union is prepared to accept a CAPE bargaining unit. CAPE members can expect to pay significantly more dues than the increase proposed by CAPE's National Executive Committee in the larger unions. Smaller unions will be reluctant to be inundated by a large number of members that would potentially be in a position to take control of their organisation.

Setting up a new union may sound more strategic and less expensive. However, all bargaining units will share the cost of CAPE's liabilities, which means that it should be ex-

pected that any decision to set up a new union will need to factor into the dues calculation the costs of severing contracts including the lease of CAPE's offices which runs for another eight years. Moreover, the dues increases that were avoided for a short period of time by merging will still be needed to meet the growing costs of providing union services. The hard reality is that costs have gone up. Any new union will need to address the issue.

Service

If members opt to wind down CAPE's operations, the matter of service to the members will need to be addressed. During the wind down, CAPE will continue to be responsible for carrying out its statutory duties. There are no provisions in the *Public Service Labour Relations Act* that allow a public service union to be negligent because its members decide to put an end to the organisation. It will be important to transfer case files quickly in order to ensure that the interests of each member is protected. Even the most efficient transfer process will cause delays. Collective bargaining will be delayed, as experienced by the CX (Correctional Services) community which is still at the bargaining table after three years of negotiations (the CX group broke away from the Public Service Alliance of Canada three years ago to join the CSN).

There is no guarantee that staff, familiar with cases and with the bargaining interests of the membership, will find their way to the same organizations as each bargaining unit. Existing unions have staff and they would have no obligation to hire CAPE staff in order to deal with files coming from CAPE. Nor could a new union formed by one of CAPE's bargaining units be able to guarantee career security. It is likely that CAPE staff would move to

The dues increase will raise your dues to a level that is still significantly lower than all other public service unions with the exception of one.

other employment opportunities; other unions and even employer representatives have repeatedly made offers to CAPE's professional staff over the past two years. Thus, there may be a steep learning curve for some unsuspecting union staff somewhere, as well as a very real possibility that a few members and bargaining issues will fall through the cracks. It will probably be necessary for the organisation to levy additional monies from the membership in order to ensure that resources are available during the winding down period as staff begin to leave.

Definitely, the overall cost to the individual member will be significantly greater to move to another union than to approve the proposed increase in dues at CAPE. Overall, this should be the case for a bargaining unit that would set up its own union, if liabilities, the cost of setting up a new organisation and the cost of addressing the growing work of public service unions are addressed responsibly. It is a fantasy to imagine that it is possible to recreate an SSEA or a CUPTE as the world has changed since 2002. Without diminishing the value of each of CAPE's founding organisations, it is important to realize that the separate resources of an SSEA and of a CUPTE would fall far short of addressing the realities of the new labour relations environment.

Moreover, beyond the dollar concerns, dismantling CAPE would also mean dismantling the best team of labour relations professionals in the public service, a team that includes Claude Archambault, Isabelle Borré, Karen Brook, Deborah Fiander, Liana Griffin,

Bertand Myre, Catherine O'Brien, Jean Ouellette, Hélène Paris, Sylvie Richard and Claude Vézina. Its strength is in the combination of contributions brought by each staff member. As a collective it serves the membership with invaluable experience and knowledge and abilities.

Keeping CAPE

Keeping it all together does come at a cost. It always has. Maybe that's why the word "union" has always had a deep significance.

Now that the costs have risen, keeping CAPE together means an increase in dues.

The dues increase proposed by CAPE's National Executive Committee was determined by an exhaustive budgetary process whereby each line item was reviewed and challenged. Some services will change. Resources will be re-aligned to address new priorities including the process of negotiating an entirely new set of pay scales for the EC group further to conversion to a new standard, and reviewing the issue of translation done by public service employees who are not TRs.

The dues increase will raise your dues to a level that is still significantly lower than all other public service unions with the exception of one. If you believe that it is the wisest course of action for you to support CAPE so that it can continue to work on your behalf over the next few years, and if you believe that CAPE is the best organisation to represent your interests, tell us. The way to tell us now is to vote, and to vote "yes".

←TOC Collective Bargaining

Collective bargaining has become a continuous process for CAPE, where different stages are increasingly overlapping. You may remember that negotiations of the EC collective agreement began in 2003, broke down in April 2004, and were resolved at mediation and arbitration in October 2004. During this same period, CAPE also negotiated a TR collective agreement and the 2004-2005 edition of the TR Financial Incentive Plan (FIP).

CAPE Negotiation Landscape

While the arbitrator was considering CAPE's presentation on behalf of EC members in early October, the Association was preparing to again negotiate a new TR agreement and a new version of the FIP, and a new collective agreement for our members at the Library of Parliament. A new FIP was signed at the end of March 2005. Bargaining of the TR agreement began in June, with 15 full days of negotiations set aside in the Fall. Bargaining for the Library of Parliament collective agreement began in September, with several more dates set aside.

In September 2005 CAPE again began preparation for the next round of EC (ES and SI) bargaining, as well as negotiation of the FIP for 2006-2007. Thus, in the Fall of 2005 we are involved at the table or are preparing for four separate negotiations.

The EC Collective Agreement

The coming round of bargaining will be one of the most important rounds ever for EC employees in the federal public service. CAPE intends to bring forth a number of issues that have become irritants for our EC members. Most importantly, the next round is the classification review round. The pay scales will be melted down and reshaped in order to fit the new EC classification standard that is almost completed.

Proposals will probably be exchanged some time in June 2006, with bargaining starting in

the Fall. If all goes well at the table, the parties may reach an agreement some time in the Spring of 2007.

Our previous experience at the table for the EC group was fraught with frustration. The EC bargaining committee had sent the negotiating team on an ambitious adventure with over a hundred proposals. Some were addressed at the bargaining table. However, when CAPE broke away from the table after about nine months there were many outstanding issues.

The bargaining team selected what it judged were the most important matters for referral to arbitration. CAPE was shocked that Treasury Board could not agree on an arbitrator: among the three names suggested by CAPE was the name of an arbitrator that Treasury Board had recently accepted for an impasse at another bargaining table. In the end, we were assigned Fred Norman by the Public Service Staff Relations Board.

Circumstances over which no one had control worked against CAPE. About ten days before we appeared before the arbitrator, a less than generous arbitral award for another group was released, and undermined our pay arguments. Moreover, Fred Norman was the conciliator for Table 1 of the Alliance, where another impasse had developed. Norman was about to release his conciliation report for Table 1 of the Alliance the day that he was to hear our case. Because conciliation reports are written to assist the parties to negotiate further, they usually

When in doubt, ask the members.

leave some room for bargaining. Therefore, they are not particularly generous, which was the case for Norman's Table 1 report. And, it became apparent that Norman was not about to reach different conclusions in his arbitral award.

Just prior to the hearing, Norman encouraged the Treasury Board and CAPE to work on outstanding issues through mediation. Two days of mediation resulted in breaking down Treasury Board's reluctance to make concessions. In fact, the parties may have made more progress during these two days than during the previous nine months of negotiation at the bargaining table. Several important issues were resolved. Thereafter, our case was presented by legal counsel, who used two expert economists to outline the economic trends and environment. The decision was released about two weeks later by Norman.

The arbitral award allowed for one breakthrough: the EC group was successful in getting wording that would allow parental leave to be taken in more than one period. This had been a long standing irritant for EC members, as the *Employment Act* allows for such flexibility, whereas collective agreements in the federal public sector did not. Subsequently, other unions would eventually get the benefit at their respective tables.

CAPE was frustrated again on the issue of pay. The difference in wage adjustment for the average EC member when compared to the trend at Treasury Board bargaining tables was a little more than \$90 in the third year of the agreement. On the positive side, CAPE was

successful in getting Treasury Board to agree to returning to the table earlier than for most other groups with a contract duration of three years rather than four. This was particularly important for our EC members in light of the anticipated completion of the EC standard. Had we agreed to a four-year contract, it would have taken an extra year before we would have the new standard in effect – an extra year before the conversion to the new standard and pay scales.

Financial Incentive Plan 2005-2006

Negotiation of the Financial Incentive Plan for the TR group in 2005 was colored by the previous round of bargaining. In 2004, the Translation Bureau, like everyone else at Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC), was concerned about contracts and costs. Consequently, the employer came to the table with what was to the CAPE negotiating team an unacceptable set of proposals. The team was faced with a dilemma: the employer's proposals were unacceptable, yet, TR members had been consulted prior to bargaining, and a clear majority of members had said that they wanted a FIP in 2005-2006.

When in doubt, ask the members. So the team decided to go back to the TR members with the employer's proposal in order to get direction. The consultation was organized as a vote, though it did not have the character of a ratification vote as per our Constitution. It should be noted that the FIP contract is very different from a collective agreement. It is a contract that applies to a TR member only if he or she volunteers to participate. Thus, it

does not require a certification vote after bargaining because a member who doesn't like it can simply not participate, whereas with a collective agreement all of the members covered by a ratified agreement are obligated to accept it.

The employer was surprised, even taken aback, by the consultation. So, while the vote was being organized, the employer called CAPE back to the negotiating table and substantially improved its offer. The result was a new FIP, less generous than the previous version but significantly more generous than what the employer had left on the table for CAPE to accept. The negotiating team found the offer acceptable and exercised its authority accordingly.

The agreement included, similar to previous agreements, a production ratio in the formula to calculate each participating member's incentive monies. Unfortunately, as the new FIP was coming into force the Bureau instituted a new production objective ratio for translation, which was exactly the same as the ratio in the FIP formula. In addition to creating a considerable amount of confusion over the purpose of the FIP and of the production objective, this new objective was significantly higher than the previous objective. Suffice it to say that CAPE, the Translation Bureau Local in particular, spent a considerable amount of energy and time addressing the issue. By the time the parties were back at the FIP negotiating table, the employer was prepared to consider giving credence to the positions we had put forth during consultations. A new FIP formula based on hours rather than number of words was proposed and the parties agreed to the details after a fair amount of difficult bargaining.

CAPE is preparing for another round of FIP bargaining. However, bargaining may not

take place, as it depends on whether the TR community gives CAPE the mandate to negotiate prior to negotiations. Members will be consulted this Fall. Moreover, there is a resolution put before the members this Fall which, if accepted, could have the effect of killing the plan. Stay tuned.

TR Collective Agreement

The previous round of bargaining resulted not only in a wage adjustment that was better than the trend in the public service, but also in the resolution of a pay equity complaint that had been outstanding for several years. Conditions are different this time around. The bargaining committee does not expect the kind of pay increases featured in the 2004-2005 collective agreement.

TR members suggested several improvements to their collective agreement, all of which have been reviewed by the committee. The package of proposals that was finally put together by the committee is fairly ambitious and could result in a lengthy round of bargaining.

AN & RA Collective Agreement

Preparation of CAPE's bargaining proposals for its members at the Library of Parliament was delayed by the untimely absence of its negotiator who was on sick leave for the entire month of April. The delay made it impossible for the committee to complete its work prior to the Summer break, resulting in a delay to the Fall of the first meeting at the table. As usual, the response rate to the bargaining input questionnaire was quite high and provided the committee with a clear idea of the membership's priorities. Proposals were prepared accordingly.

At the time of writing this article, the dates for bargaining had yet to be finalized. CAPE suggested 19 separate dates to meet with the em-

ployer at the bargaining table. If the employer's team is available for these dates, we should be able to complete bargaining before the Christmas break.

The challenge of negotiating with a smaller employer is to reconcile the employer's resistance to setting a trend with the legitimate needs of the membership. In the previous round, SSEA *cum* CAPE and management at the Library of Parliament had worked out a

constructive relationship at the table. As a result, the issues that each party brought to the table and identified as priorities were addressed. The solutions were often compromises, but compromises that demonstrated good will and imagination. The current round will require a similar spirit of compromise as there are several issues that have been outstanding for some time and that are identified as recurring problems by CAPE members at the Library.

The challenge of negotiating with a smaller employer is to reconcile the employer's resistance to setting a trend with the legitimate needs of the membership.

←TOC Classification Reform: EC and TR

Work on the new EC Classification Standard continues, on schedule. The Public Service Human Resources Management Agency (PSHRMA) and a selection of departments will be testing the new EC standard this Fall in order to ensure that its application to work descriptions allows for consistent evaluations. This means that some departments have already begun the process of transcribing work descriptions into the format that has been designed for the new standard.

At the time of writing this article, PSHRMA has not determined the rating scales for the eight elements of the standard. However, the rating scales or point rating system will need to be finalized shortly, with a final decision on the number of levels for the EC group. Then, information on all ES and SI positions will be entered into a database for the purposes of collective bargaining. Thus, the next round of bargaining will be of particular importance for CAPE's ES and SI members as the entire pay scale structure in the EC collective agreement will be changed as a result of the new classification schema.

Bargaining begins in the early Summer of 2006, and can be expected to last until late Winter 2007 or early Spring 2007. If there is agreement at the table, the new rates could be effective at that time, and conversion to the new standard would proceed. Conversion rules regarding pay movement will be subject to negotiations. CAPE will endeavour to include salary protection in the settlement for members who will be converted to a lower rate of pay.

Every conversion results in some people landing on a step where the salary is greater than their previous salary, and some people landing on a step where the salary is lower. In most cases, those who land on a step with a lower rate of pay than their previous rate of pay will want to contest the classification. In other words, con-

version could mean grievances - *many* grievances. The rule of thumb is to plan for 15% of the affected members to grieve. The bargaining table may allow the parties to reduce the number of grievances. The use of generic work descriptions may also reduce the numbers. However, in the case of our EC community, CAPE should plan for a number of grievances that will be three or four times the normal case load for CAPE's seven Labour Relations Officers. Moreover, these grievances will need to be addressed at the same time as CAPE continues to address its normal case load. Current resources cannot meet the demands of conversion.

In addition, CAPE has recently been informed that PSHRMA has delegated its responsibility to review and reform the TR classification standard to the Translation Bureau. At the time of writing this article, the Association was preparing to approach the Bureau in order to determine how it would consult with CAPE on the matter of changes to the standard. It is unlikely that the Bureau will have completed its review and designed a new standard before the end of the current round of bargaining. Therefore, conversion to a new standard would not occur until the negotiated agreement expires, or the employer asks and the union agrees to re-open the collective agreement to negotiate pay scales for the new standard.

←TOC Pension Increase Outrageous

NJC Bargaining Agent Side members expressed their outrage at the unilateral decision by the employer to increase employee pension contributions by 0.3% per year over the next 8 years, starting in January 2006. When these changes were announced, they were immediately and vociferously denounced.

“These changes are particularly insulting, given the timing of the announcement. We know that the government currently has an approximately \$7 Billion dollar pension surplus, **over and above the \$30 billion** that they confiscated from the employees. That this matter is before the courts, and that the hearings are scheduled to begin in November, makes this increase outrageous,” said CAPE President José Aggrey. *“What’s more, the Pension advisory committee has already recommended a **one time increase of 0.2%**. We strongly denounce this unilateral action, and find it entirely unacceptable.”*

We underscore the fact that we are pursuing the matter of the pension surplus, in November. In

the interim, Bargaining Agents will be bringing pressure to bear, and developing strategies with the goal of getting the employer to reverse this decision, and if necessary, implementing a more reasonable increase, more along the lines of the 0.2% increase recommended by the Pension Advisory Committee.

The increased pension contributions will make no changes in the pensions payable before age 65. They make only minor increases in the pensions payable after age 65. When fully implemented in 2013, the pension increases after age 65 for each year of service for employees at typical salary levels are shown in Table 1 below.

Summary of 2005 changes in pension after age 65 for each year of service

Salary	Pension in		Increase	
	2005	2013	\$	%
\$40,000	\$520.00	\$550.00	\$30.00	5.77%
\$50,000	\$712.30	\$743.13	\$30.83	4.33%
\$60,000	\$912.30	\$943.13	\$30.83	3.38%

Table 1

Summary of 2005 changes in employee contributions

The changes make significant increases in employee contributions over the contributions presently required. When fully implemented in 2013, the contribution increases for employees at typical salary levels are shown in Table 2 (right).

Salary	Contributions in		Increase	
	2005	2013	\$	%
\$40,000	\$1,600.00	\$2,560.00	\$960.00	60.00%
\$50,000	\$2,311.50	\$3,378.00	\$1,066.50	46.14%
\$60,000	\$3,061.50	\$4,218.00	\$1,156.50	37.78%

Table 2

Employee required contributions

A member earning a salary of \$40,000 will be contributing 60% more by 2013. Their pension before age 65 will be unchanged. Their pension after age 65 will be increased by 6%.

A member earning a salary of \$50,000 will be contributing 46% more by 2013. Their pension before age 65 will be unchanged. Their pension after age 65 will be increased by 4%.

A member earning a salary of \$60,000 will be contributing 38% more by 2013. Their pension before age 65 will be unchanged. Their pension after age 65 will be increased by 3%.

The “Employee required contributions” table, and the “Annual pension for each year of service” table show how the increases in contributions and pensions after age 65 will be implemented over the period 2006 to 2013.

Annual Salary	Year	Employee required contributions				
		Before change in 2005	After change in 2005	Increase \$	%	
\$40,000	2005	\$1,600.00	\$1,600.00	\$0.00	0.00%	
	2006	\$1,600.00	\$1,720.00	\$120.00	7.50%	
	2007	\$1,600.00	\$1,840.00	\$240.00	15.00%	
	2008	\$1,600.00	\$1,960.00	\$360.00	22.50%	
	2009	\$1,600.00	\$2,080.00	\$480.00	30.00%	
	2010	\$1,600.00	\$2,200.00	\$600.00	37.50%	
	2011	\$1,600.00	\$2,320.00	\$720.00	45.00%	
	2012	\$1,600.00	\$2,440.00	\$840.00	52.50%	
	2013	\$1,600.00	\$2,560.00	\$960.00	60.00%	
	\$50,000	2005	\$2,311.50	\$2,311.50	\$0.00	0.00%
		2006	\$2,311.50	\$2,461.50	\$150.00	6.49%
		2007	\$2,311.50	\$2,611.50	\$300.00	12.98%
		2008	\$2,311.50	\$2,761.50	\$450.00	19.47%
2009		\$2,311.50	\$2,884.80	\$573.30	24.80%	
2010		\$2,311.50	\$3,008.10	\$696.60	30.14%	
2011		\$2,311.50	\$3,131.40	\$819.90	35.47%	
2012		\$2,311.50	\$3,254.70	\$943.20	40.80%	
2013		\$2,311.50	\$3,378.00	\$1,066.50	46.14%	
\$60,000		2005	\$3,061.50	\$3,061.50	\$0.00	0.00%
		2006	\$3,061.50	\$3,241.50	\$180.00	5.88%
		2007	\$3,061.50	\$3,421.50	\$360.00	11.76%
		2008	\$3,061.50	\$3,601.50	\$540.00	17.64%
	2009	\$3,061.50	\$3,724.80	\$663.30	21.67%	
	2010	\$3,061.50	\$3,848.10	\$786.60	25.69%	
	2011	\$3,061.50	\$3,971.40	\$909.90	29.72%	
	2012	\$3,061.50	\$4,094.70	\$1,033.20	33.75%	
	2013	\$3,061.50	\$4,218.00	\$1,156.50	37.78%	

Table 3

Annual pension for each year of service

Annual Salary	Annual pension for each year of service									
	Before change in 2005			After change in 2005		Increase		%		
	pre 65	post 65		pre 65	post 65	\$		pre 65	post 65	
\$40,000	\$800.00	\$520.00	2006	\$800.00	\$520.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%	0.00%	
			2007	\$800.00	\$520.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%	0.00%	
				2008	\$800.00	\$526.00	\$0.00	\$6.00	0.00%	1.15%
				2009	\$800.00	\$532.00	\$0.00	\$12.00	0.00%	2.31%
				2010	\$800.00	\$538.00	\$0.00	\$18.00	0.00%	3.46%
				2011	\$800.00	\$544.00	\$0.00	\$24.00	0.00%	4.62%
				2012	\$800.00	\$550.00	\$0.00	\$30.00	0.00%	5.77%
				2013	\$800.00	\$550.00	\$0.00	\$30.00	0.00%	5.77%
\$50,000	\$1,000.00	\$712.30	2006	\$1,000.00	\$712.30	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%	0.00%	
			2007	\$1,000.00	\$712.30	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%	0.00%	
				2008	\$1,000.00	\$718.47	\$0.00	\$6.16	0.00%	0.87%
				2009	\$1,000.00	\$724.63	\$0.00	\$12.33	0.00%	1.73%
				2010	\$1,000.00	\$730.80	\$0.00	\$18.50	0.00%	2.60%
				2011	\$1,000.00	\$736.96	\$0.00	\$24.66	0.00%	3.46%
				2012	\$1,000.00	\$743.13	\$0.00	\$30.83	0.00%	4.33%
				2013	\$1,000.00	\$743.13	\$0.00	\$30.83	0.00%	4.33%
\$60,000	\$1,200.00	\$912.30	2006	\$1,200.00	\$912.30	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%	0.00%	
			2007	\$1,200.00	\$912.30	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%	0.00%	
				2008	\$1,200.00	\$918.47	\$0.00	\$6.16	0.00%	0.68%
				2009	\$1,200.00	\$924.63	\$0.00	\$12.33	0.00%	1.35%
				2010	\$1,200.00	\$930.80	\$0.00	\$18.50	0.00%	2.03%
				2011	\$1,200.00	\$936.96	\$0.00	\$24.66	0.00%	2.70%
				2012	\$1,200.00	\$943.13	\$0.00	\$30.83	0.00%	3.38%
				2013	\$1,200.00	\$943.13	\$0.00	\$30.83	0.00%	3.38%

Table 4

←TOC The Superannuation Act and the Employer's Increase of Employee Contributions

Many members have communicated with CAPE in order to share with us their opposition to the proposed increases.

Some members also had questions regarding how the federal pension plan works. Basic information regarding the plan is available on the Internet, at the Treasury Board Website at www.tbs-sct.gc.ca. In addition, the President of the Treasury Board is responsible for producing an Annual Report regarding the pension plan. The last report available, for the year 2003, is also available on the internet, at www.tsb-sct.gc.ca/report/APSSA/2003/pspp-rrfp_fr.asp.

Some members have asked questions and commented on the necessity of a contributions increase and the integration of the Public Service Superannuation Plan with the Canada Pension Plan and the Quebec Pension Plan. What follows are some explanations that may be useful:

Increase in Contributions

Regarding the question of an increase in contributions, many members wanted to know why Treasury Board has decided at this point in time to increase the contributions of participants in the superannuation plan. In their announcement regarding the increase, the

Treasury Board indicated that they want to ensure that *“the costs of public sector pensions plans are shared in a balanced way between the plan members and the Government, and ultimately, the Canadian taxpayer.”*

The Public Service Superannuation Act dictates that the employer (the government of Canada) and the employees of the federal public service must make contributions to a pension fund, in order to finance future pensions benefits. Under the Public Service Pension Plan, the Treasury Board decision is based on the President who may establish the amount of contributions made by employees, every year. There are only two limiting factors that are imposed:

- 1 – no single rate increase will exceed 0.4% (four-tenths of one per cent) of salary, and
- 2- Rates will not increase past the point where plan members are paying 40 percent of the current service costs of their pension plan.

Many members wanted to know why Treasury Board has decided at this point in time to increase the contributions of participants in the superannuation plan.

Thus, the government may increase the rate of contributions of employees by a maximum of 0.4% (four tenths of a percent) of employee's salary per year, as long as the contribution of the employee does not surpass 40 percent of the current service costs of their pension plan. Employees in the federal public service are currently paying less than 40% of the service costs of the pension plan. The Treasury Board may then legally increase employee contributions, and the announcement of a 0.3% increase per year conforms to the Public Service Superannuation Act as long as the employees' contributions are less than 40% of the service costs of the plan.

How the Public Service Plan Relates to the Canada and Quebec Pension Plans

According to the Treasury Board Secretariat:

"The public service pension plan is integrated with the Canada and Quebec pension plans (CPP/QPP). Integration affects both contributions and benefits. This means, firstly, that you contribute to your public service plan at a reduced rate on your salary up to the maximum covered by CPP/QPP. Secondly, it means that your pension under the public service plan will also be reduced by a standard formula when you become eligible to draw CPP/QPP benefits at age 65 or when you begin to draw CPP/QPP disability benefits at any age."

For further information in this regard please refer to Treasury Board's Document entitled "Your Pension Plan", which can be found at http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pubs_pol/hrpubs/Pensions/ypp1_e.asp.

For further information and details on the impact of the proposed contributions increase, please visit CAPE's Website at www.acep-cape.ca

←TOC The Pension Surplus Litigation

At long last, it looks like the case challenging the federal government's confiscation of the surplus in the federal public service, Canadian Forces and RCMP Superannuation Plans is in the home stretch.

Following passage of the government's pension legislation in 1999 (Bill C-78), which allowed the government to appropriate the \$30 billion pension surplus, the Association joined with PIPSC, PSAC, The Armed Forces Pensioners'/Annuitants' Association of Canada and the RCMP Veterans to contest the new legislation. This action claims ownership of the pension surplus for federal government employees.

The litigation in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice regarding the surplus in the Public Service Superannuation Plan, the Canadian Forces Superannuation Plan and the RCMP Superannuation Plan is scheduled to go to trial commencing November 14, 2005, and the trial is expected to last two to three weeks. Because of the large volume of evidence that will be submitted, we can expect a decision by May of 2006. However, we expect that whoever loses will file an appeal following this decision.

Some of the steps necessary to get the case ready for trial have taken place over the last few months. The remaining steps have been scheduled to take place prior to November 14th.

The most important recent developments have been the examinations for discovery of the plaintiffs in all three actions, which took place

in December 2004 and a case management conference on January 10, 2005.

In the January 10th case management conference, all of the parties were able to agree on a strict time table for the various matters that need to be dealt with prior to trial. This includes dates for finalizing an Agreed Statement of Facts and an Agreed Book of Documents. This is important because, to the extent that the parties can agree on certain facts and documents, this can substantially shorten the length of the trial.

The schedule also provided for expert reports to be completed by the plaintiffs by June 30, 2005 and for the government lawyers to give the plaintiffs any expert reports they intend to rely on by September 30, 2005. It is expected that most of the witnesses at trial will be experts and therefore the completion of the expert reports by both sides will be a significant step in preparing for trial.

Another key event in the preparation for trial was a Trial Management Conference with the judge who will be hearing the case, which was scheduled to take place on September 23, 2005. At that point in time, the parties were expected to have completed a great deal of the preparation work for trial.

Because of the large volume of evidence that will be submitted, we can expect a decision by May of 2006.

←TOC The New Leviathan

In the wake of union reaction to program reviews in the 1990's and to pruning of the public service that resulted in the creation of the Canadian Customs and Revenue Agency (now the Canadian Revenue Agency), the Canadian Food Inspection Agency and other similar entities, Treasury Board Secretariate (TBS) realized at the end of the decade that labour relations in the public service were, at best, strained. Prodded by public service bargaining agents and by various third party observers including politicians, TBS initiated a review which was assigned to an advisory committee, the Advisory Committee on Labour Management Relations in the Federal Public Service (Fryer committee).

The committee consulted extensively, including union officials and employer representatives, and produced an impressive report released in June 2001. The recommendations were viewed by most observers as suggesting a set of changes that would balance the interests of the principals involved, giving precedence to an improved labour climate within the public service ultimately to allow for better service to Canadians.

The underlying conclusion of the report's review was a two-pronged observation that power was seriously skewed in favour of the employer and that bargaining agents had failed to engage their members in a relationship with an employer that has that special power to pass laws. Bargaining agents had reservations about the report, but were prepared to accept the bad with the good as long as the employer was prepared to accept the whole package as well.

However, the report proved too risky for the employer as it recommended a shift, minor as it was, in the balance of power. The employer's response was to preempt the release of the report by creating a task force, the Task Force on Modernizing Human Resources Management in the Public Service (headed by Ranald

Quail). As a result, the issue of labour relations was subsumed under the rationale of human resources management. The concern thereafter was to be the improvement or "modernization" of HR management. In short, the question that was asked changed, though the problems that had been the source of the reflective process were still the same. In other words, the wrong question was being asked.

The task force set out to consult various parties but under an unusually suffocating cloak of confidentiality that included the practice of telling unions who they could send to represent them at meetings. The task force appeared to feel compelled to placate a group of anti-union Deputy Ministers simply to make some headway on matters of labour relations. The members of the task force, including Ranald Quail and Monique Boudrias, were sympathetic to union concerns. But the process was not amenable, nor was the existing balance between anti-union Deputy Ministers and DMs with a more modern management perspective, which was skewed in favour of the anti-union DMs. In the end, the task force made recommendations that were transformed into 300 pages called Bill C-25, the proposed *Public Service Modernization Act*.

The new statutes have ushered in a period where the employer has been assigned the role of managing and directing change, while bargaining agents have been relegated to a reactive role of trying to keep up with the changes forced by the employer.

A short six weeks after first reading of the bill in the House of Commons, in late March 2003, SSEA, one of CAPE's founding organizations, and other bargaining agents were appearing before the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates to propose amendments. While the committee, chaired by Reg Alcock (currently the Minister responsible for Treasury Board) appeared to be receptive to representations made before it, in the end only cosmetic changes were made and serious issues were simply ignored.

When the bill moved to the Senate, so did bargaining agents. SSEA and other unions appeared before the Senate Standing Committee on National Finance on September 2, 2003. SSEA's argument regarding the importance of protecting the primacy of relative merit in the staffing process was picked up by one Senator. But the bill passed without amendments. Royal assent was delayed for reasons unknown. Then, it was official in late November: the *Public Service Modernization Act* was proclaimed.

Transition to the new order

In the wake of years of labour unrest in the public service, the answer was the *Public Service Modernization Act* (PSMA). But it was not an answer to the question of labour relations. It was an answer to the question of human resources management, a question posed from a perspective seriously affected by indifference to public service bargaining agents at best, or at worst by anti-union sentiment.

The *Public Service Modernization Act* received royal assent in 2003. The Act made substantial changes to the *Public Service Employment Act* (PSEA) and to the *Financial Administration Act*, transformed the *Public Service Staff Relations Act* into a very different *Public Service Labour Relations Act* (PSLRA), and replaced the *Canadian Centre for Management Development Act* with the new *Canada School of Public Service Act*.

Changes were scheduled in a way that would accommodate the employer's resources and ability to manage the changes. The new PSLRA came into effect on April 1, 2005. And the new PSEA will come into effect in December 2005. For the most part, these far-reaching and numerous changes to labour relations and conditions of employment in the federal public service have yet to make themselves felt in the work place (see "The Public Service Modernization Act - Beyond Consultation and Co-development" in *Professional Dialogue*, April 2004). However, they have already significantly changed the landscape for bargaining agents.

In fact, the labour relations environment has been destabilized to an extent that bargaining agents have been placed in a situation where, at the same time as they endeavour to provide union services to their members, they are challenged with a running review of their role in the work place and concomitantly of their relationship to the employer. The new statutes have ushered in a period where the employer has been assigned the role of managing and di-

recting change, while bargaining agents have been relegated to a reactive role of trying to keep up with the changes forced by the employer. The irony of all of this is that it is this very dependent type of relationship which invariably leads to frustration and confrontation, that observers five years ago argued must be changed.

Unfortunately, the instability being experienced by most if not all public service unions has been exacerbated by the untimely departure from the front lines of several union leaders, including CAPE's own Bill Krause and Luc Pomerleau. Furthermore, many experienced union staff officers have moved to new careers made possible by the expanded role of the Public Service Labour Relations Board and by the creation of a new staffing tribunal. Thus, a large chunk of the union side representation that experienced the battles of the nineties and that had a well articulated position on the problems that underlie labour relations in the federal public service are no longer available to fight the good fight.

Add to the mix the incredible strain on union resources owing to the dual workload of the transition period, and it is easy to understand why the past couple of years have been a most demanding period for federal public service unions. Those union officers who are left are not only taking care of every day business, a full time activity in itself, but also responding to changes and providing guidance and training to the new generation of union officers who have generously stepped forward to fill empty seats.

Some reasons for concern

Experience of labour relations during the transition period has already given unions reason for concern. In many ways, the legisla-

tion's consequences are unfolding as expected, like a steam roller's wake over union advocacy.

For the past few months, Informal Conflict Management Systems (ICMS) have been set up all across the public service. Bargaining agents have been "consulted". But by and large the systems that are being set up in each department are copies of the model put together by the Public Service Human Resources Management Agency (PSHRMA). CAPE has argued that this model undermines the safeguards of formal redress procedures and the advocacy role of unions. With possibly one exception, our concerns have not been heeded.

Co-development is being hailed as the way of the future. Yet, as CAPE has argued and demonstrated time and time again, co-development without an impasse resolution process is simply another word for tapping into union knowledge and expertise for the purposes of selecting what management wants to use for its own purposes. The notion of partnership is contradicted by the employer's control over the decision-making process. The converging interests of unionized employees and of employer which was the supposed objective of co-development is nowhere to be seen.

And there is little to say about the new staffing system that is positive. The new system is skewed in such a way that many promotions will be replaced with appointments from outside the public service. Those promotions that will occur will be based mostly on individual merit which means that managers will not be promoting the most meritorious employee. Recourse has been weakened as the grounds for invoking recourse are reduced to two issues: abuse of authority, which is very difficult to prove, and language, which was rarely the problem invoked in the past by appellants. The time lines are shorter; moreover, the in-

The period of cooperation will be followed by frustration, as it will become clearer that the new statutory framework is meant to fix HR management and not labour management relations.

roduction of a new informal step in the recourse process will create confusion. In short, promotions will become less accessible, and challenging staffing decisions will become more difficult.

If the past two years are a sign of the new Leviathan, there is good reason for public service employees to be concerned.

Response

It has become clear that in the new order established by the new legislation labour management relations will be affected by an overriding tendency. The tendency will be for employer interests to subsume employee interest in the name of improved relations and “cooperation”. Such is the result of changing the problem from one of union management relations to one of human resources management.

A veneer of harmony will undoubtedly allow many labour relations practitioners to believe temporarily that the new order is working. But the underlying problems will remain and will continue to affect relations, and more importantly the work place. Distinctive objective employee interests will not “conveniently” disappear. They will percolate through the veneer as unions advocate on behalf of their members. Public service employees through their union representatives will need to be

vigilant and avoid losing sight of specific employee interests. It will be important for employees and their unions to recognize their own interests, to identify the employer’s interests, and to seek convergence wherever possible. Paradoxically, it is this very advocacy that can give rise to a true partnership, to a truly cooperative relationship with the employer. This course of action should in fact be the expectation of managers who are concerned with good employer-employee relations. Allowing concerns to be muted in the name of agreement can only lead to frustration and conflict. Unions need to express, and managers need to know the realities of, employee needs.

The transition period may be too early to pass judgement on the legacy of the new legislation. After all, we are far from having felt its full force in the work place. Yet, when the solution does not fit the real problem it is difficult to imagine how the outcome will be positive. There will be a period during which unions will do their best to make the legislation work, while continuing to carry out their advocacy role. The period of cooperation will be followed by frustration, as it will become clearer that the new statutory framework is meant to fix HR management and not labour management relations. And frustration will be followed by confrontation.

←TOC Public Service Health Care Plan Negotiations

After lengthy and sometimes very difficult bargaining, the three parties to the negotiation of a new Public Service Health Care Plan are close to reaching a tentative agreement.

The negotiations have been undertaken by representatives of the NJC Bargaining Side, the Federal Superannuates National Association, and the Employer Side.

While the details have yet to be finalized and publicized, the parties are confident that once everything has been set to paper, agreement will be unanimous.

It has been a successful experience of union collaboration at the table, with bargaining agent representatives from various unions and the FSNA working to improve the plan for active and retired public service employees. José

Aggrey, President of CAPE, participated in the negotiations and wishes to thank his colleagues, in particular Paul Morse, Business Manager of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, as well as Jean-Guy Soulière, Executive Director of the Federal Superannuates National Association.

For further information on the Public Service Health Care Plan, please consult the Treasury Board website, at:

http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pubs_pol/hrpubs/TB_862/pshcpb-rssfpp_e.asp

While the details have yet to be finalized and publicized, the parties are confident that once everything has been set to paper, agreement will be unanimous.

←TOC CAPE Labour Relations

CAPE employs the professional services of six Labour Relations Officers, a Senior Labour Relations Officer, and a Director of Professional Services. Throughout the course of the year, the Association's Labour Relations Officers have been handling an increasing caseload, as well as the growing responsibilities of consultations and co-development with Departments, Agencies and with the employer at the national level. The Labour Relations Officers are also responsible for professional services to locals, and for supporting Local Officers at consultations, and in representations.

Representation

What follows is only a glimpse at the work performed by your Labour Relations Professionals:

- A member grieved the decision of the department that denied her the right to have **paid parental leave** in accordance with the collective agreement. The department's decision to deny parental leave was based on their interpretation that the employee did not meet a technical requirement under the parental leave provisions. CAPE viewed this interpretation as being in violation of the Human Rights Code on the prohibited grounds of family status. The department resolved the grievance at the final level to the full satisfaction of the member.
- The Association successfully represented a member on an Appeal based on allegations that the **competitive process offended the merit principle**. The Appeal Board Chairperson allowed the appeal, on the grounds that our member was unjustly screened out of a competitive process for an ES 6 position. After reviewing all of the allegations, the Chairperson deemed the arguments advanced by the department, which denied our member the right to compete, violated the merit principle.
- An Appeal by four members in the National Capital Region was allowed. Because the **corrective measures implemented failed to result in a meritorious selection**, the department agreed to concede the appeal. In the subsequent competitive process, which resulted from the corrective measures, another appeal was filed. Their appeal for our member was also allowed, since it was determined by the Chairperson that the department erred in the manner in which they conducted the references for the appellant. Corrective measures to follow.
- A member filed a **classification grievance** in order to have the employer recognise that the additional duties added to the position should suffice to reclassify the substantive position to a higher level. The Association presented the case to a grievance committee, and

upon completion of the union's summation, a member of the committee suggested that the parties resolve this case. After many meetings the parties were able to come to an agreement. The highlight of the settlement is that the employee will be reclassified to a higher level, the effective date going back to April 2002. The member's salary will increase accordingly and a retroactive payment of more than \$10,000.00 will be made.

- A member filed a **Human Rights complaint** against the employer due to the lack of effort in accommodating her medical condition, which prevented this member from completing the french training at the PSC school. A settlement was reached in mediation, and the member will receive financial compensation for pain and suffering. Also, a private tutor will be provided to complete the language training.
- The employer imposed a **two day suspension** on one of our members alleging lack of productivity and not following orders from management.

A grievance was filed and presented to all levels of the process. The designated representative of the employer at the final level agreed that the two days suspension was too severe, and the discipline was reduced to a letter on file.

- Three employees filed a **complaint with the Public Service Commission contesting the appointment of one of our members** who had been hired on a determinate basis, and who was subsequently appointed without competition to a position on an indeterminate basis. The complainants alleged, among other things, that the member in question had obtained the first appointment by administrative favoritism, and that they did not meet the statement of qualifications of the indeterminate position. Following an initial investigation by the Public Service Commission, the investigating officer came to the conclusion that our member did in fact meet the statement of qualifications upon being nominated without competition to the indeterminate position, but did not meet the statement of qualifications

The burden placed on unions in the build-up to the PSMA, the PSLRA and the PSEA has only been a prelude to the increased load that CAPE will be carrying as a result of the changes brought forth by these Acts.

The simple matter of keeping abreast of changes and differences in guidelines and policies over so many departments and agencies can be a herculean task, and as a result, our LRO's, who already carry a tremendous load, will be called upon to do more.

when originally appointed to the determinate position. The investigating officer did not meet with our member during the course of the investigation. She recommended that the appointment be rescinded.

We challenged this first investigation report before an Investigative Committee, by virtue of Article 6.3 of the Public Service Employment Act. The Association and the employer demonstrated that the conclusions of the first investigation were erroneous, that our member did meet the statement of qualifications of the initial term position. The member did not benefit from administrative favoritism, and the initial appointment respected all aspects of the law, Regulations and Policies of the Public Service Commission.

A member was participating in the Accelerated Economist Trainee Program. She had been promoted to an ES-04 position in 2002, and in 2003 had received an evaluation for a promotion to the next level with an indication that she would be promoted to an ES-05 in December of 2003. She began maternity leave in September 2003, and returned to work in May 2004.

In March 2004, she received a letter informing her that the Department was reclassifying her to the ES-05 level effective December 2003. She accepted the appointment the same month. Upon her return to work, the employer withdrew the offer of appointment and sent her a modified letter indicating that her

appointment to the ES-05 group and level would not take effect until June 2004. Following the advice of the Association, she neither accepted nor refused the modified letter of appointment. She filed a complaint with the Public Service Commission demanding that they confirm her nomination to the ES-05 level commencing December 2003, and that they cancel the attempt to reclassify her retroactively from the ES-05 to the ES-03 level for the period of December 2003 to June 2004.

The Public Service Commission found that “the contractual nature of said letter of appointment makes it such that it overrides the provisions of the progression guidelines of the program” and concluded, “that the letter of appointment issued March 24 2004 with its retroactive effects to December 1, 2003 is upheld so as to produce all its consequences.”

The Public Service Commission must now decide on appropriate corrective actions.

The Association successfully represented a member who was wrongfully dismissed during the probationary period.

Consultations

CAPE is called upon to participate in all service-wide consultations because we are the third largest union in the federal public service. In addition we are asked to consult with almost 70 departments, agencies and tribunals where our members work. This degree of consultations periodically strains our limited resources. We play an active role on the

National Joint Council, and are involved with several working groups and committees, including the Public Service Commission Advisory Council working groups on Mobility, Pre-qualified Pools, and Co-Development, the NJC Dental Care Board of Management Committee, the Disability Insurance Board of Management Committee, the Official Languages Committee, the Joint Employment Equity Committee, the Workforce Adjustment Committee, the Joint Compensation Advisory Committee, and the Pensions Committee.

We are also present on the Public Service Human Resources Management Working Groups on Staffing Recourse and Staffing Tools and Models and have collaborated successfully with other unions on issues of community interest, an example is the recent negotiation of a tentative agreement regarding the Public Service Health Care Plan.

The burden placed on unions in the build-up to the Public Service Modernization Act (PSMA), the Public Service Labour Relations Act (PSLRA) and the Public Service Employment

Act (PSEA) has only been a prelude to the increased load that CAPE will be carrying as a result of the changes brought forth by these Acts. Both in terms of human resources, and financial resources, the costs are mounting and will continue to grow. While bargaining agents attempt to minimize these costs by calling on Local Leaders to participate in consultations, at the same time we call on the Employer to help us in accommodating the union representative who also has a regular job.

To a large degree the consultations regarding the development of individual departments' and agencies' guidelines and policies, are and will continue to be attended by CAPE's professional staff. With members in almost 70 departments these processes can be an enormous drain in terms of time and resources. The simple matter of keeping abreast of changes and differences in guidelines and policies over so many departments and agencies can be a herculean task, and as a result, our LRO's, who already carry a tremendous load, will be called upon to do more.

CAPE National Executive Committee

To contact any member of CAPE's Committees or Local Leadership, call our National Office at 613-236-9181 or 1-800-265-9181.

José Aggrey
CAPE President
jaggrey@acep-cape.ca

Derek Brackley
Vice President EC/LoP
Human Resources and Skills
Development Canada

Richard Oslund
TR Vice-President
Public Works and Government Services
Translation Bureau

Carol Card
TR Director
Public Works and Government Services

Tom Furmanczyk
EC Director
Environment Canada

Howard Hao
EC Director
Statistics Canada

Marcy Holyk
EC Director
National Defense

Maurice Korol
EC Director
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

Robert McVicar
EC Director
Statistics Canada

André Picotte
TR Director
Public Works and Government Services
Translation Bureau

Philip Rosen
LoP Director
Library of Parliament

Anna Sipos
EC Director
Foreign Affairs Canada/International
Trade Canada

Stan Spak
EC Director
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

Clayton Therrien
EC Director
Statistics Canada

Claude Danik
Director of Professional Services
CAPE

Donna Martin
Manager of Administration Services
CAPE
dmartin@acep-cape.ca

Finance Committee

André Picotte - Chair
Public Works and Government
Services
Translation Bureau

José Aggrey
CAPE President

Derek Brackley
Vice President EC/LoP
Human Resources and Skills
Development

Luc Gervais
Translation Bureau
Public Works and Government Services
Canada

Klaus Kostenbauer
Statistics Canada

Mike Monaghan
Statistics Canada

Richard Oslund
Translation Bureau
Public Works and Government Services
Canada

Claude Danik
Director of Professional Services
CAPE

Clayton Therrien
Statistics Canada

Sandra Wensink
Finance Officer
CAPE

*TR Collective Bargaining Committee***Carol Card**Public Works and Government Services
Canada**Luc Gervais**Public Works and Government
Services Canada**Claude Poirier**Public Works and Government Services
Canada**Karine Circé**Public Works and Government Services
Canada**Micheline LaSalle**Public Works and Government Services
Canada**Claude Danik**Director of Professional Services
CAPE**Suzanne Dumas**Public Works and Government Services
Canada**Lionel Perrin**Public Works and Government Services
Canada**Hélène Paris**Research Officer
CAPE
236-9181**Ellen Garmaise**Public Works and Government Services
Canada**André Picotte**Public Works and Government
Services Canada*TR Negotiating Committee: Financial Incentives Plan (FIP)***Jean Blais**Public Works and Government
Services Canada**Luc Gervais**Public Works and Government
Services Canada**Claude Danik**Director of Professional Services
CAPE**Suzanne Dumas**Public Works and Government
Services Canada**Lionel Perrin**Public Works and Government
Services Canada**Hélène Paris**Research Officer
CAPE**Ellen Garmaise**Public Works and Government
Services Canada**André Picotte**Public Works and Government
Services Canada*Library of Parliament Collective Bargaining Committee***Frédéric Beaugard-Tellier****Sonya Norris****Hélène Paris**Research Officer
CAPE**Micheal Dewing****Philip Rosen****Andrew Kitching****Claude Danik**Director of Professional Services
CAPE*Library of Parliament Collective Bargaining Team***Frédéric Beaugard-Tellier****Sonya Norris****Hélène Paris**Research Officer
CAPE**Micheal Dewing****Claude Danik**Director of Professional Services
CAPE**Andrew Kitching**

Elections Committee

Olivier Lalande - Chair
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

Ben Bedouani
Natural Resources Canada

Trong Nguyen
Health Canada

Michael Dewing - Co-Chair
Library of Parliament

Larry Deters
Statistics Canada

Donna Martin
CAPE Manager of
Administration Services

Mohammad Ali
Health Canada

Patrick Fothergill
Industry Canada

David Aubry
Public Works and
Government Services Canada
Translation Bureau

Adrian Johnson
Penitentiary Services

Communications Committee

Maurice Korol - Chair
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

Philip Rosen
Library of Parliament

Deborah Fiander
CAPE Communications Officer

Jose Aggrey
CAPE President

Clayton Therrien
Statistics Canada

André Picotte
Public Works and Government Services
Translation Bureau

Michael Zinck
Department of Veteran's Affairs

Constitution and By-Laws Committee

Clayton Therrien Chairperson
Statistics Canada

Carl Lakaski
Health Canada

André Picotte
Public Works and Government Services
Canada

José Aggrey
CAPE President

Michael Monaghan
Statistics Canada

Luc Pomerleau
Public Works and Government Services
Canada

Bachir Belhadji
Health Canada

Graham Myres
Health Canada

Philip Rosen
Library of Parliament

Derek Brackley
Human Resources and Skills
Development Canada

Trong Nguyen
Health Canada

Donna Martin
Manager of Administration Services
CAPE

Tom Furmanczyk
Environment Canada

Richard Oslund
Public Works and Government Services
Canada

Local Leadership

National Capital Region Representatives

Agriculture and Agrifood Canada (Local #507)

President	Luc Tanguay
Vice-President	Chris Legget
Secretary/Treasurer	Roy Blais
Stewards	Maurice Korol Margaret Zafiriou
Health & Safety Representative	John Wheeler

Canadian Human Rights Commission

Steward	Donna Duvall
---------	--------------

Canadian International Development Agency
(Local #517)

Vice-President	Rebecca Mellett
Secretary / Treasurer	Pierre Bernier
Steward / Contact	Ghislain Dussault, Josée Patry

Canadian Radio-Television & Telecommunications
Commission

Stewards	Hermina Harris Christian Maranda
----------	-------------------------------------

Elections Canada (Local #518)

President	Louise Lussier
Vice-President	Steve Skorenky
Treasurer	Éric Bolduc
Secretary	Deborah Isaac
Director	Jeff Campagnola

Environment Canada (Local #505)

Directors/Steward	Marie Jetten
Stewards	Adam Auer
Health & Safety Representative	Tom Furmanczyk

Foreign Affairs & International Trade (Local #516)

President	Archie Campbell
Vice-President	Anna Sipos
Treasurer	Karen Diechun
Directors	John Aboud Sylvie-Aimée Anseme –Baha Charles La Salle Katie MacLaurin Christine Pendragon Nancy Stewart Bill Wilson

Health Canada (Local #512)

President	Carl Lakaski
Treasurer	Martine Brault-Krzan
Communications Officer	Ron Wall
Stewards	Bachir Belhadji Sandra Chatterton Allan Gordon Ida Henderson John Horvath Patrick Laffey Tom Lips Pierre Levasseur Carol Milstone Simone Powell

Human Resources Development Canada (Local # 514)

President	Barry Maloney
Vice President	Syed Nassem
Stewards	Antonio Bakopoulos Cynthia Carter Kenneth Horricks Marc Lacroix Gilles Léger Damian Londynski Sarah Lutaaya Garry Malloy Barry Maloney Jean-François Plamondon Christian Strano
Health and Safety Representatives	Alex Berljawsky Barry Maloney

Immigration and Refugee Board (Local #501)

President	Louise Hollister
Vice-President	Laurie Ham
Secretary Treasurer	Louise Carriere
Stewards	Sean Dineen Christine Sarafian Sean Stewart Suzanne Tomek

Indian & Northern Affairs (Local #502)

President	Patrick Sampson
Treasurer	Jean Fisk
Stewards	Saajida Deen Steve Rozak Nancy Stewart
Health & Safety Representative	Steve Rozak

Local Leadership cont'd...

Industry Canada (Local #508)

Directors Jeff Corman
Norman Fee
Marnie McCall

Justice Canada (Local # 513)

Directors Josée Baril
Phyllis Doherty
Roseanne Kelly
Paula McLenaghan

Health & Safety Representatives Robert Depew
Phyllis Doherty
Jane Evans
Judith Eyamie

Health and Safety Policy Committee Representative Phyllis Doherty

Library of Parliament (Local #515)

Directors Frédéric Beaugregard-Tellier
Michael Dewing
Andrew Kitching
Sonia Norris

Library and Archives Canada

Steward Gabriel Breton

Public Service Commission (Local #509)

President Carole Sage
Vice-President Christine Aubry
Steward Debbie Romain

Statistics Canada (Local # 503)

President Clayton Therrien
Vice President Robert McVicar
Treasurer Mike Monaghan
Health and Safety Representative Anna Morrone
Julienne Patterson

Employment Equity Officer Clayton Therrien

Directors Anne Catalano
Gordon Davies
Howard Hao
Klaus Kostenbauer

Stewards

Agriculture Wayne Armstrong
Les Macartney

Business Register Bill Parrott
Consumer Prices Section Elda Allen
Industrial Org. & Finance Victor Brown
Mike Monaghan

International Trade Raymond Dubuisson
Manufacturing, Construction & Energy Prices Don Grant
Gordon Davies
Clayton Therrien

Standards Anne Catalano
Transportation Antoine Chrétien

Status of Women Canada (Local #510)

Directors Michele Bougie
Maria Shin
Stewards Teresa Edwards
Teresa Finik

Translaton Bureau (Local #900)

Executive Committee

President Luc Gervais
Regional TR Representative Claude Poirier
EC Representative Marjolaine Francoeur

Francophone Translators Representatives André Picotte
Suzanne Dumas

English Translators Representative Ellen Garmaise
Multilingual Translators Representative Peter Schmolka
Interpreters Representative Teresa Beaugregard
Terminologists Representative Marie-Thérèse Mocuano
Parliamentary Translators Representative Stephen Mullen
Lionel Perrin

CAPE TR V.P. Richard Oslund

Stewards: National Capital Region

External Affairs Marie-Anne Courbaron
Agriculture Micheline Pressoir
IRB Marc Vallée
Criminology Karine Circé
National Defense Wayne Thompson
Business Development Luc Pomerleau

Human Resources Development Diane Bisson
Heritage Line Niquet
Cécile Lamirande

Revenue André Picotte
Health Marilyn Gagné
Lide Sciences Ellen Garmaise
Annie Leblond
Dave Perron

Solicitor General Caroline Raymond
Technical Section Micheline LaSalle
Luc Gervais
Claude Leclerc

Multilingual

Americas and Middle-East Bruno Lobrichon
Europes-Asia Zoubair Rubio

IPTD

Parliamentary Committees Danielle Zanibellato
Conferences Francine Roy
Debates Lucie Archambault
Parliamentary Documents Lionel Perrin
Valérie Dutil
Parliamentary Interpretation Carol Card
Carole Lévesque

Terminology

Local Leadership cont'd...

**Professional Development
Human Sciences**Cathryn Anne Arnold
Marie-Thérèse Mocuau
Iliana Auverana**Toronto
Winnipeg
Vancouver**Michel Grondin
Stéphane Dresler
Nathalie Lavallée*Regional Offices***Halifax****Charlottetown****Moncton****Montréal****Québec****Ville Saint-Laurent**Denise Aucoin-Deveau
Lyne Perrotte
Claude J. Poirier
Isabelle Girouard
Dennis Maloney
Claude Poirier
Hélène Paquin
Raymonde Leclerc**Transport Canada (Local #506)****Directors**Phil Carrière
Jeff Harris
Janet Lynn MacNeils
Brian S. Oliver**Regional Association Representatives****Alberta***Edmonton***Directors/Stewards**Tina Bodnar
Jason Brisbois
Sandra Clark
Sarina Daviduck
Lorrie Henke**Newfoundland (Local #101)****President****Vice-President****Secretary/Treasurer****Steward**Frank Corbett
Paul C. Cahill
Gail Kenny
Bonnie Gauvin**British Columbia (Local #301)****Directors/Stewards**Ghada Ahmed
Anna Benke
Derek Brackley
Mardie Campbell
Philip Davies
Mike Haberl
Dale Komanchuk
Roberta Robertson
Dennis Siska
Rod Smelser
Ghada Ahmed**Nova Scotia (Local #201)****Stewards**Ben Black
Wendy Stonehouse
Christine Sutherland**Ontario***Burlington***Steward**

Tom Muir

*Guelph***Steward**

Candice Lee

*Kingston (Local #504)***President****Vice-President****Treasurer****Stewards**Lisa Manson-Shillington
Marcelene Holyk
William Bailey
William Bailey
Cathy McCoy*Toronto***President****Vice President****Treasurer****Stewards**Mina Gonzales
Ivonne Doucette
Wendy Dennis
Cherill Baynham**Health and Safety Representative****Manitoba (Local #601)****Directors/Stewards**Sharon Allentuck
Wayne Kramble
Brad Morrison
Stan Spak
Jodi Turner**Health and Safety Representative****New Brunswick****Stewards**Samuel Le Breton
Gilberte Nowlan*Sault Ste-Marie***Steward**

Mercedes Aquilina

Local Leadership cont'd...

Prince Edward Island (Local #102)

President	Michael Zinck
Vice-President	Teresa Pound
Directors	Tara O'Connor Samuel Ileso Derek Lefebvre

Québec, Montréal (Local #402)

President	Mario Jodoin
Stewards	Gwenael Cartier Claire Courtois Hélène Puskas Sylvie Thévenin Marc Vallières

Canada Economic Development Agency Quebec Region	
Steward	Caroline Ranger

Québec - Québec City/Ste-Foy (Local #401)

President	Bruno Levesque
Stewards	Clermont Belzile Frederick Lessard

Saskatchewan Local #701 (Northern Region)

Directors	Michelle Baldwin Deqiang Gu Melanie Kelly Linda Lazarescu-King Joyce Olson Lori Warring Patricia Yeudall
------------------	--

Saskatchewan (Southern Region)

Steward	Rob Raisbeck
----------------	--------------

Yukon-Whitehorse

Department of Justice	
Occupational Safety and Health	Darlene Mataseje

Membership Distribution*

Department or Agency	EC	AN/RA	TR	Total
Statistics Canada	2195	0	0	2195
Public Works and Government Services	299	0	1039	1338
Health Canada	744	0	0	744
Social Development Canada	574	0	0	574
Indian & Northern Affairs Canada	420	0	0	420
Justice Canada	356	0	0	356
Natural Resources Canada	354	0	0	354
Public Health Agency Canada	353	0	0	353
Agriculture & Agri-food Canada	351	0	0	351
Industry Canada	326	0	0	326
Finance Canada	303	0	0	303
Human Resources and Skills Development Can.	274	0	0	274
Transport Canada	233	0	0	233
Treasury Board	228	0	0	228
Library and Archives Canada	225	0	0	225
Environment Canada	216	0	0	216
Foreign Affairs Canada	192	0	0	192
Correctional Service Canada	172	0	0	172
Fisheries & Oceans	170	0	0	170
Canadian Heritage	127	0	0	127
Canadian International Development Agency	108	0	0	108
Privy Council Office	107	0	0	107
Library of Parliament		88		88
Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness	76	0	0	76
Elections Canada	75	0	0	75
Indian Residential Schools Resolution	75	0	0	75
National Defence	73	0	0	73
Citizenship and Immigration Canada	67	0	0	67
Public Service Commission	49	0	0	49
Public Service Human Resources Management Agency	47	0	0	47
Immigration & Refugee Board	42	0	0	42
Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency	41	0	0	41
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	40	0	0	40
Infrastructure Canada	39	0	0	39
Veterans Affairs	30	0	0	30
Canada School of Public Service	29	0	0	29
Western Economic Diversification	24	0	0	24
International Trade Canada	23	0	0	23
Canadian Transportation Agency	22	0	0	22
Status of Women Canada	15	0	0	15
Canadian Human Rights Commission	14	0	0	14
Courts Administration Service	14	0	0	14
Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission	14	0	0	14

Membership Distribution cont'd....

Department or Agency	EC	AN/RA	TR	Total
Canada Economic Development - Quebec	12	0	0	12
Patented Medicine Prices Review Board	12	0	0	12
Transportation Safety Board	11	0	0	11
Supreme Court of Canada	10	0	0	10
Canadian International Trade Tribunal	9	0	0	9
Passport Canada	9	0	0	9
Prairie Farm Rehabilitation	9	0	0	9
Canadian Dairy Commission	7	0	0	7
Canadian Grains Commission	7	0	0	7
Canadian Space Agency	6	0	0	6
Commissioner of Official Languages	5	0	0	5
Canada Industrial Relations Board	4	0	0	4
Offices of the Information and Privacy Commissioners	4	0	0	4
Canada Border Services Agency	3	0	0	3
Canada Firearms Centre	2	0	0	2
Federal Judicial Affaires	2	0	0	2
National Farm Products Council	2	0	0	2
Canadian Artists and Producers Professional Relations Tribunal	1	0	0	1
Commission for Public Complaints Against the RCMP	1	0	0	1
Copyright Board of Canada	1	0	0	1
Law Commission of Canada	1	0	0	1
Military Police Complaints Commission	1	0	0	1
NAFTA Secretariat	1	0	0	1
National Parole Board	1	0	0	1
Total:	9257	88	1039	10384
Associates		<u>38</u>		
GRAND TOTAL:	9257	126	1039	10422

*Based on the most recent information provided by Treasury Board

Canadian Association of Professional Employees

National Office Staff

José Aggrey	President	jaggrey@acep-cape.ca
Claude Danik	Director of Professional Services	cdanik@acep-cape.ca
Hélène Paris	Research Officer	hparis@acep-cape.ca
Sylvie Richard	Research Assistant	srichard@acep-cape.ca
Deborah Fiander	Communications Officer	dfiander@acep-cape.ca
Bertrand Myre	Senior Labour Relations Officer	bmyre@acep-cape.ca
Claude Archambault	Labour Relations Officer	carchambault@acep-cape.ca
Isabelle Borré	Labour Relations Officer	iborre@acep-cape.ca
Karen Brook	Labour Relations Officer	kbrook@acep-cape.ca
Catherine O'Brien	Labour Relations Officer	cobrien@acep-cape.ca
Jean Ouellette	Labour Relations Officer	jouellette@acep-cape.ca
Claude Vézina	Labour Relations Officer	cvezina@acep-cape.ca
Liana Griffin	Professional Services Assistant	lgriffin@acep-cape.ca
Sandra Wensink	Finance Officer	swensink@acep-cape.ca
Donna Martin	Manager of Administration Services	dmartin@acep-cape.ca
Anita Bangiricenge	Administrative Clerk	abangiricenge@acep-cape.ca
Sylvie Francoeur	Administrative Clerk	sfrancoeur@acep-cape.ca
Francine Lachance	Administrative Clerk	flachance@acep-cape.ca
Chantale Lebel	Administrative Clerk	clebel@acep-cape.ca
Sharon Wilson	Administrative Clerk	swilson@acep-cape.ca



Canadian Association of Professional Employees

CAPE ANNUAL REPORT 2004-2005



Canadian Association of Professional Employees
100 Queen Street, 4th Floor
Ottawa, Ontario K1P1J9
(613) 236-9181 • 1-800-265-9181 • Fax: (613) 236-6017
Web site: www.acep-cape.ca