



**RECORD OF DECISIONS**  
**National Executive Committee (NEC) Meeting**  
**Friday, March 22, 2024**

**4.1 International Men's Day**

**Moved by M. Larcher, seconded by A. Yeo, that CAPE stop celebrating International Men's Day on November 19<sup>th</sup>.**

The mover spoke to the motion, stating that in his view, there is no need to celebrate men in a patriarchal political system, which is male dominated and in which women are often oppressed.

Some were of the view that it may be worth looking into CAPE's historical data to show that as an organization, it has never celebrated Men's Day, but based on past communications, it has been more around men's mental health issues. Without celebrating "men's day" per se, it would be noteworthy to observe some of the unique situations and challenges some men now face. Doing so would not be a negative or devaluating.

It was pointed out that as previously reported to the NEC, there was a celebration at the CAPE office for Men's Day. Although in agreement that there are specific issues and challenges faced by men however, having a celebration for International Men's Day is not the appropriate way to address those issues.

**In favour: 19**

**Against: 1**

**Abstentions: 2**

The motion **carried**.

#### 4.2 By-Law 9 (Rules and Procedures) – Proposed Amendment

**Moved by M. Larcher, seconded by B. Latour, that paragraph 9.2 of the CAPE By-Laws be amended by removing the words: *“Two thirds of the members present must vote against the Chair’s decision for it to be reversed”*.**

This would ensure that the decision-making process remains more equitable and democratic. The President should not be able to impose their authority on NEC members, which goes against the Bourinot Rules.

It was clarified that this would not impact issues of interpretation of constitutional matters as the Chair is the only person with authority around those. The motion should be supported in line with the “members for change” platform. Moving forward, consideration should also be given to reviewing BL 9.3 for the same reasons.

It was also clarified that if this practice was adopted, decisions moving forward would be taken based on the simple majority of the voting NEC members.

**In favour: 20**

**Against: 0**

**Abstentions: 2**

The motion **carried**.

#### 4.3 Local Budget

**Moved by M. Larcher, seconded by A. Yeo,**

**Be it resolved that By-Law 4.1 be repealed and replaced with the following text:**

- *4.1 A Local may choose to receive an annual rebate to finance its activities or to have its expenses paid by CAPE. A Local holding more than \$50K in a bank account is not eligible for these two options.*

**Be it resolved that By-Law 4.2 be repealed and replaced with the following text:**

- *4.2 The rebate is paid out once a year, at the written request of the Local to the National Office. A Local wishing to receive a rebate of an amount lower than that provided for by Bylaws 4.3 must specify this in its written request.*

**Be it resolved that By-Law 4.3 be repealed and replaced with the following text:**

- *4.3 The rebate is paid based on the number EC, TR, LoP, or OPBO dues-paying employees working in that Local according to the table below:*

- 1-25 members: 1000 \$
- 26-50 members: 1 500 \$
- 51-75 members: 2 000 \$
- 76-100 members: 3 000 \$
- 101-500 members: 5 000 \$
- 501-1000 members: 9 500 \$
- More than 1000 members: 10 000 \$

**Be it resolved that By-Law 4.6 be repealed and replaced with the following text:**

- *4.6 Authorized travel to attend meetings or courses offered by the Association are reimbursed by CAPE. CAPE is also responsible for the necessary expenses for the conduct and interpretation in both official languages of the annual general meeting of any Local that submits a written request for such support.*

The mover explained that this would establish a \$50K cap in bank accounts for Locals, preventing Locals from requesting rebates or asking CAPE national to pay for its expenses. It would put some responsibility on Locals to better manage their funds and better represent and organize their membership. It would also ensure the rebate is protected from inflation. The overall intent is to allow Locals to ask for less funding if less is needed and to simplify the funding structure for Locals.

Some were of the view that imposing a \$50K cap would penalize some Locals who plan on a more long-term basis such as using their funds for a daily strike pay to supplement the national strike fund.

**Moved by J. Solomon, seconded by T. Green, that the motion be amended as follows:**

***4.1 A Local may choose to receive an annual rebate to finance its activities or to have its expenses paid by CAPE.***

On the amendment,

A capped amount should not be imposed on Locals. This should be a matter of consultation and planning by members of each Local.

Some felt that a cap of \$50K was too high and suggested that perhaps the NEC should find ways to support all Local members in a more equitable way, irrespective of their size and departments.

It was reiterated that the goal is to ensure that all Locals receive the same amount and have the flexibility to manage their own funds. The NEC may not be able to do so for all

Locals, hence the cap. The amendment would not change that. There is a considerable amount of work to do on the defence fund (strike fund) - irrespective of this motion.

Some spoke against the amendment and felt the cap should remain in place as it would create an equity between Locals.

**In favour: 10**

**Against: 8**

**Abstentions: 2**

The amendment **carried**.

On the amended motion,

*4.1 A Local may choose to receive an annual rebate to finance its activities or to have its expenses paid by CAPE.*

Some were of the view that in the spirit of demonstrating a more democratic approach, the NEC should consult with Local members to identify the problems before putting in place a solution. The NEC should also have a sound knowledge and understanding of the budget and of the issues faced by Locals before making such a decision.

**Moved by L. Spek, seconded by B. Panasyuk, that this matter be referred to the Finance Committee.**

The mover of the motion stated that this matter should be looked into further in terms of its potential impact on some Locals, especially the smaller ones with unique circumstances. There should be an opportunity to discuss the issues around rebates and the overall inequities and their impact on Locals.

Some spoke against the motion to refer, stating that the NEC should not have to consult with all Locals and members before making such a decision. Members will have the opportunity to address this at the next national AGM and reverse (or not) the NEC's decision. It was also pointed out that Article 4.6 addresses the issue pertaining to smaller Locals who face challenges around the planning of their AGM.

It was noted that this matter was already addressed by the Finance Committee and with the Director of Finance, leading to this proposed solution which in some's view, could and should be implemented sooner rather than later.

Many members of the NEC were either members or Presidents of their respective Locals and are therefore aware of their issues and needs. This would help smaller Locals who need to be up and running and deferring the process would not be in their best interest in terms of inequity.

A recorded vote was requested on the motion to refer.

**In favour:** F. Assu, C. Goldberg, L. Spek, S. Holmes, L. Munro, P. Makrodimitris, N. Curti, S. Feldman, B. Panasyuk (9)

**Against:** M. Larcher, T. Green, A. Hersberger, A. Yeo, B. Latour, N. Burron, A. Petra, R. Ajmera, C. Hill, A. Brabant, J. Solomon, M. Wylie (12)

**Abstention:** N. Prier (1)

The motion to refer was **defeated**.

On the amended motion (entire motion),

Some felt that in spirit, the motion presented a good solution, however there should be a forum put in place for all Locals to openly discuss issues and challenges. Perhaps the NEC should discuss this further moving forward.

A recorded vote was requested on the amended motion.

**In favour:** M. Larcher, T. Green, A. Hersberger, A. Yeo, B. Latour, N. Burron, A. Petra, F. Assu, R. Ajmera, C. Hill, A. Brabant, J. Solomon, M. Wylie, S. Holmes, N. Curti (15)

**Against:** C. Goldberg, S. Feldman (2)

**Abstentions:** N. Prier, B. Panasyuk, A. Trau, P. Makrodimitris, L. Munroe, L. Spek (6)

The amended motion **carried**.

#### **4.4 Participatory Budget**

CAPE is committed to fostering transparency, accessibility, and member engagement in its operations. As such, members should be able to actively participate in the decision-making process, especially in critical matters such as budget allocation.

In the absence of a clear and easily accessible process for the members to engage in building the budget, it is important to establish such infrastructure.

Recognizing that this is a complex long-term task, it is important to start by producing a prototype to test and evaluate it in close collaboration with the members.

**Moved by B. Panasyuk, seconded by R. Ajmera, that CAPE:**

1. **Reviews various participatory budget models and their relevance to CAPE;**
2. **Decides on one of the models to test initially;**
3. **Adapts the chosen model to the current CAPE's Constitution and By-Laws by building on the existing Constitution, paragraph 23.5;**
4. **Tests the model in the course of the 2025 budget preparation; and**
5. **Gathers feedback and evaluates the tested process to review what adjustments are needed in the participatory budget process, the Constitution and By-Laws, and relevant training provided to the members.**

The mover explained that the intent of the motion is to allow for a more open process and provide members the opportunity to contribute to the budgetary exercise and provide critical feedback.

**Moved by M. Larcher, seconded by J. Solomon, that the motion be amended as follows:**

3. **Adapts the chosen model to the current CAPE's Constitution and By-Laws;**

The mover of the amendment explained that the proposed amendment would open the consultation process – not limit it to Local leaders and to the Finance Committee. Leaving the reference to Article 23.5 could also restrain the participatory budget.

Some were of the view that Article 23.5 does not state that this would be an exclusive consultation with Local leaders, but it would be part of the process. As such, there is no contradiction.

It was reiterated that the intent of the proposed amendment is to allow more flexibility to the NEC and to the Finance Committee to consult at various levels.

The mover of the original motion considered the proposed amendment as being a friendly amendment.

**In favour: 17**

**Against: 0**

**Abstentions: 4**

The amendment **carried**.

On the amended motion,

**Moved by M. Larcher, seconded by A. Hersberger, that the motion be amended as follows:**

**No. 4. Tests the model in the course of the year 2024-2025 and**

**No.6 (New) And the process is established in regular consultation with of the Local Executive members.**

The mover explained that the proposed additional point (No. 6) would link to the spirit of being more inclusive.

In line with that thinking, some were of the view that the new statement should reflect "all members" vs only Local Executive members.

It was clarified that the intent is simply to establish the process (as per BL 23.5).

**Moved by B. Panasyuk, seconded by M. Larcher, that the following sub-amendment be considered:**

**4. Tests the model starting in the year 2024**

**6. (New) And the process is established in regular consultation with of the Local Executive members and any other CAPE members that wish to participate.**

**In favour: 15**

**Against: 0**

**Abstentions: 3**

On the amended motion,

It was clarified that, as discussed by the Finance Committee, steps have already been taken by staff to develop a more participatory budget to replace the current process. There is a difference between having consultation on the budget and establishing a participatory budget. Currently, the Finance Committee develops the budget and presents it to members while this would allow members to be involved in the actual development of the budget.

**In favour: 16**

**Against: 0**

**Abstentions: 5**

The amended motion **carried**.

#### 4.5 **Proposed Vision Statement**

*(VP A. Yeo assumed the role of Chair at this time - 11:40 a.m.)*

**Moved by N. Prier, seconded by A. Brabant, that the following Vision Statement be approved:**

##### **CAPE VISION STATEMENT 2024-2026**

##### **Vision:**

***CAPE members will exercise our collective power to win on the issues that matter to us***

##### **Mission:**

***To win a more just, safe, and healthy workplace, and to assert ourselves in the face of our employer, through member empowerment and organizing in an inclusive, transparent, and accountable union.***

##### **Values:**

***We aim to build a union based on common values of:***

- ***Member empowerment***
- ***Collective action***
- ***Participatory democracy***
- ***Integrity & transparency***
- ***Equity & Inclusivity***
- ***Solidarity & social justice***
- 

##### **Goals:**

- 1. To provide federal public service workers (FPS) with the knowledge, tools, and confidence they need to advocate, organize, and resist on issues that matter. To help FPS workers identify and work on those issues, and to integrate CAPE into the broader labour movement.***
- 2. To run supermajority, effective campaigns through a common front approach.***



- 3. To build trust in our union and show leadership in the broader labour movement.**
- 4. To win telework rights and other material improvements in our lives through member engagement and empowerment.**

The President, mover of the motion, stated that the proposed vision statement was collectively crafted as a result of the strategic planning session. In his view, it should not be modified unless changes are substantive or if something has been omitted. If NEC members are relatively agreeable to the proposed vision, it should not word smithed.

Some raised concern with the reference to “Federal public service worker” in the Goals of the Vision Statement, as not all CAPE members are federally employed.

As such, the motion was amended as follows:

**Moved by S. Feldman, seconded by M. Larcher that the following statement be amended as follows:**

**Goals:**

- 1. To provide CAPE members with the knowledge, tools, and confidence they need to advocate, organize, and resist on issues that matter. To help FPS workers identify and work on those issues, and to integrate CAPE into the broader labour movement.**

A sub-amendment was proposed, to keep the reference to FPS while adding the reference to “CAPE members”.

**Moved by A. Brabant, seconded by B. Latour, that the following sub-amendment be considered:**

**Goals:**

- 1. To provide CAPE members and federal public service workers (FPS) with the knowledge, tools, and confidence they need to advocate, organize, and resist on issues that matter. To help CAPE members and FPS workers identify and work on those issues, and to integrate CAPE into the broader labour movement.**

The mover of the amendment did not accept the sub-amendment as being a friendly amendment. The NEC therefore resumed its discussion on the sub-amendment.

The question was called to vote on the amended motion.

**Moved by M. Larcher, seconded by A. Trau, that the question be called on the amended motion.**

**In favour:** 16

**Against:** 2

**Abstention:** 1

The motion on calling the question **carried**.

In closing, it was stated that the intent of the sub-amendment is to make the Vision Statement more inclusive and connect with all members. It would also speak to having a common front with other federal public service unions and solidify those relationships.

The NEC agreed to proceed to the vote on the sub-amendment.

**In favour:** 17

**Against:** 3

**Abstentions:** 3

The sub-amendment **carried**.

On the motion as amended,

**In favour:** 16

**Against:** 1

**Abstention:** 1

The motion **carried** therefore the NEC proceeded to the vote on the amendment.

The question was called on the sub-amendment

**In favour:** 19

**Against:** 0

**Abstentions:** 4

The sub-amendment **carried**.

On the amended motion,

Some spoke against the motion (Vision Statement as amended) as it represented a significant departure from CAPE's position and its relationship with management in some departments, which has always been based on a collaborative approach and on

seeking consensus on issues. This new Vision Statement could be interpreted as being highly confrontational and may not be what members want for the organization.

Some were of the view that although different from the previous position of CAPE, it is the proper direction for the way forward as CAPE is a union that collaborates with the employer. This proposed vision would tie into the work being done by the PSAC and other labour unions to address issues while assuming its place in the labour movement. This is a departure from the past but as a democratic organisation, the NEC has been given a strong mandate by the membership and having heard members, it has the responsibility to act accordingly on this mandate.

A recorded vote was requested.

**In favour:** T. Green, M. Larcher, B. Latour, B. Panasyuk, N. Burrton, A. Petras, A. Brabant, C. Hill, R. Ajmera, F. Assu, L. Spek, S. Holmes, N. Prier (13)

**Against:** J. Solomon, A. Trau, S. Feldman, P. Makrodimitris, L. Munroe (5)

**Abstentions:** C. Goldberg, A. Hersberger (2)

The motion **carried**.

*(The President resumed his role of Chair at this time - 1:25 pm).*

#### **4.6 CAPE Donation to the Union of National Defence Employees (UNDE)**

**Moved by B. Latour, seconded by M. Larcher, that CAPE donate \$3,000 to the Union of National Defence Employees (UNDE), to be distributed equally among all NPF locals currently engaged in strike action.**

The mover spoke to the motion. He indicated that the intent of the motion was for a \$3,000 donation to be given to the six (6) non-public funds (NPF) UNDE Locals currently engaged in strike action, which would be \$500 for each Local. (UNDE is a component of PSAC.)

Such a donation would go a long way in raising morale and building relationships with CAPE's colleagues in the other federal public service unions, which is necessary to form a common front in the next round of bargaining. This is a tangible show of solidarity, and it will not greatly impact CAPE's finances.

Clarification was sought on whether the proposed amount would be in line with the policy on donations. It was clarified that the NEC has the authority to make such decisions and has the authority to free additional resources if the amount per policy is exceeded. The policy allows for donations of up to \$5,000 per year, therefore, the

proposed amount would be less than the current level for this year, representing approximately 60%. It was noted that there have been no other formal requests received to date. It was also noted that this was done in consultation with a PSAC Local.

**In favour:** 19

**Against:** 1

**Abstentions:** 2

The motion carried.