

Canadian Association of Professional Employees



CAPE ANNUAL REPORT
2009 - 2010

Table of Contents

President's Message	2
The 2010 Budget	4
Collective Bargaining	5
EC Conversion	7
The Charter Challenge	8
The Public Service Pension Plan	10
The Pension Appeal	13
PSMA Review	14
The Census Issue	19
Representation and Consultation	20
Electronic Mailings	24
Training	24
CAPE Committees	25
Local Leadership	32
Membership Distribution	35
National Office	37

President's Message


Dear colleagues,

Some people complain that their work never changes, that it brings no surprises... Most union presidents these days can't complain about that. The Employer keeps us busy and is always looking for a new curve ball to throw at us. After breaking away from the bargaining tradition and imposing its final offer in 2008, after sending, through allies such as the C.D. Howe Institute, all sorts of distorted messages on the Public Service Pension in 2009, it then launched a new series of Program and Strategic Reviews, as a direct consequence of the March 2010 Federal Budget.



CAPE was not to let these events go by without reacting. We know for a fact that our members deliver essential services and programs to the Canadian population. We also know that our members are trained professionals whose skills are in great demand in the Public Service as well as in the private sector. Such dedicated employees deserve to be treated well. It is very sad that the Employer, who happens to be the Canadian government, does not seem to realize it. CAPE will keep reminding the Employer of the importance of a professional and competent Public Service.

On another front, we have undertaken a review of how we communicate with you, with other unions, with the media, with MPs and with the general public. In this year's annual report you will read about the work of our committees and how they will change the way CAPE operates as well as the image we project. We are professionals. We provide the Government with the data, the analysis and the advice they need to make informed decisions. We give the Government the necessary tools and services to communicate in both official languages. We then should be seen as experts and this is the image we have been and will be working on: we are knowledge workers on which you can always rely to get the true story, always based on facts.



This report will also give you an update on the major files that have kept us busy. Of course, one of these was the threat to our pension plan. We published two issues of *Professional Dialogue* on the subject: one rebutting the C.D. Howe Institute study, the other one setting the facts straight on the myth of the Cadillac pension plan.

The update will also provide information on our *Charter* challenge, on the Pension appeal, on the *Public Service Modernization Act* five-year review, on the long form Census, on collective bargaining, on the EC conversion and the policy grievance, etc.

Keeping yourself informed, through this report, as well as through the *Professional Dialogue* or the CAPE website, is the best way for you to know what we are doing for you and what is happening in our relationship with the Employer. The Public Service has been under repeated attacks over the last few years and the circulation of information is the first response. Mobilizing against these attacks is the next step.

I hope you enjoy reading this Annual Report as much as we enjoyed preparing it for you. ●

Claude Poirier
CAPE President

The 2010 Budget

The 2010 budget document revealed that no additional funds would be given to departments and agencies to address the 1.5% wage increases scheduled for this fiscal year. Departments and agencies would have to find those funds in their own coffers by whatever means necessary, including workforce reorganization. There are ongoing concerns that this may result in the use of lay-offs.

The pensions were not implicated, but that does not mean that they are safe from manipulation in the next budget. In fact, it is fully anticipated that some changes will be made to the federal public service pension plan in any one of the upcoming annual budget announcements.

As CAPE President Claude Poirier observed, *“The members are concerned about possible*

In anticipation of the presentation of the 2010 Budget, the Education and Mobilization Committee convened a Special General Meeting of the CAPE membership in order to review the budget and discuss possible implications.



future attacks on their pensions, and the impact of the restraints on their wages, benefits and workloads, and they are legitimate concerns. We must remain vigilant – CAPE will be very engaged with the employer when it comes to examining ways to make up for the budgetary restraints other than pillorying the federal public service pension plans.”

For further information on CAPE’s reaction to the 2010 Budget, please see CAPE’s “Education and Mobilization Committee” on page 25. ●

Collective Bargaining:

In the fall of 2008 all bargaining agents who were sitting at bargaining tables with the employer were presented with a non-negotiable "final offer" and the threat of legislated wage freezes, possibly with lesser increments, if the agreements were not ratified. The effect of the agreements was essentially the same as a wage control, with employees seeing economic increases over the four years of the agreements of 2.3% for the first year, and 1.5% for the next three consecutive years. The wage controls imposed by C-10 (Expenditures Restraint Act) expire on March 31, 2011.

EC and TR Collective Bargaining

In the last round of EC collective bargaining CAPE again put the issue of EC conversion on the table, with the hopes of negotiating pay rates and rules affecting pay on movement of employees to new EC levels resulting from the conversion. You will recall that in 2006, CAPE had agreed to a one-year collective agreement as the conversion exercise had not sufficiently progressed to allow us to address these two issues.

We can now share with you what transpired at the bargaining table, since the information of what took place became public when CAPE's policy grievance on the application of Article 27.07 of the collective agreement (see "EC Conversion – The Grievance", on page 7 for more information on the policy grievance) was heard by the Public Service Labour Relations Board (PSLRB). In the spring of 2008, CAPE's bargaining team presented its proposal on pay rates to the Treasury Board's bargaining team: it included a position on wage adjustments, the effects of conversion on relativity with the private market and rules affecting pay on movement of employees to



new EC levels resulting from the conversion. CAPE's proposals dealt with internal and external pay relativity with the private labour market and with other public service groups for the EC bargaining unit. At that time, the Treasury Board's bargaining team indicated it did not have a mandate yet for its position on rates of pay for conversion and would strive to get one by September. Come that month, a meeting was held on September 24 during which CAPE was informed that the employer's bargaining team had still not received a mandate to deal with conversion pay issues. As indicated above, we were presented in November 2008 with a non-negotiable "final offer". The pay rates

and rules affecting pay on movement of employees to new EC levels resulting from the conversion were never negotiated.

Consequently, in July 2009, CAPE filed a policy grievance based on the employer's refusal to negotiate. Again, see "EC Conversion – The Grievance" on page 7.

The Next Rounds

The TR agreement expires April 11, 2011, the EC collective agreement expires on June 21, 2011.

There has been much speculation as to why the employer has approached the collective bargaining process in such a manner, and at the timing of their approach.

At the time of this writing, CAPE has yet to be extended the same invitation to return to the bargaining tables as the Public Service Alliance of Canada (PSAC) and the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada (PIPSC) received from Treasury Board in September of this year. There has been much speculation as to why the employer has approached the collective bargaining process in such a manner, and at the timing of their approach. Having received no such invitation to return, early, to the bargaining tables, CAPE will continue on its previously charted course for the next



round of collective bargaining set to begin in the spring of 2011.

Library of Parliament Collective Bargaining

The collective agreement for the Library of Parliament bargaining unit expires on June 15, 2011.

Electronic Survey

During the last round of collective bargaining with the Library of Parliament, CAPE conducted a pilot electronic survey with our members in this bargaining unit, with the hopes of implementing similar collective bargaining surveys on a larger scale with CAPE TR and EC members. As a result, this round of bargaining will see members of each bargaining unit invited to participate in on-line collective bargaining surveys. ●

EC Conversion – The Grievance

*As outlined in the Collective Bargaining article on page 5 of this Annual Report, despite the employer having given every indication of good faith and intent to arrive at an agreement regarding the rates of pay and rules affecting pay on movement of employees to new EC levels resulting from the conversion – **these critical aspects of the conversion were never negotiated...***

In July 2009 CAPE filed a policy grievance based on the employer's refusal to negotiate.

Article 27.07 of the EC Collective Agreement reads:

If, during the term of this Agreement, a new classification standard for a group is established and implemented by the Employer, the Employer shall, before applying rates of pay to new levels resulting from the application of the standard, negotiate with the Association the rates of pay and the rules affecting the pay of employees on their movement to the new levels.

CAPE's position is that, having failed to abide by the collective agreement, the employer has clearly violated the agreement. The hearing of the policy grievance was held on September 14, 2009. In a decision handed down on October 6, 2009, Ms. Hélène Laurendeau, Assistant Deputy Minister of the Treasury Board, dismissed the grievance. The employer claimed to have met its obligations in accordance with Article 27.07.

CAPE disagreed with the employer's decision and a notice of reference to adjudication of the policy grievance was forwarded to the Public Service Labour Relations Board (PSLRB) on October 7, 2009.

When the notice of reference to adjudication of the policy was given, CAPE had informed the Public Service Labour Relations Board that the Association was ready to participate in a mediation process to attempt to settle the grievance.

Treasury Board informed the PSLRB and CAPE that it considered mediation inappropriate in this case.

The adjudication hearing was held on September 9, 2010 in Ottawa and was heard by Ms. Michele A. Pineau, Vice-Chairperson of the Public Service Labour Relations Board. At the hearing, it was CAPE's position that the language of Article 27.07 of the collective agreement creates an obligation on the employer to negotiate the rates of pay and rules affecting the pay of employees on their movement to the new classification levels since the new EC classification standard was established and implemented by the employer during the term of the collective agreement.

The collective agreement was signed on March 11, 2009 and the new classification standard implemented on June 22, 2009. It was the employer's position that the rates of pay and rules affecting the pay of employees on their movement to the new levels had been negotiated and incorporated in the collective agreement (for more information, please see "Collective Bargaining" on page 5).

The grievance was denied by Ms. Pineau in a decision issued September 27, 2010. Ms. Pineau submitted that, having signed the collective agreement with the EC rates of pay, CAPE agreed that these were, in fact, the newly negotiated rates of pay as reflected the EC Conversion process. At the time of this writing, CAPE is considering the possibility of an appeal. ●

CAPE's *Charter* Challenge – the Legal Saga Continues

In May of 2008, PIPSC and CAPE launched a constitutional challenge seeking to invalidate provisions contained in the Public Service Labour Relations Act prohibiting federal employees from negotiating protections and improvements in a variety of areas, including pensions, classifications and staffing...

The background to this action is as follows...

On June 8, 2007 the Supreme Court of Canada released a decision in *BC Health Services*, where the Court recognized for the first time that the right to collective bargaining is constitutionally protected by the freedom of association guaranteed in s. 2(d) of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedom*. As a result of this decision, restrictions imposed by the *Public Service Labour Relations Act* (PSLRA) on bargaining over important terms and conditions of employment for inclusion in a collective agreement appear to violate the guarantee of freedom of association contained in the *Charter*.

The Supreme Court concluded in *BC Health Services*, the right to collective bargaining cannot be reduced to a mere right to make representations. The necessary implication of the *Public Service Labour Relations Act* is that prohibited matters cannot be adopted into a valid collective agreement, with the result that the process of collective bargaining becomes meaningless with respect to them.

During the most recent round of bargaining, the government still refused to bargain in respect of critical issues such as pensions and job classification systems, and instead purported to rely on the existing legislative restrictions. As a result, the Professional Institute of the



Public Service of Canada (PIPSC) and CAPE decided that a legal challenge was necessary to vindicate the constitutional rights of their members.

PIPSC and CAPEs' position is that the legislative restrictions at issue interfere with our ability to engage in protected associational activity and that Government has substantially interfered with the ability of PIPSC and CAPE members to engage in collective bargaining by enacting these limitations.

During the most recent round of bargaining, the government still refused to bargain in respect of critical issues such as pensions and job classification systems, and instead purported to rely on the existing legislative restrictions.

Section 7 of the *PSLRA* deals with classification. It reads: *Nothing in this Act is to be construed as affecting the right or authority of the Treasury Board or a separate agency to determine the organization of those portions of the federal public administration for which it represents Her Majesty in right of Canada as employer or to assign duties to and to classify positions and persons employed in those portions of the federal public administration.*

Section 7 of the *PSLRA* directly infringes on collective bargaining by removing from the bargaining table, among other issues, the establishment of classifications, instead leaving this to unilateral employer determination.

Section 113 prohibits, among other things, bargaining terms and conditions that have been or may be established under the *Public Service Employment Act* and the *Public Service Superannuation Act*. Staffing and related matters are excluded from collective bargaining, and so is everything that could be related directly or indirectly to pensions.

Sections 150 and 161 preclude bringing to conciliation and arbitration the matters of pension, classification and staffing.

Taken together these provisions of the *PSLRA* represent severe restrictions on the *Charter* rights of CAPE's members and on the *Charter* rights of every single federal public service employee. The legal action undertaken by CAPE and PIPSC, if successful, will compel the government to negotiate pensions, classification and staffing and will restore these rights in practice. ●



The Public Service Pension Plan and the Cadillac Myth

In the fall of 2009 the C.D. Howe Institute issued a report entitled “Supersized Superannuation: The Startling Fair Value Cost of Federal Government Pensions”. CAPE immediately took aggressive action to identify the misleading and erroneous premises upon which this report was based. With the assistance of past President Bill Krause, CAPE issued an analysis of the report, and dedicated the two 2010 editions of the Professional Dialogue to addressing the distortions presented in the C.D. Howe report, and common misconceptions relating to the public service pension plan.

In its report, the C.D. Howe Institute, a conservative think tank, claimed that there was a significant deficit in the pension plans of Canada’s public service, Canadian Forces and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. One of the findings contained in the report was that by using something called alternative valuations and fair-value accounting, they calculated an accumulated deficit of nearly \$522 billion at the end of fiscal year 2008/2009.

After a careful review of the information in the report, and an analysis of the various accounting methods available to the Institute for use in the analysis, it was determined that their use of “fair-value accounting” in fact skewed the figures to the point that they barely reflected reality.

Fair-value accounting is defined as the amount for which an asset could be exchanged or a liability settled between knowledgeable, willing parties, in an arm’s length transaction. Quoted prices in active markets must be used as fair values when available. In the absence of such prices, valuation techniques and all relevant market information should be used. It is allowed to make a significant adjustment to an observed price in order to arrive at a price at which an orderly transaction would take place.

In comparison, under historical cost accounting (HCA), assets and liabilities are recorded

at their values when first acquired. They are not then generally restated for changes in values. Costs recorded in the income statement are based on the historical cost of items sold or used, rather than their replacement costs. Long term prices and rates are frequently averaged over extended periods of time, yielding less volatile results.

*A*mong all federal public
service retirees now
receiving pensions, the
average is less than
\$24,000.00 a year.

In fact, as we pointed out in our analysis, Canada’s Chief Actuary has chosen the more traditional HCA method. Which begged the question, why would an examination of the pension funds not be undertaken using the accounting method by which it is governed?

The media, with few exceptions, took this distorted information and ran with it. At which

point CAPE felt compelled to address the misconceptions surrounding the “Cadillac” public service pension plan...

The Federal Public Service Pension Plan – What it Is and How it Works

The minister responsible for the Public Service Pension Plan is the President of the Treasury Board.

The administrator of the pension plan is the minister of Public Works and Government Services.

The minister of Public Works and Government Services is assisted in the management of the plan by the Public Sector Pension Investment Board (PSP Investments). This is a crown corporation which manages the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the Canadian Forces and the federal public service pension plans’ accumulated employer’s and participants’ net contributions totalling approximately 4 billion dollars. In 2000, the *Public Sector Pension Investment Board Act* amended the plans to provide for the external investment of pension contributions. The moneys are invested in fixed income instruments, Canadian and foreign equities, real estate, private equities, infrastructure, etc. using in-house or external fund managers.

According to the PSP Investments website “PSP Investments’ current ongoing growth contributes to an exciting work environment which fosters innovation, teamwork, as well as development opportunities in all sectors of our organization” – which vastly contradicts the harbingers of doom outlined in the C.D. Howe Institute report.

The Basic Mechanics of the Plan:

Employees appointed on an indeterminate basis (minimum 12 hours per week) or for terms of more than six months start partici-



pating in the plan from the beginning of their employment; term employees (six months or less) begin after completing six months of continuous employment. It is a defined benefit plan.

Prior to age 65, pensions are calculated as follows: 2% X number of years of pensionable service (to a maximum of 35) X average salary for 5 consecutive years of highest paid service. Public service pension plan benefits are reduced automatically by a standard formula at 65 – which is the normal age of eligibility for the Canada Pension Plan (CPP) or the Quebec Pension Plan (QPP). Because all Canadian workers and employers must also contribute to the CPP if they work outside of Quebec, or the QPP if they work in Quebec, both contributions and benefits of the public service pension plan are coordinated with the CPP/QPP.

An unreduced pension is payable at the age of 60, with at least two years of pensionable service, or at the age of 55 with at least 30 years of pensionable service.

In 2010 public service employees contribute 5.5% of their earnings to the pension fund up to the maximum set by the CPP/QPP, and 8.4% of their earnings over the maximum set by the CPP/QPP to the pension fund. CAPE's concern is that this figure may increase in the 2011 federal government budget.

The minimum level, known as the Year's Basic Exemption (YBE), is set at \$3,500; the maximum level is set every year by the CPP/QPP and is known as the Year's Maximum Pensionable Earnings (YMPE). The maximum is adjusted each year in January, based on increases in the average wage. In 2010 this maximum is \$47,200.00.



The pension is indexed, taking into account increases in the cost of living, at the beginning of each calendar year. In 2010 this amounted to a 0.5% increase. The administrators of the plan say "taking into account increases in the cost of living", but a quick referral to the Statistics Canada website advises us that in the 12 months leading up to September 2010, the costs of 7 of the 8 major Consumer Price Index components rose. Transportation costs rose 2%, shelter costs rose 2.4%, food prices increased by 1.6%, household operations costs increased by 1.9%...

At the present time, Treasury Board's authority is limited such that plan member rates cannot exceed 40% of the current service cost of the pension plan.

The Result

Among all federal public service retirees now receiving pensions, the average is less than \$24,000.00 a year.

By Way of Comparison

It's immensely disheartening to compare this \$24,000.00 a year to the pensions received by MPs. MPs' pensions are indexed at a rate of 3.3%. The *minimum* pension is \$28,000.00 but this amount naturally increases with the number of years they are elected. According to information provided on the Canadian Taxpayers Federation website, the average pension earned by politicians who retired or were defeated during the last federal election in 2008 is \$74,890.26 in 2008 dollars. The average severance was \$81,378.34. *That's* a Cadillac plan.

For an indepth analysis of these issues, please visit the CAPE website to view the August 2010 Professional Dialogue, "Federal Public Service Pensions – The Cadillac Myth" at <http://www.acep-cape.ca/EN/publications/>. ●

The Pension Appeal – Another Legal Saga

The Canadian Association of Professional Employees, the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada, the Public Service Alliance of Canada, the Armed Forces Pensions/Annuitants' Association of Canada and RCMP employee associations launched a legal challenge several years ago against pension legislation passed by the government in 1999 – Bill C-78. This legislation allowed the government to appropriate over \$30 billion in pension surplus in the three pension plans – the Public Service Superannuation Plan, the Canadian Forces Superannuation Plan and the RCMP Superannuation Plan. The action, filed in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice, claimed ownership of the pension surplus for federal government employees.

The Ontario Superior Court of Justice disagreed, and an appeal was filed to the Ontario Court of Appeal. The plaintiffs were back in court in April 2010 to pursue the issue of the 30 billion dollar pension fund grab.

The plaintiffs' legal counsel provided an historical summary of the facts, the impact of Bill C-78, and the grounds where they believed the Trial Judge erred in his decision. The plaintiffs' counsel reasserted their fundamental position that the actuarial amortized surplus of the 90's was built on contributions that must remain in the superannuation account. There is a legal interest surrounding the surplus issue.

Legal counsel for the plaintiffs respectfully submitted and argued that the Trial Judge erred in the following areas:

- 1) Superannuation account is not assets;
- 2) Trial Judge acknowledged only that there was a separate account – no separate fund;
- 3) Trial Judge also erred in that he did not declare that all contributions must remain in the account.

Legal counsel for the plaintiffs devoted a good portion of time arguing that the superannuation account was real assets and that the employer breached its fiduciary duty when it allowed the surplus contributions to be used to reduce the debt.

Legal counsel for the Attorney General raised many arguments, the principle one being that the plaintiffs' position is premised on an interpretation that Parliament intended to give an interest and benefit beyond what is inscribed in the legislation itself. Legal counsel for the Attorney General also submitted that the Court of Appeal should not interfere with the decision of the Trial Court based on judicial principles established by the Supreme Court.

On October 8, 2010, the Ontario Court of Appeal dismissed the actions. The parties are examining the decision in order to determine what, if any, future actions will be taken. ●

Legislative Review of the Public Service Modernization Act

Five years after its adoption, the Public Service Modernization Act (PSMA) came under legislative review, and CAPE was asked to provide an assessment of our experience with the administration and operation of the Public Service Employment Act (PSEA) and the Public Service Labour Relations Act (PSLRA) in relation to the original intentions of the PSMA. As we advised the employer...

Regarding the PSEA

The proclaimed objective for enacting the PSMA was to modernize the way human resources management was carried out in the federal public service. The new PSEA was supposedly designed to address concerns of employees and management regarding hiring processes and practices. The main goals were to:

- ▶ Transform the way public servants were hired – by now hiring the “right persons”;
- ▶ Strive to have a public service representative of Canada’s diversity;
- ▶ Transform the way public servants were managed and supported;
- ▶ Focus on learning and development for employees at all levels;
- ▶ Clarify roles and responsibilities and hold managers accountable for their decisions in the hiring processes;
- ▶ Streamline the hiring process by making it faster, more transparent, more accessible, fair, and respectful of employees and to foster effective dialogue between employees and management.

Were these achieved? In a nutshell, not at all.

It is our experience that the concept of “right fit” in hiring decisions is open to abuse and has not led to the stated goal of finding the right person for the job in the majority of situations. Qualifications and ability to actually carry out the responsibilities of the position do not seem to be a priority consideration for staffing decisions. It has become easier for managers to simply confirm acting appointments into positions and abuses in the non-advertised hiring processes seem to be a continuing theme across departments.

On the issue of management accountability for their decisions in the hiring process, the extremely limited grounds for challenging staffing decisions leads to a cynicism amongst employees in the process and a feeling that managers cannot be held accountable for their staffing decisions. Of note, our members conveyed to us the untenable situation they find themselves in when facing an error or perceived abuse of authority in the hiring process. They now have to accuse someone – their current manager or one they would like to go work for – of abusing their authority. They can no longer try to attack a process, but must now accuse a person. This creates conflicts, fear of reprisals and leads in most cases to our members deciding against exercising their rights. Any exercise of such rights is seen as a career limiting move.

In addition, there is an overwhelming consensus that the changes made to the *PSEA* have not led to a faster hiring process as was envisioned under the new legislation. We have heard from many of our members that staffing actions from initial posting to notification of appointment to a staffing pool can take upwards of 14 months and more.


On the issue of transparency, the very subjective nature of selecting a candidate for a position based on the concept of “right fit” does not lend itself to a transparent process when you cannot quantify the decision-making criteria. Moreover, the lack of any requirement to provide timely notice in cases of acting assignments have led to ridiculous situations where notice of acting assignments and recourses available were provided only after the assignment periods were over.

The issues of fairness and accessibility of the staffing processes raise serious concerns with our membership. The process has become

more cumbersome under the new legislation. There is a general sense of resignation in the process as the grounds for recourse are extremely limited. Although we were promised a process that would be fairer with the addition of a quasi-judicial tribunal to review management’s decisions, we quickly realized that the enabling *Act* in fact did the opposite. The *PSEA* limits the grounds for complaints so much that it is next to impossible to meet the burden of proof that must be established for the tribunal to intervene. This is compounded by the realities of the Tribunal’s extremely limited powers of redress and the constant intervention of the Public Service Commission – that is supposed to be an impartial intervener, “a guardian of merit and non-partisanship” – against the interest of employees filing complaints.

One example of the limited powers of redress can be found in the *Cameron and Maheux v. Deputy Head of Service Canada et al* (2008 PSST 16) case. Despite finding that the appointment





If the employer is serious about its review and wishes genuinely to improve legislation in order to improve labour relations, it should begin by changing those sections of the PSLRA that prohibit unconstitutionally bargaining matters related to classification, staffing and pensions.

made in that case was done so in bad faith and not based on merit, the Public Service Staffing Tribunal (PSST) found that revocation of the appointment was not an appropriate corrective action in the case. If complainants go through the time and effort of successfully proving bad faith by filing complaints aptly described as “career limiting moves” with no effective remedy, are others likely to bother? We doubt it.

Regarding The PSLRA

It is CAPE’s opinion that the revised *Public Service Labour Relations Act* (PSLRA) is not balanced labour legislation such as one finds in many provinces. It is legislation which favours the employer rather than endeavouring to strike a balance between the government and its unions.

The PSLRA was also amended for the stated purposes of encouraging and fostering labour-management dialogue, joint problem-solving and more effective collective bargaining. The amendments also expanded the scope of the Public Service Labour Relations Board’s (PSLRB) jurisdiction concerning human rights issues, duty of fair representation (DFR) complaints and other issues.

Concerning the dialogue between labour and management, we can only conclude that the legislation did not have the expected outcome.

In the absence of a clear definition of “consultation”, several departments and managers have decided to interpret this requirement in its simplest and inadequate version: providing information. Relationships between management and CAPE have not improved in several (or most) departments as consultation continues to be seen as an importune obligation rather than a cornerstone of good human resources management. Furthermore, in the absence of a third party resolution process, co-development initiatives are nothing more than uneven partnerships where bargaining agent resources are abused while the employer maintains full control over the decision-making process.

With respect to the adjudication process and efficiency, CAPE wishes to raise concerns about the jurisdiction of the PSLRB to function and process adjudications and DFR complaints efficiently. On the adjudication side, a recent case from the Federal Court, *AG of Canada v. Amos*, illustrates some of the inefficiency of the current adjudication process. The Court determined that an Adjudicator under the PSLRA could not inquire into an alleged breach of a settlement because of a lack of express language in the PSLRA allowing adjudicators to do so. Adjudicators/Arbitrators under the *Canada Labour Code* can in fact determine whether or not grievance settlements have been breached without the necessity of the parties recommencing litigation with a new grievance. This lack of

jurisdiction may discourage the settlement of grievances and lead to more litigation, either of the initial grievance(s) or new ones filed post settlement. The language of the *Canada Labour Code* would thus be preferable.

In dealing with unfair labour practice complaints, the *PSLRA* specifies in Section 190 that

“The Board must examine and inquire into any complaint made to it that”

“(g) the employer, an employee organization or any person has committed an unfair labour practice within the meaning of section 185.”

In addition, the Board has the duty and power in accordance with s. 191 that states: (1) Subject to subsection (3), on receipt of a complaint made under subsection 190(1), the Board may assist the parties to the complaint to settle the complaint. If it decides not to do so or if the complaint is not settled within a period that the Board considers to be reason-

able in the circumstances, it must determine the complaint.

Under the current legislation, the requirement for the Board to inquire into any complaint can be particularly onerous for smaller bargaining agents given the expanded scope of DFR provisions which has led to a greater complexity of issues and a corresponding increase in the time required to respond.

In our view, the PSLRB should adopt procedures that would allow a representative of the PSLRB to inquire into allegations that the union acted in a manner that is arbitrary, discriminatory or in bad faith in its representation of members.

In several jurisdictions, including Ontario, the Board may be asked by the responding party to dismiss a complaint (or may do so on its own initiative) if it does not meet the basic requirements of an arguable case. The Board can then dismiss the complaint without a consultation or hearing.



The Board's Rules of Procedure in Ontario provide that after an application is filed, a Labour Relations Officer is normally assigned to meet with the employee and the union to try and help them reach agreement. If there is no agreement reached, a consultation (or informal hearing) is held with a Vice Chair of the Board. At the consultation, the employee must establish that the union violated the *Labour Relations Act*.

By using more informal procedures, the Ontario Labour Relations Board and other labour boards have been able to deal with DFR complaints much more effectively.

It is our view that DFR complaints would be dealt with in a much more expeditious manner if the legislation was written to allow the PSLRB to adopt more effective means to resolve them. The Board has not been given sufficient powers to screen or otherwise efficiently dispose of these complaints. While the Board does have the power to dismiss complaints of a frivolous and/or vexatious nature, under s.40(2)¹, there are many complaints that may pass this low threshold but not meet an arguable case test. This then causes all parties, the employer, unions, complainants and the Board to expend time and resources, when more efficient and cost effective procedures could and should be used.



CAPE's Recommendations

If the employer is serious about its review and wishes genuinely to improve legislation in order to improve labour relations, it should begin by changing those sections of the *PSLRA* that prohibit unconstitutionally bargaining matters related to classification, staffing and pensions. Moving the discussion of these matters away from the consultation table to the bargaining table will go a long way to establishing a better balance between the parties which was after all the original purpose of changing the statutes that structure relations between the employer and bargaining agents in the federal public service. ●

¹Even this provision does not explicitly allow the PSLRB the power to declare a person a vexatious litigant, a process adopted by the OLRB to deal with individuals who are abusing the Board's processes. Wording such as that found in the PSST's regulations (s.27) should be adopted for the PSLRB to provide the PSLRB with additional authority to make such declarations when appropriate.

The Census Issue

In the summer of 2010, it was announced by Industry Minister Tony Clement, who is responsible for Statistics Canada, that the mandatory long form census would no longer be used.

This decision was met by a hailstorm of objections from the professionals who make statistics their living, including but not limited to Ivan Fellegi, the Canadian Association of Business Economists, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council, the Canadian Economics Association, and the Canadian Council on Social Development. The announcement was met with concern internationally as well.

As the bargaining agent representing over 2,000 employees at Statistics Canada, including statisticians and economists, as well as another 10,000 professional federal public service employees who, in the commission of their duties and responsibilities often rely on the integrity of the information generated by the Canadian Census, CAPE is gravely concerned with the impact this decision will have on the ability of our members to serve their employer and the Canadian public.

As CAPE President Claude Poirier observed in a letter to the membership,

“The long-form census debate, whatever the outcome is, only proves that this government has no respect for the great competence, knowledge and professionalism of its public servants.”

In a letter written to Members of Parliament and Senators, Mr. Poirier stated:

“Hundreds of different organizations, charities, medical associations, politicians, religious groups and individuals have expressed their educated and educational disagreement with the decision,

and have cited extensive concerns regarding the impact of this decision on the viability and reliability of the Canadian census data: underrepresentation of minority groups, the disabled, those living in remote areas of the country; biased information; inadequate information for the development of social programs, regional budgeting, geographic and demographic profiling... the list goes on and on.

The Conservative government, in the form of Tony Clement, has no business micromanaging issues of statistical methodology, and disregarding the advice of experts, including globally recognized preeminent professionals in the field.”

As we have already done on the CAPE website, The Canadian Association of Professional Employees would like to again recognize the enormous sacrifice of Dr. Sheikh, his integrity and professionalism. Dr. Sheikh resigned from his position as Chief Statistician of Statistics Canada because he disagreed on professional grounds with the Conservative government's decision to eliminate the mandatory long census form.

CAPE members cannot speak out against the government's decision, for fear of repercussions from the employer. Mr. Sheikh voiced the concerns and objections of CAPE members in all government departments including Statistics Canada. ●

Representation and Consultation

The Labour Relations Officers are the faces of the organization that most members see, most often. They act as representatives on employment and labour relations issues relating to the terms and conditions of employment of CAPE members, and they act as representatives of the Association at both departmental and national levels, in consultation with the employer on behalf of the membership. These two aspects of their work demand that they be committed to the well-being of the membership and the Association as a whole. With respect to consultations, the President of CAPE and the Director of Labour Relations also play significant roles.

What follows is a snapshot of some of CAPE's accomplishments this past year.

Representation

From October 2009 to September 2010, 536 representation files (formal and informal) were opened and for which CAPE Labour Relations Officers provided representation. Many of these cases involved complex issues such as harassment, accommodation and performance – matters that cannot be reported on because of privacy issues. However, there were several significant cases that warrant mention, including the following...

A member was subject to several disciplinary measures, from a letter of reprimand to several notes of suspension for a total of 34 days of suspension. Several grievances were lodged regarding these disciplinary measures as well as other matters, and the member's record was adjusted to his satisfaction. The employee received compensation for the days of suspension and the records were expunged.

A member filed two grievances: classification and statement of duties. The member's many attempts to resolve the situation with the employer were unsuccessful. With the assistance of CAPE's LRO, we were able to assist the

member in bringing this matter to a resolution. A proper statement of duties was provided, and the classification level was increased. A retroactive payment of almost two years will be provided to the member.

A member's workload had significantly increased over the years and the department refused to reclassify the member's position. Evidence establishing that the department was aware that additional duties had been assigned to the position was presented to the members of the Classification Grievance Committee. In CAPE's opinion, the department classification section had not properly assessed the additional duties. The Classification Grievance Committee accepted our recommended assessment and allowed the grievance. The position's classification was increased with a retroactive effective date of almost two years.

A member approached CAPE for assistance as the member had been subjected to improper treatment by a supervisor over a long period of time. The member was concerned that his accommodation needs were not properly met by management. The member also became increasingly concerned that the supervisor was overly critical of work performance. An action plan was devised with the member and discussions were entered into with senior officials to

attempt to deal with the situation through informal recourses. The employer agreed to change the reporting relationship temporarily during which time the member explored other career opportunities that were more suitable. CAPE worked closely with employer representatives and eventually the member secured another assignment in a position which the member deemed better suited to his work experience. The member was very pleased with the outcome and appreciated that the matter was resolved through informal channels as this was less stressful and less time consuming.

Representation – EC Conversion

As a result of the EC conversion, 187 classification grievances were filed. Of these 187 original grievances, 60 have been resolved, 2 are awaiting decision, and 125 cases are outstanding. Of these remaining 125, many have yet to be analysed as to their merit, and it is possible that not all cases will proceed to hearings.

Consultation

In addition to the representational work performed by CAPE's Labour Relations Officers, they are also CAPE's Representatives at departmental and regional consultations, at the National Joint Council Committees, and other diverse committees such as the Micro and Small Agencies Labour Management Consultation Committee. What follows is a summary of the consultations held in some departments and agencies.

Health Canada: CAPE continued to raise concerns regarding how harassment cases are dealt with by the department, the EC Development Pilot Project and multiple re-organizations in various branches.

Department of Veterans Affairs: CAPE continues to consult on the proposed devolution of the St. Anne's Hospital to the Province of Quebec.



Agriculture Canada: CAPE continues to consult on the impact of budget cuts on access to language training, workload and mobility for our members. There have been ongoing consultations regarding employment equity.

Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency: CAPE consulted on leave policies, workplace harassment and staffing.

Public Works and Government Services: CAPE consulted on the new policy on parking that was recently introduced.

Canadian Heritage: CAPE is consulting on the ongoing restructuring. The parties have been meeting regularly and it appears that all of our members will be able to find employment and avoid being declared surplus.

Human Resources and Skills Development: CAPE had consultations surrounding the ineffective grievance process and issues with the harassment process. Working groups have been created to address these issues. Regarding the impact of the 2010 budget, it was determined that a few EC positions (less than 10) will be affected by a combination of the strategic review and the impact of the 1.5% increase. CAPE also consulted on harassment in the workplace, as well as on a guide for managers regarding the H1N1 pandemic.

Canadian International Development Agency: CAPE consulted regarding the Agency's operational budget, as this was increased again this year (last year of a 5-year commitment from the government). No positions will be abolished, but programs may be cut or see their implementation delayed. CAPE also consulted on the closure of the Information Center on International Development. The closure was scheduled for March 31, 2010. There was no loss of employment.

Transport Canada: CAPE consulted regarding problematic grievance processes, labour-management relations as well as the issue of parking.

Environment Canada: CAPE consulted regarding the Code of Ethics, the examination of the Labour-Management Consultation structure, as well as the issue of parking.

Fisheries and Oceans: CAPE consulted regarding the Code of Conduct, the mandate of various committees, the nature of consultation, as well as the issue of parking.

Natural Resources: CAPE consulted regarding the consultation protocol, Labour-Management relations and the LLMCC mandate.

Canadian School of Public Service: CAPE consulted on a return to work protocol, the implementation of the Integrated Learning Management System, action plans regarding the results of the Public Service Survey, a H1N1 action plan, anti-harassment training, and the transition of pay and benefit services.

Elections Canada: CAPE consulted on the expense and use of determinate employees, a Treasury Board submission to increase indeterminate positions, the intranet and Human Resources strategic planning.

Foreign Affairs and International Trade: CAPE consulted on the Treasury Board Conflict of Interest rules, the staffing process, such as those used for term positions, indeterminate positions and for employees who are declared surplus, as well as on the mandate of the Labour-Management Consultation Committee.

Translation Bureau: CAPE consulted on matters of training, Termium VI, local consultations, office space, improving internal communications, the situation at Pay and Benefits, a guide regarding return to work and conflicts of interest, as well as performance evaluation.

National Joint Council Consultations

Occupational Health and Safety Committee: CAPE participated in the review of the mandate of this committee.

From October 2009 to September 2010, 536 representation files (formal and informal) were opened and for which CAPE Labour Relations Officers provided representation.

Employment Equity Committee: The committee was consulted regarding the impact of the Health Canada Fitness to Work Evaluation Process as a potential barrier in the accommodation process, proposed changes to the Treasury Board Policy Suite (policy instruments which impact on Employment Equity), the Canadian Human Rights Commission's Maturity Model, government wide Anti-Racism Strategies, and the impact of the census changes on the availability and reliability of Employment Equity related data.

Dental Care Board of Management: CAPE is involved in the development of a new employee booklet that will assist members of the plan in understanding their entitlements.

Treasury Board Policy Management Review

CAPE was invited to participate in the Policy Management Review Initiative and a policy review committee created by Treasury Board. Essentially, the Treasury Board's mandate is to rescind as many central policies as possible and delegate, through the issuance of simple guidelines, the responsibilities to draft, consult and implement directly to departments. To that end, Treasury Board has already rescinded 8 policies, 6 of them without consultation with bargaining agents, and 2 others following CAPE's withdrawal from the table. The decision to withdraw came following the realisation that our input was clearly not going to change or influence Treasury Board's decisions.

Pension Advisory Committee

CAPE President Claude Poirier was appointed to the Pension Advisory Committee (PAC) on June 22, 2010. During the 2009 - 2010 period, CAPE participated in four PAC meetings, and more are scheduled for the near future. Points discussed during these meetings included the need to appoint a Special Advisor to provide an effective recourse to deal with employees' complaints surrounding pensions, issues, the Superannuation annual report, bargaining agents' concerns regarding reforms made to the Superannuation plan as a result of announcements made in the 2010 budget, and the C.D. Howe report which implied changes should be made to the Superannuation Plan to offset costs, and possible non-legislative changes including an increase of employee pension contributions.

Public Service Commission Advisory Council

CAPE is represented at the Public Service Commission Advisory Council (PSCAC) by the Director of Labour Relations. The only meeting of the PSCAC was held on April 30, 2010. Much of the meeting was spent discussing the revitalization of the PSCAC. A Working Group was set up and mandated to review the PSCAC's Terms of Reference, resources and membership. The Working Group submitted recommendations to the PSCAC. New Terms of Reference were agreed upon and will be posted in the near future on the PSCAC's website. ●

Receive CAPE Documents and Website Update Notifications Electronically

Members who subscribe to CAPE's electronic mailing service not only receive documents electronically, they also receive website update notifications. CAPE's Communications Committee has made it a priority to encourage members to utilize this mailing option, with the goal of faster, better, more immediate information dispersal, reduction of costs and, of course, to save trees. At the present time, approximately 30% of members avail themselves of this service.

Members of CAPE's bargaining units must remember, however, that in order to receive electronic website updates and electronic versions of the Association's publications, they must be registered members of the Association

and must provide the Association with a home e-mail address. This, too, is easily accomplished on the CAPE website, under "Becoming a Member" on the homepage. ●

CAPE Training

As in past years, CAPE provided regular Stewards Training Courses to our volunteer representatives in the spring and in the fall.

The programs offered include **Basic Stewards Training**, **Know Your Collective Agreement EC**, and **Know Your Collective Agreement TR**.

In the case of our representatives at the Library of Parliament, with a bargaining unit of approximately 80 members, training regarding their collective agreement is provided on an as requested basis.

In addition, CAPE holds **Duty to Accommodate** and **Occupational Health and Safety** courses once a year for its stewards. Only members who are Association representatives

(stewards and local leaders) or who have made a commitment to becoming an Association representative can participate in these courses.

During the Spring and Fall of 2010, over 35 stewards and local leaders participated in these courses.

In addition to Stewards Training, this year CAPE has invited members of the Collective Bargaining Committees to participate in **Collective Bargaining Training**. ●

CAPE Committees

A vast amount of what CAPE achieves each year is accomplished through the effort and commitment of hundreds of volunteers – members of the National Executive Committee, the Local Leadership and the various NEC sub-committees all contribute invaluable resources to the Association. What follows is a brief description of the efforts and accomplishments of the various CAPE Committees...

CAPE struck an **Education and Mobilization Committee** late in 2009 in response to concerns that arose in the federal public service prior to the announcement of the details of the 2010 Budget – to motivate members to act on issues at hand, the initial issue being the perceived threat to the federal public service pension plan. To this end, CAPE produced an analysis of a C.D. Howe Institute report that falsely stated that the federal public service pension plan was facing an imminent financial crisis.

In February of 2010 the Education and Mobilization Committee held a day long information

and training session, inviting several panelists to participate in a discussion forum regarding pensions in general, and the federal public service pension plan in particular. Panelists included Bernard Dussault of the National Association of Federal Retirees and former Chief Actuary, Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions; Bill Krause, former President of ESSA, SSEA and CAPE, and former member of the Pension Advisory Committee; Phil Rosen, former member of the CAPE National Executive Committee and former employee of the Library of Parliament; and Kevin Skerrett, Research Officer



with the Canadian Union of Public Employees. A Question and Answer document was developed as a result of this forum, and distributed to the Local Leadership and the CAPE membership. This document can be found on the CAPE website at http://acep-cape.ca/pdfs/General/files/mobilisationquestions_e.pdf.

In anticipation of the presentation of the 2010 Budget, the Education and Mobilization Committee convened a Special General Meeting of the CAPE membership in order to review the budget and discuss possible implications. Subsequent to this, several evening information sessions were scheduled during May and June, 2010, including such topics as “At Stake: Your Pension, Your Retirement”, “The True Meaning of Fiscal Restraint” and “Facts and Action: What Needs to be Done”. Further events and information sessions are scheduled for the Fall of 2010.

CAPE President Claude Poirier has summarized the primary message of the Education and Mobilization Committee as follows,

“The upcoming challenges are significant. The stakes are high. Empowering ourselves to affect events in defense of our rights for the future requires that we hear from the CAPE membership and work together now.”

The committee continues to actively seek the input of the CAPE membership regarding issues and concerns of interest to the membership as a whole.

The CAPE Communications Committee was particularly active during the 2009-2010 period. Two surveys of Local Leadership were undertaken in order to identify the needs and concerns of the membership regarding communications.

A communications plan was developed and submitted to the National Executive Committee for approval. The communications plan

includes the development of an on-line discussion forum, the redesign and refinement of the CAPE website, and the development and implementation of a RAND campaign to increase CAPE’s membership and heighten the Association’s visibility within the federal public service.

A “Parliamentary Outreach” program is currently being implemented, with the goal of further increasing CAPE’s visibility among the political leadership of Canada, including members of Parliament and the Senate.

The Communications Committee will also be developing “Issue Papers” that will provide information and educational materials, that will be published on the CAPE website.

The CAPE membership database will also be reviewed and examined from the perspective of functionality, the goal being to ensure that the membership lists provided to the Local Leadership are useful, relevant tools that accurately reflect the ongoing status of departmental CAPE membership.

In addition to the acquisition of promotional materials, the Communications Committee initiated the practice of providing CAPE committee members, Local Leaders and the National Executive Committee with CAPE business cards.

The committee also initiated the development and production of CAPE signs and banners to be used at various CAPE events and meetings – these are being made available to members and Local Leaders through the CAPE national office.

CAPE’s Young Member’s Advisory Committee was established to proactively plan for and invest in the future leadership of the Association by fostering succession planning to fulfil CAPE’s future needs. To this end the committee’s goals include increasing young member’s awareness of the role, responsibilities,



CAPE's Finance Committee meets on a regular basis. During the past year it held 7 scheduled meetings and 3 unscheduled meetings. This committee is responsible for the preparation of the Association's budget, the review of the Association's finances, and ensures transparency and accountability in the Association's finances.

The Audit Committee was established with the goal of providing additional transparency to the functions of the Finance Com-

activities and affairs of the Association. The committee's mandate includes organizing workshops on leadership, career advancement, work-life balance and other subjects of interest, as they arise. The committee endeavours to enhance communications and networking between young members, and communication with the National Executive Committee.

mittee. Essentially, the Audit Committee performs an oversight function to the National Executive Committee's fiduciary responsibility to the Association, reviews the financial statements to ensure that they accurately reflect the Association's finances, and reviews the financial statements to ensure they are understandable by members.

CAPE's Constitution and By-Laws Committee spent the first part of 2010 reviewing the Constitution and By-Laws, with the goal of creating a more consistent functionality between the two, removing inconsistencies, redundant clauses and improving the wording, and addressing issues that have arisen as a result of changing technology and a growing membership. Any changes to either the Constitution or the By-Laws must be approved by the CAPE membership, and they will be asked to vote on proposed changes this fall. The committee will continue its work into 2011, with further recommended changes expected in the fall of that year.

The **CAPE Elections and Resolutions Committee** organizes and oversees all election and voting processes, including proposed changes to the Constitution and By-Laws, with the exception of the ratification of tentative agreements.

CAPE Committee Members

Minutes of all CAPE committee meetings can be found on the CAPE Website at www.acep-cape.ca

CAPE National Executive Committee

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

Claude Poirier
CAPE President

Ray Zwicker
EC/LoP Vice President
Public Works and Government Services

André Picotte
TR Vice President
Public Works and Government Services
Translation Bureau

Jean-Luc Bourdages
LoP Director
Library of Parliament

Sandra Chatterton
EC Director
Health Canada

Cindy Creran
EC Director
Justice Canada

Ian Dawson
EC Director
Public Works and Government Services

Richard Duranceau
EC Director
Human Resources and Skills
Development

Carl Lakaski
EC Director
Public Health Agency

Damian Londynski
EC Director
Human Resources and Skills Development

Sean Maguire
EC Director
Indian and Northern Affairs

Stephen Mullen
TR Director
Public Works and Government Services
Translation Bureau

Julie Pentick
EC Director
Health Canada

Gregory Phillips
EC Director
Statistics Canada

Kim Piché
EC Director
Indian and Northern Affairs

Sharon Pichie
EC Director
Statistics Canada

Geneviève Thibault Gosselin
TR Director
Public Works and Government Services
Translation Bureau

Lee Whitmore
EC Director
National Defence

Michael Zinck
EC Director
Veterans Affairs Canada

Claude Danik
Executive Director
CAPE

Jean Ouellette
Director of Labour Relations
CAPE

Donna Martin
Manager of Administration Services
CAPE

Finance Committee

André Picotte
TR Vice President
Public Works and Government Services
Translation Bureau

Ian Dawson
Public Works and Government Services

Claude Poirier
CAPE President

Ray Zwicker
EC/LoP Vice President
Public Works and Government Services

Claude Danik
Executive Director
CAPE

Sandra Wensink
Finance Officer
CAPE

Constitution and By-Laws Committee

Stephen Mullen
Public Works and Government Services
Translation Bureau

Claude Poirier
CAPE President

Claude Danik
Executive Director
CAPE

André Picotte
Public Works and Government Services
Translation Bureau

Michael Zinck
Veterans Affairs Canada

Donna Martin
Director of Administration Services
CAPE

Audit Committee

Felix Meunier
Transport Canada

Cindy Creran
Canadian Grain Commission

Marc-Alexandre Beaulieu
Public Works and Government Services

Elections and Resolutions Committee

Michael Dewing
Library of Parliament

Jackie LeBlanc
Public Works & Government Services
Canada - New Brunswick

Anita Bangiricenge
Administrative Clerk
CAPE

Jill Hull
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

Jacob Porter
Health Canada

Communications Committee

Ray Zwicker
Public Works and Government Services

Geneviève Thibault Gosselin
Public Works and Government Services
Translation Bureau

Claude Danik
Executive Director
CAPE

Sandra Chatterton
Health Canada

Marc Vallée
Public Works and Government Services
Translation Bureau

Deborah Fiander
Communications Officer
CAPE

Scott Crawford
Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency
Prince Edward Island

Claude Poirier
CAPE President

Liana Griffin
Professional Services Assistant
CAPE

André Picotte
Public Works and Government Services
Translation Bureau

Young Members Advisory Committee

Heather Anderson
Privy Council Office

Maciej Karpinski
Canadian Human Rights Commission

Donna Martin
Director of Administration Services
CAPE

Ben Black
Public Works and Government Services

Daniel Spanu
Western Economic Diversification

Education and Mobilization Committee

Gabriel Breton
Library and Archives Canada

Sandra Chatterton
Health Canada

Ruth Cherry
Indian and Northern Affairs

Agnes Crane
Human Resources and Skills
Development

Nick Giannakoulis
Public Health Agency of Canada

Salma Jaroudi
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

Carl Lakaski
Public Health Agency of Canada

Brian McDougall
Human Resources and Skills
Development

Bob Parsons
Veterans Affairs Canada

André Picotte
Public Works and Government Services
Translation Bureau

Simone Powell
Public Health Agency of Canada

Jean-Pierre Racine
Canada Economic Development

David Tucker
Indian and Northern Affairs

Claude Poirier
CAPE President

Jean Ouellette
Director of Labour Relations
CAPE

Liana Griffin
Professional Services Assistant
CAPE

EC Collective Bargaining Committee

Gord Brennan
Indian and Northern Affairs

Gabriel Breton
Library and Archives Canada

Normand Faulkner
Human Resources and Skills
Development

Todd Johnson
Human Resources and Skills
Development

Lawrence Mangano
Canada Border Services Agency

Laura E. Munroe
Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Kim Piché
Indian and Northern Affairs

Patrick A. Warner
Health Canada

Ambrose Wong
Statistics Canada

Claude Poirier
CAPE President

Claude Danik
Executive Director
CAPE

Hélène Paris
Research Officer
CAPE

Liana Griffin
Professional Services Assistant
CAPE

TR Collective Bargaining Committee

Matthew Ball

Public Works and Government Services
Translation Bureau

André Picotte

Public Works and Government Services
Translation Bureau

Hélène Paris

Research Officer
CAPE

Isabelle Girouard

Public Works and Government Services
Translation Bureau

Marc Vallée

Public Works and Government Services
Translation Bureau

Liana Griffin

Professional Services Assistant
CAPE

Pascal Machado

Public Works and Government Services
Translation Bureau

Claude Poirier

CAPE President

Jean Ouellette

Director of Labor Relations
CAPE

Lionel Perrin

Public Works and Government Services
Translation Bureau

TR Financial Incentive Plan Negotiating Committee

Stephen Mullen

Public Works and Government Services
Translation Bureau

André Picotte

Public Works and Government Services
Translation Bureau

Hélène Paris

Research Officer
CAPE

Lionel Perrin

Public Works and Government Services
Translation Bureau

Jean Ouellette

Director of Labour Relations
CAPE

Liana Griffin

Professional Services Assistant
CAPE

Library of Parliament Collective Bargaining Committee

François Côté

Library of Parliament

Sonya Norris

Library of Parliament

Hélène Paris

Research Officer
CAPE

Élise Hurtubise-Loranger

Library of Parliament

Jean Ouellette

Director of Labour Relations
CAPE

Liana Griffin

Professional Services Assistant
CAPE

Local Leadership

National Capital Region Representatives

Agriculture Canada (Local #507)

President	Salma Jaroudi
Secretary-Treasurer	Maurice Korol
Steward	Maurice Korol
Steward and Employment	
Equity Representative	Maria Rodriguez
Occupational Safety and Health	Randy Muma John Wheeler

Canadian International Development Agency (Local #517)

President	Sandra Gagnon
Vice President	Pierre J. Tremblay
Secretary-Treasurer	Pierre Bernier

Canadian Radio-Television & Telecommunications Commission

Steward	Lorraine Séguin
---------	-----------------

Elections Canada (Local #518)

President	Alain P. Tremblay
Vice President	Jean Roy
Treasurer	Louise Lussier
Secretary	Kathryn Gallacher
Directors	Martin Grégoire Tanney Kennedy Kevin Phillips Barbara Robertson

Health Canada (Local #512)

President	Simone Powell
Vice President	Nick Giannakoulis
Secretary-Treasurer	Wendy Palma-Cormer
Director	Sandra Chatterton
Occupational Safety and Health	Jeff Marchand Heather Hudson Joneja

Human Resources and Social Development Canada (Local #514)

President	Dorin Petriu
Vice President	Liam Lynch
Secretary-Treasurer	Geoffrey Gurd
Directors	
200 Montcalm	Todd Johnson
Promenade du Portage II	Michel Fourzly
	Christian Strano
Promenade du Portage IV	Normand Faulkner
	Brian McDougall

Immigration and Refugee Board (Local #501)

President	Louise Carrière
Occupational Safety and Health	Louise Carrière

Indian & Northern Affairs (Local #502)

Treasurer	Sean Maguire
-----------	--------------

Industry Canada (Local #508)

Directors	Theodora Cosac Hélène Gagnon
-----------	---------------------------------

Justice Canada (Local #513)

Directors	Paula McLenaghan Lista Papathanasopoulou
Stewards	Josée Baril Franca Palermo Shelley Sutherland
Occupational Safety and Health	Lisa Raymond

Library and Archives Canada (Local #519)

President	Dave Pelc
Treasurer	Jean-Rony Benoit
Steward	Gabriel Breton

Library of Parliament (Local #515)

President	Michael Dewing
Directors	François Côté Allison Goody Élise Hurtubise-Loranger
Occupational Safety and Health	Daniel Thompson

Natural Resources Canada (Local #520)

President	Allan Howatson
Vice President	Galina Obolenskaia
Secretary	Elizabeth Walsh
Directors	Margot Ashfield Carol Fairbrother Gerly Jean-Baptiste

Public Works and Government Services (Local #521)

President	Ray Zwicker
Vice President	André Cardinal
Secretary	Peggy Warren
Treasurer	Rose Harasym
Director - Employment Equity	Richard Sharpe
Steward	Barry Rosenfeld

Statistics Canada (Local #503)

President	Greg Phillips
Vice President	Ambrose Wong
Secretary	Sharon Pichie
Treasurer	Ann Kurikshuk-Nemec
Stewards	Wai Man Raymond Chan Louise McLaren

Local Leadership cont'd...

Status of Women Canada (Local #510)

Directors	Michele Bougie Maria Shin
Steward	Teresa Edwards

Translation Bureau (Local #900)*Executive Committee*

President	Marc Vallée
Regional TR Representative	Jackie LeBlanc
Francophone Translators Representatives	André Picotte
English Translators Representative	Ellen Garmaise
Multilingual Translators Representative	Marc Pichard
Interpreters Representative	Paule Antonelli
Terminologists Representative	Sophie Rouy
Parliamentary Translators Representative	Lionel Perrin

*Translation Bureau – Professional Services***Multilingual Translation, Regions and National Security Branch***National Defense Division*

National Defense HQ Unit	Christian Poulin Wayne Thompson
Prairies Regional Unit	Kimberley Winslow
Montréal Military Translation Unit	Isabelle Girouard Kate Forster

Security and Emergency Preparedness Division

Pacific Regional Unit	Michel Pigeon
------------------------------	---------------

Regional Translation Services Division

Ontario Regional Unit	Phu Hoa
East Coast Regional Unit	Lyne Perrotte Denise Aucoin-Deveau
Montréal Regional Unit	Barbara McClintock
New Brunswick Regional Unit	Jackie LeBlanc Claude J. Poirier

Multilingual Translation and Localization Division

Europe, Asia and Middle East Languages	Peter Whimster
Languages of the Americas, Aboriginal and Other Languages	Sylvie Gajevic
DND Foreign Languages Sub-section	Barbara Schultz

Scientific and Technical Translation Branch*Natural Sciences Division*

Agriculture Unit	Caroline Milot
-------------------------	----------------

Sciences and Technology Division

Medicine and Technology Unit	Geneviève Thibault Gosselin
Meteorology Group	Raymonde Leclerc

Technical Translation Division

Transport Unit	Andrée-Anne Côté Karine Bigras
-----------------------	-----------------------------------

Mechanical, Electrical and Civil Engineering Translation Service	Manon Hinse
CRTC Group	Julie Thibodeau

Sociopolitical and Legal Translation Branch*Québec Division*

Human Sciences Unit	Danièle Lévy
Major Projects Unit	Juliette Goudreau
Political Sciences Unit	Céline Danis

Social Programs Division

Health Unit	Marilyn Gagné
Human Resources Unit	Diane Bisson André Picotte

Legal Translation Division

Economics and Legal Services Unit	Christine Gendreau
Courts Unit	Claude Leclerc

Political Translation Division

International Trade Canada Unit	Louis Ménard
--	--------------

Sociocultural Translation Division

Immigration Unit	Marc Vallée
Canadian Heritage Unit	Line Niquet

Corporate Services

Training and Evaluation	Micheline La Salle
--------------------------------	--------------------

Interpretation and Parliamentary Translation*Parliamentary Proceedings*

Committees	Diane Burgess
Debates	Corinne Wyss

Parliamentary Documents

Committees and Library of Parliament	Anne Rousseau
Services to Parliamentarians	Lionel Perrin
Legislative Translation	Stephen Mullen
Conference Interpretation	Francine Roy Roland Sarot
Parliamentary Interpretation	Karine Circé

Terminology Standardization Directorate

Terminotics Division	Christine Hug
Human Sciences Division	Sophie Rouy
Standardization Strategies Division	Luc Pomerleau
Scientific and Technical Division	Chantal Reid
	Marc-Alexandre Beaulieu

Local Leadership cont'd...

Regional Association Representatives

Alberta (Local #801)**Directors/Stewards**

Valerie Chessor
Lillian Cook
Marcie Hawranik
Laura Munroe
Harjit Shokar-Khaira

British Columbia (Local #301)

President
Vice President
Directors

Michael Haberl
Ian Dawson
Ghada Ahmed
Lisa Banxachai
Robert Russo
Rod Smelser
Ed Southcott
Ruth Cherry

Stewards

Rachelle Haider
Joanne Kelly
Susan Mansoor
Diana Stevely
Vincent Schillaci Ventura

Manitoba (Local #601)

President
Vice President
Treasurer

Cindy Creran
Yvonne Kuncze
Thea Haut

New Brunswick (Local #202)

President
Vice President
Occupational Safety and Health

Samuel Le Breton
Manon Mallet
Matthew English
Julie Nadeau

Newfoundland (Local #101)

President
Vice President
Director
Steward

Agnes Crane
Bonnie Gauvin
Gerard Fardy
Juanita Knee

Labour Management Consultation Committee

Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency

Paul Parsons

Occupational Safety and Health

Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency

Joanne Fennelly

Nova Scotia (Local #201)

President
Vice President
Secretary/Treasurer
Occupational Safety and Health

Ben Black
Charles Gilbert
Anne-Marie Leger
Lisa Fougere
Tracy Kempton
Michelle Hébert Boyd
Robert Grandy
Robert Grandy
Glenn McMullen

Directors**Stewards****Labour Management Consultation Committee**

Canadian Coast Guard College

Monique Berger

Ontario**Guelph****Steward**

Tammy Belliveau

Kingston (Local #504)**President**

Marcelene Holyk

Toronto (Local #511)**President**

Lauren Kirk

Vice President

Karen Mendonça

Treasurer

Wendy Dennis

Stewards

Teresa Cuke

Ed Frankow

Occupational Safety and Health

Karen Mendonça

Labour Management Consultation Committee

Karen Mendonça

Sault Ste-Marie**Steward**

Mercedes Aquilina

Prince Edward Island (Local #102)**President**

Craig Abbott

Vice President

Mary Beth Maclean

Director

Teresa Pound

Stewards

Tara O'Connor

Scott Crawford

Michael Zinck

Québec**Montréal (Local #402)****President**

Mario Jodoin

Stewards

Hubert Brown

Gwen Cartier

Marilou Dufour

Michel Morin

Yves Proulx

Jean-Pierre Racine

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

Bruno Levesque

Vice President

Frederick Lessard

Saskatchewan**Northern Region (Local #701)****Directors/Stewards**

Laurie Desautels

Deqiang Gu

Adrian Johnson

Pat Yeudal

Southern Region**Steward**

Rob Raisbeck

Membership Distribution*

Department or Agency	EC	AN/RA	TR	Total
Statistics Canada	2127			2127
Public Works & Government Services	368		1093	1461
Human Resources and Skills Development Canada	1335			1335
Health Canada	1049			1049
Indian and Northern Affairs	698			698
Public Health Agency	628			628
Industry Canada	436			436
Natural Resources Canada	423			423
Justice Canada	413			413
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada	398			398
Transport Canada	389			389
Environment Canada	385			385
Treasury Board	378			378
Finance Canada	364			364
Foreign Affairs Canada	322			322
Citizenship and Immigration Canada	267			267
Fisheries and Oceans	236			236
Library and Archives	235			235
International Development Agency	196			196
Public Safety Canada	161			161
Canadian Heritage	159			159
Privy Council Office	109			109
National Defense	105			105
Library of Parliament		85		85
Elections Canada	83			83
Infrastructure Canada	81			81
Public Service Commission	72			72
Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions	72			72
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	71			71
Penitentiary Services	58			58
Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency	51			51
Veteran Affairs	50			50
Canada Border Service Agency	44			44
Federal Regional Development (Quebec)	42			42
Canada School of Public Service	40			40
Western Economic Diversification	39			39
Immigration & Refugee Board	31			31
Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	22			22
Canadian Transportation Agency	21			21
Passport Canada	19			19
Information and Privacy Commission	15			15
Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada	13			13
Patented Medicine Prices Review Board	13			13
Human Rights Commission	13			13
Status of Women	13			13
Canadian Space Agency	12			12
Radio-Television & Telecommunications	11			11
Transportation Safety Board	10			10
Registry of the Tax Court of Canada	8			8

Membership Distribution cont'd....

Department or Agency	EC	AN/RA	TR	Total
Canadian Dairy Commission	8			8
Canadian Grain Commission	7			7
Canadian International Trade Tribunal	6			6
Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario	5			5
Military Police Commission	4			4
Commissioner of Official Languages	4			4
Federal Judicial Affairs	3			3
Assisted Human Reproduction Agency of Canada	3			3
Office of the Registrar of Lobbyists	2			2
National Parole Board	2			2
National Farm Products Council	2			2
Copyright Board	2			2
CLR - Canadian Labour Relations Board	2			2
Canadian Artists and Producers Tribunal	2			2
Public Sector Integrity Canada	1			1
NAFTA Secretariat	1			1
Hazardous Materials Information Review Commission	1			1
Communications Security Establishment Canada	1			1
Total:	12141	85	1042	13268
Associate Members:	12			12
GRAND TOTAL:	12153	85	1042	13280

*Based on the most recent information provided by Treasury Board

Canadian Association of Professional Employees

National Office Staff

Claude Poirier
Claude Danik
Jean Ouellette
Donna Martin
Deborah Fiander
Hélène Paris
Sylvie Richard
Liana Griffin
Sandra Wensink
Sylvie Francoeur
Isabelle Borré
Claude Archambault
Karen Brook
Isabelle Germain
Luc Gervais
Bertrand Myre
Isabelle Petrin
Lionel Saurette
Claude Vézina
Anita Bangiricenge
Mark Courty
Chantale Lebel
Julie Parisien
Sharon Wilson

President
Executive Director
Director of Labour Relations
Manager of Administration Services
Communications Officer
Research Officer
Information Officer
Professional Services Assistant
Finance Officer
Finance Officer Assistant
Education Officer
Labour Relations Officer
Labour Relations Officer
Labour Relations Officer
Labour Relations Officer
Labour Relations Officer
Labour Relations Officer
Labour Relations Officer
Administrative Clerk
Administrative Clerk
Administrative Clerk
Administrative Clerk
Administrative Clerk

cpoirier@acep-cape.ca
cdanik@acep-cape.ca
jouellette@acep-cape.ca
dmartin@acep-cape.ca
dfiander@acep-cape.ca
hparis@acep-cape.ca
srichard@acep-cape.ca
lgriffin@acep-cape.ca
swensink@acep-cape.ca
sfrancoeur@acep-cape.ca
iborre@acep-cape.ca
carchambault@acep-cape.ca
kbrook@acep-cape.ca
igermain@acep-cape.ca
lgervais@acep-cape.ca
bmyre@acep-cape.ca
ipetrin@acep-cape.ca
lsaurette@acep-cape.ca
cvezina@acep-cape.ca
abangiricenge@acep-cape.ca
mcourty@acep-cape.ca
clebel@acep-cape.ca
jparisien@acep-cape.ca
swilson@acep-cape.ca

Canadian Association of Professional Employees

CAPE ANNUAL REPORT 2009 - 2010



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