

**Michael Dewing** – Next question please

**Michael Zinck** – My question is you've all referred to governance, to a change in governance and that Local Leaders would have more I guess more input in the say of the organization. Could you speak to that directly. How would Local Leaders, such as myself as President and other local Presidents, how would you change the structure such that we have actual decision-making ability or much stronger input than we have now - which is which is honestly essentially none. We don't have it, unless we're sitting at the National Executive we really don't have it. The Local Leaders meeting, as identified as an example this year will be from two to four o'clock. Its' truly more an information session. Nothing we're going to approve or pass there will be passed on to the AGM or the NEC for decision-making so how would you change the structure so that when I come to a Local Leaders meeting with the Local Leaders it will actually mean something in terms of what we say will turn out to policy or action of some sort. Thank you.

**Michael Dewing** – Derek would you like to go first?

**Derek Brackley** - Thank you, yes. As President, I will consult with the Local Leaders and come up with a way of doing this. I don't want to say that I have all the answers. I want to go through a consultation but a couple of, one idea is to have a position on the National Executive Committee which is held by a Local Leader that's selected by the group of Local Leaders. So what that would do is give a direct connection - everybody has a say on who is on the Executive but that only comes once every two years for each position. A more immediate link to the Local Leaders would be to have a member, a representative of the Local Leaders on the NEC and it could be a voting member. There's no reason we couldn't do that, that would be certainly one solution. Thank you.

**Michael Dewing** – Clayton.

**Clayton Therrien** - I think if we had greater local autonomy for those locals that have to work with all like yours, Health Canada, TRs, Statcan and DFAIT - numerous locals that do have lots of strength to begin with through numbers in organization. I think they should be able to have a say at the NEC table, to have some voice there to be able to say well look out in PEI or out in wherever - West we have particular problems that we need addressed and we want a fifty thousand dollar solution and we're willing to pay for it, that's what I'm talking about. If you want to garner resources. that's fine with me – that's the type of autonomy I'm looking at – that you have a relationship with the NEC or on the NEC, however it works out but I'd look at more local autonomy and the other thing is, if I was President, you would see me out at your hometown much more often.

**M. Dewing** – thank you - José

**José Aggrey** - yes, first of all thank you Michael for bringing this question up because I wanted to share with you that when I was Chair of the Constitution, I was the one that introduced that concept of having local of having meetings with the Local Leaders to approve budget, we never had that. You can go back to the predecessors of our organization. So I hold that as an important mechanism to introduce or to bring in ideas from all around our locals in the country. So I, I've always felt that by having a Local Leadership meeting you'll get input from them in order to make decisions that is broadly based. Now, in terms of the concept I have it's not the only solution in terms of the concepts that I have for more participation by the Local Leaders, is this, if we have a different structure of governance and here is just an example, the governance structure that I'm thinking of is would be based on delegated bodies and the delegated bodies would be, people who would be selected from their regions or locals to come to a convention to have the power of decision making, to make decisions when they are at the convention, not just decisions made by the NEC, the NEC would be part of that body and there will also be representatives who are not Local Leaders like Presidents or Vice-Presidents or stewards who'll be part of this delegated body. It's a concept that I think we can examine and to see whether it will work for our organization. This way, decisions made by us will be broadly based as opposed to decisions made by either the executive or an executive with the Local Leaders so that's the concept that I would propose. Thank you.

**Michael Dewing** – Thank you very much José - Richard.

**Richard Oslund** - Well, first of all Local Leadership meetings – three a year, one in February to discuss election by-law amendments before the deadline for such changes and other matters arising. One in June to discuss the budget and not just ten percent of the budget, the way the package said this year, everything, everything that the Association spends will be on the table another in September to discuss issues not covered in the first two and I will as the person calling the meeting, I'll insist that it is chaired by a Local Leadership, by a Local Leader. I actually suggested this, this year, but the Local Leader wasn't available and I'll ask the people present to have motions and make decisions for passing on to the NEC. Not just a list of things people might have said with no particular identification of who was saying it. I'll encourage Local Leaders to take part in the – the ICMS, the Informal Conflict Management System, so that they have something to do rather than just pass on information handed down from the national office. I'll also encourage them to take part in first level grievance hearings, so that they – they're the people who work beside you. They know your working conditions better than anyone else and they're the person, they're the people best qualified and if that doesn't work then we call in the LRO's because that's a limited resource and we should be using them as effectively as possible. Thanks.

**Michael Dewing** – Thank you – we have another question.

**Carol Card** - Carol Card, TR Director on the National Executive Committee. We know that we've had a dues increase. My consider it a minimum one that maybe barely got our heads above water. We know that there are some additional costs probably facing us in the future with the new legislation on the appointments process, with the imposed consultations with the Informal Conflict Management System, the EC conversion and so on. I would like to know from each of you how you see our financial situation evolving - whether you see the need for a new dues increase or whether you see cutting costs as the optimum way to deal with what I assume are going to be increasing costs, say within the next two years and more.

**M. Dewing** – Thank you – Clayton would you like to go first on this one.

**Clayton Therrien** - Sure, Sure. On staffing I think with the reduction recourse of avenues recourse they're, well the costs are going to go down because there's going to be less grievances plainly. There may be more complex grievances because there's human rights legislation that now can be grieved but that has yet to be tested. So in general staffing recourse I think that unless there's maybe there'll be problems trying to implement case law but I think with the lack of recourse that we've had that we now have I think that costs will be going down there. ICMS I think again at least from the evidence I see at Statcan is that it's actually decreased the number of grievances, that people go, can talk and then they do file formal grievance too and just to be sure and be covered but I think it's reducing the cost again of some of the job of our LRO's. With EC conversion yep we're going to need a Classification Officer for at least a year for all of the EC's. That might be a buck a piece per month and that's about all I can say right now. Thank you.

**Michael Dewing** – Thanks - José would like to comment on this one?

**José Aggrey** - Yes, a couple of things. First of all we made a projection in terms of our budget for a Classification Officer, in case, there are many issues or challenges arising from the conversion. If and when we should need more resources for another Classification Officer I think we make a budget for it. But more importantly you may have seen the budget. This year, at least we are in the black but subsequent years there's a question mark. So if you look at the long term operations of the organization there is going to be a need for us to have a dues increase. Now what form of a dues increase, I don't know. The Executive has approved at least in principal that we look at the issue of dues increase over the long term, medium and long term and that's something we'll have to do immediately the new executive is elected.

**Michael Dewing** - Thank you – Richard.

**Richard Oslund** - Thanks for raising this point Carol. As you know the first 91 percent dues increase was turned down and in the fall we were looking at how we can fix our balance so that it's balanced and I found myself in the bizarre situation of being the person trying to get the largest increase on the NEC. I was proposing a twelve dollar increase per month and I had to fight off two amendments that were trying to reduce

that figure. One of them was quite substantial reduction but it passed just barely and that balanced our budget for this year and there's a tiny deficit next year with the hiring of another LRO and a Classification Officer. But I'm very confident that we can free up money, first of all by finding a sub-tenant. If we found a sub-tenant for twenty percent of our office space that would save a hundred and forty thousand dollars which is almost enough to hire two junior LROs, including their benefits and office expenses. So I'm very confident we can meet the challenges with the current dues structure. Thanks.

**M. Dewing** – Thanks - Derek

**Derek Brackley** - Thank you. Clearly, we have to look at sub-letting. That's the instructions from the NEC and it makes sense, at least in the short term and we need to successfully sub-let that part of our floor. I would think that with Clayton, unlike Clayton's judgment that grievances will go down, I think actually especially on the staffing process they're likely to go up. What's going to happen - yes there's only two grounds for appealing appointments but the grounds - one of the grounds is abuse of authority and that's as yet undefined, and as that gets defined through grievances we'll find out what it is that we can actually grieve around abuse of authority. In terms of the classification reform and the new EC category, we will hire a Classification Officer; it's built into the budget for next year. The budget is going to be about a hundred thousand dollars in the red next year and so that will be something that the next executive will have to deal with. We do have some money in the bank so I think there are larger things that are going to have an effect on that, are we going to have a downsizing, therefore a decrease in revenue. When you have a downsizing people tend to grieve less because there's an awful lot of fear so that's not a good thing. Perhaps our membership will actually go up because the government wants to do more policy and that will solve all the problems. And that's something we had sort of throughout the nineties in SSEA and coming into the merger we had an increase in membership. We didn't have to raise the dues because our membership kept going up so our revenues kept going up. We don't control management, we don't control what management does, we don't control what management creates for our members and therefore the level of grievances they have, so we have to keep a watchful eye on this. I'm reasonably optimistic in the short term and next couple of years and after that we'll have to address the situation. Thank you.

**Michael Dewing** – Thank you

**Member** - Concerning lobbying what I'd like to know from the four candidates is what are their philosophies for lobbying? Is their philosophy political and biological philosophy or take a position for a political party or against one party? Or is it only to defend the union interests in the public forum without taking a position?

**Derek Brackley** - Lobbying has got to be a very effective process. It's got to be one where you first of all develop an understanding of the networks and who's in power and what their ability is to influence the situation and to talk to the right people, bring the

information to the table, be persuasive that can be done with any party, it can be done with senior officials or the politicians and that's where we have to go and as far as taking a position that supports one party or another, first of all it would create huge problems for one of our bargaining units because they work in Parliament and second I don't think it'll be all that useful for the membership overall, the constitution says we do things that are in the interests of members and I think that in the best interests of our members, we need to endeavor to stay close to those who are in power in a way that we are networking with them we know where they're coming from, they know where we are coming from but not that we are taking political sides or endorsing one party or another.

**M. Dewing** – Clayton.

Sure. I've made it fairly clear a number of times that I'm non partisan as far as my advocacy is and would be. I believe in this approach that its one of the few things I agree with the PSAC on, is that they had worked with Richard Nadeau and sent out the invitation to me and a number of other local labour leaders to go down and support the legislation and to meet afterwards and I believe that maybe CUPTE had done things like that as well, is that you go down and meet and maybe wine and cheese or you have a handshake with those people that support the legislation that you support but its issue by issue and again, same with working with other bargaining agents, I would want to work , well obviously with our fair kin, PSAC and PIPS and any other member of the NJC, bargaining agent side of the NJC that there are (inaudible) communications is, go local, go where those politicians are, anybody that's on that list of friends of labour, hit them at home, get on the radio there, put in ads in the local newspapers, here we got a lot, we got eighty five percent we're local here, our membership was eighty five percent here in the NCR so if we start putting advertisements in the Ottawa Citizen we're gonna be getting some kind of awareness at least from that kind of movement. Thank you.

**M. Dewing** – Thanks a lot - José

yes, first of all I think it's not politically wise to align ourselves with one political party. Primarily because, as you know, parties change, parties get into power, parties get defeated so if you align yourself with one party and its not in power it creates a difficulty for you. But primarily, effective lobbying is knowing the powers, the corridors of power, knowing who's out there, who has the leverage, who can effectively help your cause whether their in a position or not you can have a position raising questions for you in the house and making the government look bad and getting some results so it's a question of knowing how to play with the political parties and the powers and the corridor of powers, being able to assess who it is that are gonna be effectively help your cause. m you start off also by providing information about yourselves and this is why I think CAPE needs to have a document that provides a profile an image and what it is that we do for Canadians to ensure that people understand and with that document in our hands we can then effectively lobby, by meeting as I say with the Clerk of the Privy Council, meeting with politicians, whether they be Minister's or local MPs and we've done this in the past, looking at the legislation m the m .. O.K. I'll stop.

**M. Dewing** – Thank you- Richard.

Well first of all I'd like to say that I agree we don't really have the luxury of backing one political party because they do change so often. If you're the United Autoworkers it might make sense for you to actively support one party and their candidates but we work for the government and we work for these people and I just don't think it's wise but I do think there are times when we can do very effective lobbying for example, unfortunately he just left the room, but Luc Gervais, the President of the Translation Bureau Local found out about a rumour of a plan to move about four hundred TRs out of the national Capital and he was able to alert the national office and provide very cogent reasons of why that's not a very good move, not just because the members didn't want to move but because it didn't make sense economically and I think that's the sort of lobbying we can do effectively. Thanks.

**M. Dewing** – I think we have time for one or two more questions – its nearly 8:00 o'clock. What do people think? Keep going O.K. well we got a question here.

**Michael Zinck** – I want to congratulate Carl on being acclaimed as the Vice-President and now my question to the four of you is one of you'll be the President What are you going to have the Vice-President do? What duties and responsibilities would you delegate to the Vice-President and what is going to be his role in this union aside from standing in for meetings when you are not available? Thank you.

**M. Dewing** – Alright where were we – who started first last time – Richard how would you like to go first?

Well the first thing I'll do is sit down with the VPs, because they are after all Vice-President's and their the person who stands in for the President most often and I'll ask them what roles their comfortable with, what particular issues are important to them, what they would like to work on and I'll take it from there but I see a much larger role for the Vice-President's m and for all the members of the NEC but specifically for the Vice-President's and that would be my first approach.

**M. Dewing** – Thank you – Derek.

I think an awful lot can be done in terms of liaison with locals and that's would be, where I would ask the VPs to turn their efforts m and not just Carl, but also Lionel so I just wanted to recognize that. And also there are issues and issues come up and issues can be dealt with. We can have issue champions on the executive, people who would actually take responsibility for exploring an issue m coming up with alternatives and proposals for the NEC on different issues so those would be the two areas that I would have in mind but I'd also want to talk with the VPs and find out what their interests are and their areas of expertise. Thank you.

**M. Dewing** – Thank you – Clayton.

I think the TR vp would have a very special role in that again he would be overseeing a large group, its homogenous coast to coast, there's a lot of people to see, there's groups that need to be represented there m there are a lot of issues and I have no intention of absorbing the that - or changing the structure of that local but m I think that the TR VP would be extremely important that I think that as far as working I'm just gonna say that I have worked with Carl for a couple of years we talk together all the time and we get along fine, we have different philosophies but we get along just fine and I think that if there are.. – I know that Carl has particular items that he'd like to advance I know that the form of the youth committee was one of his ideas actually and I think that he probably could have provided some criteria and some vision for that for that particular committee rather than just saying – here have a committee so that's where I'd like to go Thank you.

**M. Dewing** – Thanks – José.

yes, a couple of things while I agree with my colleagues that an expanding responsibility for the Vice-President is important and it's appropriate. First I disagree with you Clayton, the youth idea wasn't Carl's idea but lets put that aside second I think the most important thing is not to put the cart before the horse as they say. I think what we need to do is first of all find out what structure of governance within that, then you can identify extra rules or responsibilities for the Vice-President without that you'll be just creating positions which may be of variance of the Constitution. The Constitution is the document that helps us to operate the organization if you include in the Constitution, that the Vice-President's will do A, B or C, that will be his or her responsibility and so while I recognize the expanded responsibility for the Vice-President, I think we should wait until we define the structure, the governance structure of the organization and then identify the rules accordingly.

**M. Dewing** - Thank you and another question over here.

A question for all the candidates. Are you in favour of co-operative activities with your counterpart in other public sector unions and if so could you describe to us two sorts of activities that you would see m involving CAPE in terms of our fellow federal public unions?

**M. Dewing** – Derek, would you like to go first on this one please?

So there are a number of activities that the unions do co-operate on and around the National Joint Council especially so there's a fair bit of co-operation already and I would certainly support that as a I don't know whether that counts as one of my two (inaudible) but I think the other activities would be supporting the notion of the public service as a valuable component of our society especially if this quotes new government becomes the new new government and m engages in a downsizing exercise so we need to demonstrate the value of the public service. Second, we're coming up for bargaining round next year when virtually all the collective agreements expire exactly at the same

time and while the the while the unions don't see things the same way at the very least we should be talking to each other and m being informed of what each other are doing so we don't blindsides one another while we're doing it and that different from group bargaining I'm not suggesting that I 'm suggesting that we are going to be talking to each other and being aware of what each other are doing. Thank you.

**M. Dewing** – Thanks – Clayton,

Yeah I have quite a bit of experience working with the other organizations, the GLBT issue was thrown over to me from PIPS and PSAC I've championed that on their behalf again because we have the numbers and we get the attention of the Chief Statistician m a lot of what I would be co-operating on is communications and media m if we could if there is as some speculate that there might be a new new government m in that case we may very well have to put on a big awareness show and in order to do that you have to go to the bigger media, go to television and things like that and things I don't think we can afford ourselves things we'd have to partner with other groups and so m m that's part of it I know the NJC is a very important part of our well our negotiations because that's really where all our benefits are are decided but m I was kind of disappointed in the Chairmen yeah the secretary said the NJC is the greatest secret treasurer that there is in the public service because I think maybe they should be advertising themselves on our behalf.

**M. Dewing** – Thank you – José .

That's an extremely important question. I don't know what your name is Sir?

**Member - Charles.**

Charles - Thank you for that question. Yes we do have meetings and joint activities at the National Joint Council but more importantly I think it was Ghislain who made a point about how we should as professionals show our professionalism or have a profile, here are two things that I've initiated, first of all, we have all talked about bargaining and whenever there's a perceptible difference between one rate or agreement and another we get upset and I'm talking about generally all employees I mean public service union members, but here's something, I have met with the President of PIPS, Michèle Demers to discuss exactly an issue that pertains to all of us, and that is, if you look at the way we collective bargaining when PIPS or when PSAC particularly goes for bargaining all our rates are tied to PSAC and yet we consider ourselves professionals, which means, before the Employer there is no distinction between us and them. So what we decided to do is to look at a strategy where we can mobilize ourselves and put our case before Treasury Board and the powers (inaudible) to show them there ought to be a difference by virtue of what we do, our contributions, and by virtue of the fact that there's an investment in all of us as professional so that's one important thing that we are looking at, secondly, cooperation by way of looking at (inaudible) purchases with losing the autonomy of each union. For example, if you all purchased something call it



m materials office materials we might get it cheaper there are other things but in the interest of time I will stop.

**M. Dewing** – Thank you Richard.

Yeah well first of all we should be cooperating with the other unions through the NJC on the various directives that are signed and which form major parts of our collective agreements for example, if we want better dental benefits we have to work in concert with the other public sector unions so that's a very important avenue of co-operation and secondly there are court cases that are very expensive but have potentially huge payoffs that unions can go in on collectively. The best example of that is our current challenge of the Employers truly shocking thundering of our pension fund. That court case is gonna takes years and hundreds of thousands of dollars but its very important for our members that we pursue it. And the best way to do that is by pooling our resources because that action effects pretty well the retirees and future retirees in practically in every union. Thanks

**M. Dewing** – Do you have a question?

(Interpretation)

Claude Poirier and I'm the current President of the TR Local and not Luc. The Translation Bureau Local is quite a different local from coast to coast from Vancouver to Newfoundland, we have one member in Newfoundland but non the less there is one member there and all of the translators, interpreters and terminologist and a few EC members are working for the translation bureau and my question is for all of the candidates. We have an election campaign lastly approximately six months and one can imagine that if there is a new President elected its going to take that person as least six months to come up to speed and given the length of time do you have anything to say on the mandate which is a two year mandate.

**M. Dewing** – thanks – Clayton.

I suppose if I won I'd like it to be longer. Like Carl there's certain issues with incumbency and so on that we might want to deal with as well and I hope that is sorted out at some point and decided once and for all whether we want to keep supporting the incumbents , having a structure that supports incumbents m so that's the rationale thing you've got the elections, you have all the AGMs happening at once and there's just a natural advantage unfortunately

**M. Dewing** – thanks – Jose.

Claude it's one issue that hasn't come up that much but I can assure you if I win the Presidency, part of the governance structure will be to look at the term of office because I do know maybe an unfair comparison but almost all the other unions have three year or four year terms but it is only our that is two years and again m I know when I make

references, some people get upset but I will say it anyways, when I was Chair of the Constitution Committee I want to change that because I felt that it did not give a new President enough time to set his own or her own course to understand the mechanisms of the workings of the organization. A two year term is really (inaudible) and part of what I consider a maturation of our organization is to move away from some of things that are no longer tenable so that's a very good point.

**M. Dewing** – Richard.

(Interpreter)

First of all Claude , I'd like to apologize personally when I talk about rumours of moving to Moncton, I was referring to the summer of 2005 and when Luc was the Chair of the Local but I really know that you are now the Chair of the Local I haven't forgotten that, I am aware of that. I have nothing against a two year mandate and I don't believe that I, I believe that most of the members do not even realize that we have elections every two years given the number of people who are in attendance tonight, in any event, m and a two year mandate, this evening, the Americans are electing members of the house of representatives and their mandate is a two year mandate. I think that I can work with that and I intend to start very quickly in January. Thank you.

**M. Dewing** – thank you very much – Derek

First of all I just want to let you know we have currently a three month election process, we changed it, it was a five and half months our President wanted to make it six months but we were successful in reducing it to three months. m in terms of the length of the mandate I guess the thing is that the members have to decide through a constitutional amendment . Would I be in favour of three years, I think so but I would also be in favour of term limits and I think that under two year mandate I think three terms would be enough and under a three year mandate two terms would be enough. I think six years of probably one President is enough and if members want to change half way through then that's just fine with me. Thank you.

**M. Dewing** – We have another question.

**Carl Lakaski** – My question has to do with collective bargaining the past round of bargaining seem to have produced what a lot of people were pleased with I know Jose has claimed personal credit for that result and this puzzles me a little bit and this question is to all of you. We got 2.5 percent Treasury Board gave non unionized employees 2.5 percent. So what exactly did we get out of that? Not only that pensioners in terms of an indexed pension, our pensioners that is from the public service got 2.8 percent so their doing better with indexed pensions then we are with our collective bargaining strategy so I'm a little puzzled as to why people are proud and happy with that kind of result. Not only that, the result puts us in a very bad position that means as it as admitted we're all going to be coming to the table basically at the same time during the next round of collective bargaining I'd like to know, what your strategy or what – any

thoughts you have about the collective bargaining strategy aside from praising Claude Danik, which you all seem to have done, Richard being perhaps offering the only alternative to having him head the bargaining strategy again, without him do you have any other ideas, any innovative ways that you might want to proceed because as far as I'm concerned 2.5 percent cannot be considered a victory for a union. Thank you.

**M. Dewing** – Jose would you like to start?

yes thank you. First of all let me make it clear that I'm not claiming sole responsibility for it. I worked behind the scenes I was hoping that I had my notes with me next time I will show you the notes, the days etcetera the strategy that we've used let me put it this way, the negotiator and I had a different strategy and this is what brought the results I can share with you the details later but but I think what is important that you realize we almost as I mentioned we duck tailed our negotiations or what we get from Treasury Board is usually what they give to the lead group which is PSAC and this is why I just mentioned to you in terms of strategy, Pips, the President of PIPS and I have met to develop a strategy as a matter of fact PIPS has taken an initiative way before us. What they are doing is having a workshop to discuss exactly that and what I was told by Michele is that after the discussion the workshop she will meet with me to give me a summary of what transpired and to see how we can collaborate to raise our profile before Treasury Board to ensure that we are recognized as professionals. That's part of the strategy until that m when you talk about the fact that we're all going to the table at the same time, our strategy is not to go before PSAC I think it's important that they go before us so that at least we can get what they get without us falling behind and always trying to do a catch up.

**M. Dewing** – Thanks - Richard.

m first of all I'd like to talk about leadership most people don't believe this but I was actually in the army and an officer and the first thing you're taught is officers don't eat until all the men have eaten, officers don't go to bed until the men are tucked in their bunks and as union President I won't accept any increase in my salary above the lowest increase that has been won for a member of our bargaining units during my term m I'll start at the bottom of the pay scale which all of our members start that's going to save the union 25 thousand dollars a year which we'll put towards an LRO. I think that the Chair of a bargaining should be a member of that committee so that he or she has a vested interest in the outcome of the bargaining I think it will make them bargaining that much harder if they share the gains won for the member s I'm not to excited about the 2.5 percent increase that I won as a member of the TR group it seems like an awful lot of money we spend for the union tog et a result that is no different than non-unionized members get and I think we should do better.

**M. Dewing** - Derek–

With respect to the 2 nd half percent that the non-unionized members received, which was the same as unionized members received, I'd say that the non-unionized people

got 2 and half percent because the union people got 2 and half percent and that their riding on our coattails. Is two and half percent enough? No, two and half percent is not enough. We need as I was saying discuss with other unions, co-ordinate with other unions and be on board with them and beyond that we need to do some things that we have done in the past which is add a step to the pay scale that can be done. There are there are unions I believe in Quebec that have a once you reach the top of the scale you add two percent or whatever per year in addition to the general increase which is a way of keeping on the job which is going to be an issue over the next little while so m there are ways to do this m the m Financial Officers just signed an agreement and it something in it as well that's in addition to the general increase and that the way you do i. treasury Board has to have that general increase to give to everybody and then we would have to negotiate. In terms of what is that our group can add to that agreement that's in addition to whatever everybody else gets because yes we do need to have more because our wages have been going down. Thank you

**M. Dewing** – thanks – Clayton

Yeah I do wish that we kept up with the cost of living m and in just simply indexed and didn't have to go the table that would be nice I suppose, save us some time but there's just I believe that Claude explained it to us in that there's just a pot of money there O.K. here it is how you guys gonna divide it up, maybe you're going to spend more on the lower end with the larger increase and give less to the higher end – there's all sort of things you can do I suppose if you just got a (inaudible ) amount we have to go toward the benefits because that's really where unions are paying off and I gotta friend out in Alberta he's working in the oil patch he's going as hard as he can he's a native guy so he doesn't have to pay the taxes but he's going to go on the union because he know the benefits are, right? And its as simple as that and that's the way we gotta go more vacation time and this generation, unlike the last is really looking for more time than money.

**M. Dewing** – Are there more questions? In keeping with – like I said we want to transcribe this and get it up on the web as soon as possible. Perhaps, we'll wrap it up by 8:30. a ocuple more questions that way we'll be able to get by the time we transcribe and have it translated and up on the web its going to take a while so we have another question?

(Interperter)

Yes in fact, this is just following on what we just talked about given the possibility that next year, it's a possibility and I'd like to under score that – that we have a majority conservative government which would have restrictive policies in terms of salary increases. Suppose such a government where to give as its instructions not to grant any salary increases ridiculous salary increases what would be the general strategy for CAPE m if one of you were to be President given such a scenario?

**M. Dewing** - Richard would you like to start this one off?

Yeah yeah well I haven't really had time to think about this one. It's a hypothetical question. I don't know if the conservatives are going to win and if they win I don't know that they're going to introduce a wage freeze in the mid nineties what we did was concentrate on other options in what we all know what happened we were held back there really was nothing we could do in but we did manage to nip around the edges and improve benefits and if it's the law of the land that we can't have a salary increase I don't know if there's really anything much that the union can do beside break the law in its up to the members to decide whether they want to go the route that opens the possibility to strike I'll respect their decision certainly but if they decide they want to avoid that possibility then I'll respect that decision too.

**M. Dewing** – Derek.

Yeah I think that first of all, we would coordinate with other unions (inaudible). Second and perhaps, more generally, I think that the federal public service unions should be engaging in a constitutional challenge that particular issues might provoke it but maybe we should do it anyway in that there are a number of things the federal public service unions are not able to negotiate which unions in other segments of our society are able to negotiate so is it reasonable that the federal government is in a prejudicial to its own workers. It's not a reasonable circumstance and we've lived with this for a long time and I think maybe especially if there's a 0 increase mandate then maybe it's time to challenge that and if that was the case then 0 increase we could do such things as in take them to the board and say that is a unfair practice, there are a number of approaches that we could devise.

**M. Dewing** – Thanks Clayton

Well unfortunately again this is the law, so I agree with Richard either you break it or you can comply again the strategy is to go for other things just the same as with the (inaudible) pot of money, you go for other things, more time ensure that your pension benefits are not being eroded, with the last pension case we should be able to learn something from that in as far as and again I'm just borrowing here you got to cooperate with other unions the unions in the NJC but I'm a little more hopeful because I think the labour market is on our own side there's so many people that are going out west and fleeing here and and and out we see members and members every day there's more and more retirements and we expect entire divisions to be cleaned out. Ours is a hundred and fifty persons and we expect at least 70 percent to be gone within the year and there not replacing them as quickly as they did so the work still has to get done I would be more concerned about off shoring or contracting out that work.

**M. Dewing** – Thanks – Jose.

Mike before I answer the questions are you going to give us two minutes to make our closing comments? I think that was the plan.

**M. Dewing** – (laughter) No but sure that sounds good if everyone

(inaudible )

Let me try and answer Andre's questions. I think it is a very difficult question to answer primarily because we're looking into the future and right now its difficult to determine whether the conservatives will get a majority or not but let me share with you what I know, while I do not trust the governments because they will say anything to please you I do know they have a different philosophy coming into the next election. The conservatives will do their damndest best to avoid a friend in the electorate, particularly since they do have two or three of the powerful Ministers coming from our region. I'll leave it at that but m let me make a couple of comments on the strategy on going into any negotiations. We determine the demands from our members if our members say we want more money, we strike for it, if they say they want more holidays , we strike for that so that something that has been determined by the whole and if we are faced with the situation where we cannot get more money we'll have to go back to the members and ask what else would you like but before we do that honestly you know we do have a survey the survey tells us everything that our members want we determine by ranking the first second third priorities or demands and based upon that if we are unable to get number one then we will try and see if we can get number two and that's how our negotiations are done and almost all the time you go back to the negotiating team or the committee to define other possible demands in place of other things you couldn't get.

**M. Dewing** – Thank you in keeping with the idea this all needs to be translated and transcribed and everything I think people will be able to read whats already been said. Anymore more questions. NO O.K. Thank you very much for coming and that's it. Thank you.