

Michael Dewing – thank you everyone. We now have the rebuttal for second statements segment. Two minutes each please starting with Richard Oslund.

Richard Oslund - First of all I'd like to talk about why I'm so optimistic about finding a sub-tenant. Last November the Globe and Mail reported that Ottawa's downtown commercial real estate market, which traditionally has one of the lowest vacancy rates in North America, is ending on a strong year and experts say available space in the core is shrinking. Then in June, the Ottawa Citizen reported that among Canadian cities only Calgary had a lower downtown office vacancy rate than Ottawa.

Now I'd like to revisit the issue of spending controls, this time looking at a specific example. When he became President, José's salary was paid at the top of the EX pay scale which is revised every April first. José's 2005 raise was for three percent, bringing him to just over one hundred and twenty one thousand dollars. Later that summer though the Finance Committee was given his old salary to put into the budget which the members then approved. Not surprisingly, the salary actually paid to José this last past financial year exceeded the approved figure by more than three thousand dollars. That's three thousand dollars of real money. Money that came off the members' pay cheques and was paid to José. The NEC authorized no such disbursement from its contingency fund, so either the money was shifted over from some other approved budget allocation or it came directly out of CAPE'S bank account, with no authorization from the members. Either way, that's not how I want my money handled and that's one of the reasons why I'm running as President. Thank you.

Applause.

M. Dewing – Derek Brackley.

Derek Brackley - I just wanted to say that under the incumbent's leadership, CAPE is reacting to situations rather than pro-acting. What we need in terms of forward looking strategy is we need a strategy around potential downsizing of the Public Service. There is no question that this is a very strong potential and, and members know that so... We also have no strategy on improving career opportunities. We have a very short term view of the budget. We don't have a longer term view of the budget and I want to say that I'll provide vision and action on all of these issues.

Now I want to just say a couple of things the, the, the way the power is set up in our organization is concentrated very strongly in the hands of the President. All the members of the staff report directly or indirectly to the President. The President has the authority under the constitution to delegate responsibilities to members of the NEC or to certain members of the staff so essentially the whole structure is to support the President and I would say at this time my experience over the last two years suggest that many of the things that have been done have been done more or less in spite of the President, I hate to say, rather than because of the President. I think that needs to change.

There is the situation for instance of the EC collective agreement. Mr. Aggrey claims this was something done under his leadership – he came to the first meeting and excused himself from the bargaining.

I was a member of that bargaining committee and I was at the meetings and I was there throughout so let's be clear - there were people on the bargaining committee - José was not one of them. The brainstorming session that we had was my suggestion and it was carried out.

José wanted to write the report in such a way that our grand ideas around communications were to buy some pens, cups and something else – pads, note pads. I think there is more we can do in the way of communications and a strategic plan. Thank you.

Applause.

M. Dewing – next is Clayton Therrien.

Clayton Therrien - At our first board meeting on the current board we were led by the incumbent. Management team presented us with massive staged dues increase scenarios. I proposed a one time increase of ten dollars to balance the budget. That was dismissed. Then we were treated to a proposed ballot question that was dishonest and undemocratic. We were going to ask, would you like this massive hike or that massive hike? One vote in favour carries. I was shocked at such a tactic was considered in the first place. Thankfully, Richard and I pulled them back from the brink and the NEC offered a yes or no question.

I believe our members are intelligent enough to know the value of the union without resorting to fear mongering, political rhetoric, group think or empty boasting. I believe our Association is strong enough to undergo a realistic and honest evaluation. I believe we can achieve our goals effectively to issue orientated alliances and strong political lobbying. I believe I represent every employee and not just those that represent political opportunity for me. Again, I'm asking for your vote.

I just want to go through a couple of more issues that I've been involved in; the staffing issue, the PSMA, I've been in weeks and weeks of, of day long meetings on the PSMA. On EC conversion we have a lot of questions on the new pay lines, how are the SI 3s going to fit into these new pay lines. A lot of our Sis are frustrated at being held down at the two level they want some mobility upwards. These are issues I have been dealing with and I will continue to deal with. Advocacy of GLDT rights - trying to get a champion for them at the local or at the National level to ensure that they are treated equally. There's currently trying to help well actually management recruit more women into the EX group and we're focusing now on trying to recruit an ES to represent us on that committee. Thank you very much. Oh and I just wanted to say if you want to know who the friends of labour are then go to Bill C-263 that was last year and then C-257 that was this year – that was the anti scab legislation. I was invited there by Richard

Nadeau. I'm not a separatist but I went there to support the legislation. Look at the roll call from the handsard. Thank you very much.

Applause.

Michael Dewing – José Aggrey.

José Aggrey - Thank you again. I'll do my best not to respond to all or some of the accusations or statements made. It will take away the time for me to put forth my position but a couple of things first of all last year when we were in the financial difficultly.

I think it was imprudent of me to organize meetings when we didn't have the money to exist to survive. It was a decision made to ensure that we continue to have enough resources for the operation of the organization and that is why we did not have last year a meeting of the Local Leadership so I think we should dispel the notion its its just prudent to choose your priorities right – if you are President.

Second, I beg to differ - the idea of having an executive committee planning session wasn't Derek's idea – if he wants to claim it that's fine. This idea was there in fact before he himself came on the executive. We held one and we're suppose to hold another one and I'm sure there are a couple of people here who were planning for it without putting them on the spot there are two people here who were planning for a strategic planning session way before Derek came on so it's not his idea.

I didn't have time in my first opening remarks to talk about my vision to inspire young members to develop leadership skills and credentials to become the next generation of CAPE leaders.

Secondly, I have a vision to ensure that CAPE have - has a governance structure that will reflect its current size, to meet current and future obligations and challenges arising from the new era of work environment created by the PSMA

Lastly, I think you'll allow me to make a quick statement about planning for the future. When you understand how the government works you'd understand how you strategize to ensure that your members are not impacted negatively by the current legislation. Let me just share with you, I've met with the Public Service, the President the Vice-President of the Public Service Health Public Service Human Resources Modernization Agency. We've got a piece of advice as to

Michael Dewing - can I ask you to wrap it up?

José Aggrey – yes I will.

We've got a piece of advice how we can position ourselves and raise the image of our members. It's not at the negotiations table but going to the top. Having discussions

with the Privy Council the Clerk of the Privy Council because they have the power and we're putting into place a strategy to do exactly that. So I'm not I'm not completely oblivious of the fact that we need to plan ahead because of the new legislation on Human Resources Modernization Act. Thank you .

Applause.

Michael Dewing - Thank you very much. Now its time for the questions for the Presidential candidates. I think we will try to limit the questions to a minute or so - its about what they went for with the last session. So if we can keep the questions short please and the answers fairly short, we should be able to get quite a few questions in. First question please.

Question 1

André Picotte - My question is for Richard Oslund but the other candidates may comment as well. We expect a union leader not to make judgments that have a sense of solidarity among other things. What I'd like to ask Richard essentially is the following. How was he able a year and a half ago to organize a petition to reform or at least amend the constitution considering our financial incentive plan and to do so he recruited in the list of people signing the petition ECs while the FIP concerns only the TRs and among other things bargaining is the TR bargaining committees responsibility or the ECs. The question is, the question is essentially how was he able to do that? How could he lack judgment and proceed in this way?

Richard Oslund – We negotiate collective agreements for all our members and we simply ask them to stand up for the rights that we negotiate for them. And the Constitution allows any member of this union to sponsor a constitutional amendment and if you think it's wrong for someone who's in an elected position to do that then I suggest that you sponsor a to change the Constitution to make that impossible.

At one point I thought I might not get the one hundred signatures required, I asked about ten ECs to sign my petition. It turned out I didn't need their signatures because shortly after that I received one envelope that had thirty signatures. I got forty more after that. I had far more than I needed. But I would like to point out André when you were talking about this issue at the National Executive Committee and you were urging them to send out a letter to all the members of the union, that letter includes a paragraph that urges non TRs to vote against the amendment so I asked ten people - ten ECs to vote in favour of it. You asked nine thousand to vote against it. I don't think if I committed, if I have done a crime of some sort then I think you must of done the same by getting the ECs involved. I'd also like to point out that a majority of people supported my amendment and probably more would have supported it if the letter sent out by the NEC urging them to vote no had not contained certain errors. For example, the claim

Michael Dewing - Sorry that's two minutes up - thanks. Anyone else like to comment.?

Clayton Therrien – I signed this petition. Its our constitution, the TRs, and the ECs and the LOP group and I think I have a right to have a say in whether all our groups are participating in full democracy or not. This is a financial agreement, it does have a large impact. I know just from Richard's petition that there are people that wanted it changed that are effected and there are probably more because he didn't have a grand platform in order to, in order to advocate his ideas. He just went from person to person and sought out people that would support his amendment for me it was a matter of democratic ratification and if that meant more costs well that's just the cost of democracy so that's the way I see it. Thank you very much.

Derek Brackley – it was a very interesting situation and a bit difficult I think for those of us who are not TRs. I would certainly support the notion that any member can ask for an amendment to the constitution. I'm not sure that particular feature should be in the constitution and I would support on principal that TRs if they want to engage in the FIP each year then they can certainly do so. It is also my understanding that there is a part of a questionnaire before the FIP there is a questions to whether TRs want to continue having that arrangement and that the answer to that question is yes, certainly there are people who disagree with it but in general the answer of the majority vote yes on it so lets listen to that particular majority and get on with negotiating the FIP. Thank you.

José Aggrey – Ah yes, also to support the right of the TRs to negotiate for their financial incentive program if indeed a majority of them support that there's no reason why it shouldn't be, and for Richard to do what he did I think the intent of that question wasn't that you didn't have the right to do it but as a member of the executive did you consider this as it was in the interest of the organization? That I think was the nature of the question. Of course you have a right to do anything within the constitution but did you consider this as something that someone who is on the executive should do? That is the question. It was detrimental to the organization and I think that you realize and if I may say so we lost the first round of dues increase not because members rejected it but because of your, your letter to members to oppose it and I think that's not good for someone who is on the executive looking after the interests of the whole community.

Michael Dewing – Thank you very much so we'll go to the second question.

Question 2 - Well this a continuing TR theme you can precede me if you'd like and I will follow.

There's been a lot of rhetoric and statements made in - I'm thinking of Moncton, the President did do something but the local had to exert some pressure and then when we did have the retreat, NEC retreat for planning this goes back to the previous council so this is nothing new there and a lot of things were said tonight and I'm thinking about what Richard has said as well but something was said that really, really, really scares me and Clayton said it. He spoke about reviewing the governance and reviewing the finances for the locals and he referred to the Translation Bureau local in particular and when I hear that, especially given Clayton's other statements it really scares me so I'd

Clayton Therrien - I would - first I would look at all our finances - have an honest account. I know there's a lot right now. Last year we had a fairly honest account of the local finances but this year a lot of items, looking at the GLs, some of the items are being mixed up so we don't have an honest account there. Have an honest account of what things costs and like I said, TRs put in seven times or eight times as much money up front to join this organization. They paid up front and I'd rather protect that equity and make sure they have the representation that they desire because there is, I'm, I suspect that the TRs are not satisfied with the level of representation they currently have and I know that the twenty two hundred ESs and Sis at Statcan are represented by one LRO that's shared with the Maritimes, so we're satisfied with that – that's over - that's about twenty five hundred members served right there by one so there's different needs that each of the groups have and I want the right to have local autonomy too at Statcan, at Health, the right to have it - and take care of our own finances as locals.

Michael Dewing - Thank you

J.Aggrey – Yes I just want to make a comment on that because I think there's a certain amount of misrepresentation. First of all, I was at the negotiation table when we merged with the TRs. One of the unique structures of governance within the constitution is to allow the TRs to organize themselves and to have their unique setup for their local.

This is a marriage of two groups, there is a cost to merger and I will stand up and I will support the TRs to have their system the way it is – its part of what we have become as CAPE and I will not deny them their right to organize themselves based upon their unique setup. I think we should be very careful when we talk about the TRs spending or having that extra this or extra that. It's a unique circumstance and we accepted that when we negotiated and when we agreed to become one organization.

M. Dewing – Derek Brackley is next.

Derek Brackley – I'd just like to say that we have, we've gone through the merger, we have a united organization and those who wish to make it otherwise I think are not in support of the direction that the organization has gone and should continue to go. The merger is a fact. With respect to costs - I know that with Statcan Ivan Felligi is the deputy minister there and he may not be around forever and maybe things will change and all of a sudden Statcan will be a very high cost local and I don't think that at that point their members- members at Statcan will want to reduce the amount of service they're getting so I think this is a very false argument. We're one Association, we've got one dues structure, we will put resources where they are needed and let's move on . Thank you.

Michael Dewing – Richard.

Richard Oslund - I don't think this is ancient history because CAPE at some point is going to want to attract other unions to join. I think everyone realizes that we need to get

bigger and the government seems to want unions to get bigger so they don't have to talk to so many different players. But if you wanted people to be attracted to CAPE, I think you have to look at the way this last merger was handled. I just like to point out that before the merger the TRs had two full time representatives and two million dollars in the bank. After the merger our share of CAPE's equity is two hundred thousand dollars, and we have one LRO sometimes. This last year we had very little service from the LRO for various reasons and I think the TRs need better service and I think if you want to attract people to join CAPE in the future that problem has to be addressed.

Michael Dewing – Thank you. Next question please.

Question 3 – My name is Carl Lakaski, I guess I'm Vice-President elect of the EC group and LoP group.

I guess we are in a fairly unique situation this election. I think it's unique in the sense that this union CAPE nor any of its predecessors have had five Presidential candidates and my question actually is addressed to José. Given the very creditable nature of the opposition you face. What is it about your leadership – what is it about those claimed accomplishments you've had that has generated such a sustained, sophisticated and analytical opposition to you as President?

José Aggrey – if I knew I would have told them not to compete with me.

I don't know - people have interest, people have aspirations and we have an open and democratic process and anyone can run against anyone. I've no answer specifically for you, all I know is that there are things that I've accomplished in the short time and I think the evidence is there. I've been around the executive for over seventeen years. I've seen Presidents come and Presidents go and I've seen a lot of things that have been done. Granted CAPE is only three years old and the things that I've done within two years, I think it is remarkable. I just mentioned the fact that I have been able to establish six new locals in less than two years. Yes ah you may not realize and I know that when Derek mentioned the fact that I was not at the negotiating table what he didn't know is what I was doing behind the table. In fact I had a little slip, I wish I could have found it to show you while and when exactly that I was negotiating with Treasury Board officials for that one year agreement. Anytime anybody wants I'll be able to produce the document exactly the paper that I wrote all the strategy on, the date of it just to show you. So I think that within a relatively short time I can say I'm running on my record. That's as much as I think I'm going to say.

Michael Dewing – thank you very much. Would the other candidate's like to comment? Richard.

Richard Oslund - Well I'd just like to say that I think an awful lot more could have been done to involve members. José said he didn't hold a Local Leadership meeting for fifteen months because of the uncertainty of our future but the members voted for an increase in mid-December of last year and José didn't hold the next Local Leadership

meeting until mid-June. That's six months. To me there was no reason to wait six months after the dues increase had been adopted. I think an awful lot more could've been done to get members involved.

Michael Dewing - Derek .

Derek Brackley - On much the same theme, we haven't had a Local Leadership meeting for a while. We're having one the day before the AGM at the end of this month. While it's good we hold Local Leadership meetings, the attitude of the current President towards that meeting was that; it's not really necessary and there's not much to talk about. So I think that maybe says an awful lot about the current Presidency. Also, the, the, the notion of governance and getting to changing the governance structure. We need to give Local leaders a role. We need to give them a say. We need discuss it. We need to talk about it and then we need to do it. Yes we need absolutely to get there.

On that question I think there is a fair bit of opposition because there are a number of candidates running because there is a clear need to demonstrate and have a President that provides more leadership than we currently have. Thank you.

Michael Dewing - Clayton.

Clayton Therrien - Yeah again this goes back awhile. Our first meeting as a board the communications that we received during the merger from both the past president and his successor were very similar and I don't think they were very, I don't think they were absolutely forthright in presenting the consequences to us and actually brokering a deal that would be fair to all members. And again like I say, different units costs different amounts. I know that Derek likes to speculate about what if there's an earthquake or what if this blows up there's always some sort of fear mongering that you can provide. For you there's a lot of what ifs in the world but I'm more - I'd rather face reality.

Michael Dewing – thank you the next question over here please.

José Aggrey - I think Mike I need to comment on the last issue.

Michael Dewing – I'm sorry José there's just one per person or otherwise we'll be here all night.

José Aggrey - O.K. O.K. That's alright I'll have (inaudible)

Question 4 – This question is for all four candidates (inaudible) I'd ask firstly to identify the single largest disappointment of the office of the President during the last term of the current President and ask each to comment on that, and secondly I'd like to ask each of the candidates to specify their three highest priorities for the upcoming term of the

President and to rank order these number one, number two and number three. Thank you.

Michael Dewing – Alright since this is a question to all candidates I think we'll go in the order that we first pulled names. Would Richard like to start?

Richard Oslund – Well, I'll skip the part of the single largest disappointment

Member - I should say with the exception of dues so that we put this on a level playing field.

R. Oslund – Right yeah I just pass. I spelled out a number of disappointments and I can't pick between them.

As for priorities, well my very first priority will be to rent out up to 20% of our current office space and that leads into the second priority which will be to ensure that there are resources - abundant resources available to help people in the EC conversion, because once the job description are drawn up then people can start grieving and we're going need lots of resources on hand for that, including a classification officer and at least another LRO, perhaps two. And I plan to put the money saved from the rent towards that. And my third priority is more involvement - three Local Leadership meetings every year scheduled at times that everyone knows about so that they can plan for them. Thanks

Michael Dewing – Derek.

Derek Brackley - Thank you. My, I guess my biggest disappointment was when the President came to the executive with a ballot, just after the first after the first dues increase had failed, he came to the table with a ballot that essentially called for us to decertify the union if the answer was no on the second ballot - and the problem with that is it's unconstitutional and I would say that that indicates - I'll let you draw your own conclusions of what that indicates.

Priorities. I think that certainly the EC conversion is a very important issue and that will be dealt with as one of the first two priorities. It's largely staff also I think a lot of it can be dealt with by staff but the NEC has to deal with it. We need to prepare, we need to have a - we have to do some anticipatory planning for downsizing because that's something I believe is very very important.

Very possibly second or third rather and I should actually make this one the second one and the second one the third one, we need to develop a change in governance that increases participation by members, changes the relationship of the NEC to the Local Leadership and we also have to, in terms of that whole governance piece, look at succession. Right now the President holds all the power. Nothing is happening with anybody else taking responsibility or being given responsibility, so I would suggest that

we need to share responsibility on the NEC and certainly the President can delegate it to somebody.

M. Dewing – wrap it up please.

And we can also look in the longer term to getting a constitutional change to do that kind of thing.

M. Dewing - Thank you. Clayton.

We did have a number of disappointments over the course of this Presidency. Just the most recent I guess will do. I was disappointed with the numbers that - number of members that actually attended the training sessions. There was some expansion of the training sessions that I had, I had advocated back in the spring and wanted implemented back in the spring and there didn't seem to be, there wasn't a lot of people. One of the courses had to be deferred or cancelled or amalgamated between the languages. And the other was the retreat, it costing three times as much as projected - there were no conclusive results that I can point to and say well that was a positive result out of it. There was no real, I mean there's a lot of heap but not much light so I think it was kind of a waste of day and waste of reimbursement and travel and things, and especially the consultant fees of I don't know some 10, 20, 15 thousand dollars or something.

Priorities - right now I'm working on these, consistently been working on these for now. I meet every two weeks on EC conversion because we have twenty two hundred members so this is the flagship I suppose of the EC group. We have to ensure - I do know I do have a good idea of where this is going. The other is language training, ensuring that there is access to language training especially if the next government is going to sustain the current official languages policy and political lobbying as well I think it is very important that we have a President who is extremely active and gets out there and meets the politicians and decision makers and actively lobbies on our behalf. Thank you

Michael Dewing – Thank you – José.

José Aggrey – Three priorities, the first is advocacy to influence government, policies and legislation and tying to that, I hope you will allow me, is the issues of EC classification and conversion. The second is really to improve communications to our members; this has been something that has come up all the time. How do we communicate well or better with our members? The third is really to review the governance structure because I think it is important, as I mentioned, for us to have a structure that reflects our current size, our demands, our obligations and challenges. You asked about disappointments, I just wish I could have done much more than I have. That's about it.

Michael Dewing – Thank you and we have another question please.

Sandra Chatterton - Before I ask the question I have a favour to ask you as the Chair.

Michael Dewing - Yes

Sandra Chatterton - I would like to find out how many people are attending this meeting and for the record who are not running for election and who or not members of the Elections Committee given that we have a membership of over ten thousand people I wanna know how many people like myself are here.

One, (inaudible) two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine. (inaudible)

M. Dewing – Lets not deal with the format now. Let's just go to the question please.

Sandra Chatterton - I just wanted to have it illustrated – have it noted on record how few people are attending.

Michael Dewing – Can you introduce yourself?

Sandra Chatterton - Oh I'm going to do that. My name is Sandra Chatterton. I'm a member of the Health Canada local, I've been a member of the executive, three executives, past President of the Health and Welfare locals and the HRDC local. I've been involved in collective bargaining both on the management side and the union, dealing with Treasury Board. Richard made a really good point, I mean he was the first one to raise it. He felt that somebody like Claude Danik is overburdened and should not be leading collective bargaining necessarily. It could be one of the national executive.

With my background I personally don't feel that even and I've worked for labour Canada, done negotiations and so on, I still don't feel adequate enough to represent the members in terms of salary, in terms of our pensions, in terms of our benefits and so on and it actually frightened me, Richard when you said that that you felt ..

Michael Dewing – Could we have the question please – could we have the question please?

Sandra Chatterton - What do the rest of you feel about that, do you feel that you can be competent enough to lead it, or do you feel we should be using – to be rough around the edges – you know – hired guns like Claude and so on.

José Aggrey - Could I take that?

M. Dewing – Sure José – go ahead.

José Aggrey – Thank you Sandra for bringing it up. First of all, negotiations is not an easy thing. You got to be well versed, experienced, you have to have the temperament – you know what it takes to really sit down and negotiate and I think I've told, I've been

on the table negotiation table several years and I think Claude Danik is competent, is very competent in negotiations, has the temperament and he does a very good job. Secondly, the constitution has the provision that allows the President to delegate, I delegated to Claude because I know of his professionalism and I think that, and in fact, in other organizations they do hire separate negotiators to negotiate at the tables for them and we're lucky to have Claude who does both, he does extraordinary other work and also negotiates for the Association.

Michael Dewing – Thank you – we're going in reverse order. Clayton would you like to comment?

Clayton Therrien - Yeah, if I was President I do not have any problem with Claude Danik leading the negotiations. I know, well, only because it's Claude and I know him personally and I know of his competence and his expertise but I certainly would attend every collective bargaining meeting and actually be there and understand what has transpired and what priorities of the membership are and maybe get a (inaudible) afterwards but I would be involved directly. I do believe in direct action, again, direct democracy for that thing - for that matter, but in the matter of negotiations I would just as soon have Claude again because I know him personally and I do trust him.

Michael Dewing – Thanks - Derek.

Derek Brackley - Yeah clearly, when we negotiate we want to have the best person for the job doing it, so Claude is great. He is a very excellent negotiator and we're lucky to have him. So certainly as long as Claude is around he'll be the one, if he's capable of doing so, of doing negotiations. At some later point we'll have to see what the next best decision is and we'll take it from there but I have absolute confidence in Claude's negotiating ability and I think the bargaining committees are well served.

Michael Dewing – Thanks - Richard.

Richard Oslund - Yeah I'd just like to say that the constitution states that the President negotiates collective agreements. It's his second duty after officially representing the Association, and the previous NEC before I joined it, specifically changed the constitution to widen the pool of people who are available to head negotiating teams. There was an amendment approved by all members by a large majority that said any member of the NEC can head a commission – or a committee that negotiates a collective agreement. I'm for giving people responsibilities, you can talk about getting people involved but if they have no responsibility why would they even bother. I, the President heads the National office - he decides how much of the National office's resources are assigned to different activities, the President decides how many people are working to support the collective negotiating team. As President, I'll ensure that whatever team is chosen, whatever person heads that team, they'll have the full support of CAPE's researchers and advisors.

