The problem with Memorial: RESPECT (lack thereof).

From a staff person’s perspective, a lot of the problems we experience at MUN could be summed up in this simple word or more specifically a lack of it. As president of the local, I am one of the first to hear from members when they feel mistreated. Often these have to do with how they are being spoken to by someone; how they have been denied promotion; or just because they are unsure of what changes are coming within a department that is restructuring and how it might affect them.

In many cases I’m floored by the lack of basis respect shown our fellow members by management. Surely it’s not that difficult to call a meeting to let rank and file know what is going on when departments are undergoing change! Is it too much to ask a manager to check with staff once a year to ask what their work goals are and offer advice on what they should do to reach them? And as for harassing or disrespectful behaviour, why is it that if staff practiced it they would be quickly reprimanded while it’s not only allowed but probably indorsed as acceptable action for management!! When is the last time you heard of a manager being taken to task by a superior for poor treatment of staff?

Some of the poor treatment our members experience is at the hands of supervisors/managers. Whether it is outright harassment or just lack of care or lack of communication, it is unforgivable this day and age. If it was staff doing the same I’m doubtful they would still work here.

You’d think that given the difficulty of getting and keeping good staff lately this poor management attitude would change at Memorial – well let’s just say this University is slow to catch up with the reality of the times, they still see staff as an endless supply that can be abused at will. Some of them probably still think us lucky to have jobs. This is not a good attitude for any institution of higher learning especially given the employment outlook for our province/country.

As the union has said on many occasions, Memorial must take responsibility for the actions of its Managers. The union consistently provides proof of poor management skill to Human Resources when its members are involved. We have a good number of what the Union considers to be poor managers within Memorial and have named these to Human Resources over the years along with examples of their poor management skills. While some actions are taken by Human Resources to deal with the most serious complaints, it is the Unions position that these actions are too few or not sufficient to effectively deal with the problem. The complaints involving not very serious behaviour are hardly ever dealt with by Memorial. In short it is the Unions view that Memorial
does very little to correct poor management practices or poor managers and is now faced with a systemic problem of poor management in many parts of the university. If things continue as they have with Human Resources protective attitude towards all management, no matter how bad, we’ll be as dysfunctional as Eastern Health before long.

The local will do another survey shortly similar to a non-scientific one tested last year, asking members to tell us what they see as the problems they face at work. Questions about: Treatment by supervisors/managers; Chance of promotion/transfer; Comparison with how they view the working relationship in their department/division compared to what they know about other areas of MUN; General work satisfaction; etc. will make up this survey and we hope to have as good a response as we have in the past.

Memorial will be informed of the overall results without identifying staff. More importantly the results will be used to see where action is needed and where we should concentrate our efforts to bring about improvement. When we do identify problems remember that we need your support to address them. That might involve information pickets or letter writing campaigns, whatever is needed to get our concerns addressed.

We’ve written a few articles now on how our members are treated at MUN. I would like to leave you with a couple of important thoughts regarding poor treatment in a unionized environment.

(1) When you are treated in a way that disturbs you, you have a right to let the union know and the union has a right and a duty to approach management about it. When we do raise the issue we keep with it until changes are made at MUN.

(2) If any manager threatens a member, or warns them not to get the union involved, it is even more important that they contact us, anonymously if you must. We will deal immediately with every case where the locals authority or legitimate duty is questioned and make sure that management is aware of our legal duty to be involved.

(3) The next time you see another employee who feels that they are mistreated by management, ask yourself one very important question – could that happen to you? If the answer is yes then support and encourage your fellow staff and your union when we try and bring about change. After all does any member really believe that the protection of any bad manager would trump the wishes of 900 plus employees??? There is strength in numbers and we can accomplish much if members stand up together when confronted with unacceptable behaviour by anyone at this University. Remember that the next time you or someone you know has been treated poorly at Memorial. There is a U in Union; there are approximately 1000 of them in CUPE 1615 at MUN.

Written by: Mike Murphy, President CUPE 1615
Your Union

The Time is Near

I’m not referring to the end of the world in 2012. If you believe that will happen, best quit your job and spend the short time you have left enjoying life to its fullest. I’m not referring to becoming a grandfather either, although I’m hoping that I will be one by the time this article is being read by you. (Update: Baby granddaughter, Olivia Jane Murphy born June 9, 2011, 10.5 lbs.) What I’m referring to is Political Change.

We’ve just seen a big change in the Federal Political landscape with many ordinary people putting faith in an NDP Opposition while giving Harper and Company a mandate to govern and leaving the Liberals in the dust. If Harper continues his arrogant ways, as demonstrated by putting Fabian and some other has-been in the Senate, I predict that ordinary Canadians will finally give the NDP a chance to govern and show what they can do when given that responsibility. But that change in Canadian Politics is four years from now, the change that I would really like to talk about is the one coming to Provincial Politics in our province this October.

We will have a Provincial Election on Oct. 12, 2011. That’s correct, a short two months from now we’ll be casting ballots again. While I’m convinced that Cathy Dunderdale and the Progressive Conservatives will win a mandate to govern, I’m doubtful that the Liberals will hold on to many of their seats. I’m predicting that Lorraine Michael and the NDP will form the Official Opposition in our House of Assembly.

Why am I predicting this you may ask? As I see it, Newfoundlanders/Labradorians are finally breaking out of the old tradition that gave us successive Liberal or Conservative governments. The day when we vote as our fathers and mothers did is finally over. We’re growing confident enough to think outside the box and are beginning to consider other parties and points of view to lead us in the next millennium. After seeing what damage big business and their political supporters can do, government like the NDP that puts the concerns of citizens ahead of business doesn’t look all that bad.

All political change usually starts small and grows. In Newfoundland and Labrador in this past federal election, more ordinary people in the urban centers of our province voted for NDP candidates than ever before. Youth are also turning to the NDP in greater numbers to address their concerns. As a result we have two NDP members in St. John’s/Mount Pearl area and many more that garnered respectful numbers of votes throughout the province. The citizens of this province are giving their votes to NDP candidates instead of voting for the
same old parties.

Nova Scotia has already broken the mould that defined Atlantic Canadians as belonging to either Tories or Wigs and Newfoundland/Labrador is close behind. South of us in the U.S.A, Obama is proving to be as left wing as anything Canada has produced. With two wars, a recession and a large deficit Obama still managed to bring in Medicare. As a result the Republicans have targeted him and along with their big business partners will do everything they can to make sure he doesn’t win another term. Let’s hope Obama does run and win again.

That is why next year we’ll have a NDP Opposition and someday soon we’ll have an NDP government in our province. The times of change are here, our belief that big business and big banks interests are the same as ours has finally been dismissed as hogwash.

By October I’m hoping that many more voters will cast ballots for good NDP candidates that will start coming forward to offer themselves for public service. Already we’ve heard of many qualified individuals that will be running as NDP candidates in this election. Many of these are young people with new progressive ideal about how government should be run. By October 13th, the Liberal Party of Smallwood, Wells and Tobin will be reduced to single digits and that won’t be too soon. Lorrain Michael will be the leader of a strong opposition to Dunderdale’s reduced Conservative majority.

We may be a couple of elections away from giving the NDP the right to govern in our province, but that is changing and that change is starting in urban centers and in the minds of younger voters. As we become a have Province and start to see the social problems and inequities that come with new wealth, we’ll need politicians that keep in mind what Newfoundlanders/Labradoreans hold most important.

Concerns about the social fabric of our province and its people’s well being is what define us, not big oil, not big industry or big development and certainly not pockets full of money and ½ million dollar houses. A strong socially minded opposition will be what the people of this province will want and that’s a good thing. One day the NDP will govern in our province and our identity as being concerned first and foremost with the well being of our fellow Newfoundlanders/Labradoreans will be protected. The cultural that had defined us in the past and made us proud to be Newfoundlander is what the NDP is all about and they will protect that.

This time round give a lot of thought to those running and which of them really represent your interests and your future before you cast your ballot.

Mike Murphy
Vice President (Labour) NDP Newfoundland and Labrador
WHO DOESN’T LOVE A PARTY!!!!!!!!!!!!

In this issue and on the Local’s webpage there is an important notice. CUPE 1615’s Annual Labour Day Picnic. I have been a member of our Social Committee for a number of years. It is so much fun for us to organize a picnic for members and their families. Everyone just has a relaxing afternoon enjoying the company of friends and family. Each year we have more people dropping by for something to eat, good conversation and laughter.

Last year Ingrid Verbree-Barnes made a wonderful suggestion – why not book Skyhigh Amusements. We booked the Velcro Wall and Mickey Mouse’s Bouncy House. Everyone had a ball. The kids were lining up for the Velcro Wall. Yours truly even had a go at the Velcro Wall. It was a laugh but I have to say that a person needs to have good knees. It is not as easy as it looks. Face painting, games, mini golf, prizes, snacks, drinks, cake, barbeque and of course, loot bags. How could you not have fun? It is a great opportunity to meet fellow members and get to know new people. It is a chance to put a name to a face you might have seen at the university. You get to know about other parts of Mun. Aren’t you in any way curious about other members of the very large local you are part of.

So come join us at the North Bank Lodge in Pippy Park on Sunday September 11 from 1pm -4pm, rain or shine. You don’t have to have children to attend. It is for ALL members. If you are going to attend please send an email to me, Susan Kearsey (skearsey@mun.ca) or Ingrid Verbree-Barnes (ingrid@cs.mun.ca) with the following:
1. Number of people attending. Please break this down into the number of adults and children.
2. The age of the children is needed. We do have loot bags to pass out and the child’s age lets us know what to put in the bag.
3. If anyone has an allergy we need to know.
4. If anyone is a vegetarian we will have vegetarian burgers and hot dogs.
5. It is important to know the number of people attending so we will have enough food for everyone.

Mark the date and time in your calendar, send an email, drive to Pippy Park and have a great time. See you there.

Susan Kearsey
In 2008 a three-year activity plan was prepared for the Memorial University pension plan. The successful achievement of the objectives for 2009-2010 are listed in the Annual Report. The activity plan and full report are available on the Human resources web page at this link http://www.mun.ca/humanres/employees/pensions.php

The Memorial University Pension Fund is currently managed by six external investment management firms under various individual mandates. The overriding objective of the Fund’s investment policy is to maintain predictable and stable benefit costs and contributions over the long term. A policy asset mix has been established which is expected to achieve this objective at a reasonable and acceptable level of risk. The nominal annual return of the policy asset mix is expected to be 7.5% within a range of +/- 9.4%.

In 2009-10, global equity markets began to stabilize and recover, posting double digit positive returns. The turnaround in equity markets, combined with strong fixed income performance, resulted in an annual return for the Fund of 16.33% at March 31, 2010. This ranked in the 95th percentile as compared with other Canadian pension funds (1st percentile being the top performer and 100th being the worst). Our Total fund of investments has equaled the benchmark for the last quarter of 2010 at 4.14%. We continue to see improvements but these are not large profits returns. Our fund is such that we seem to protect our money when the market is down and make small gains over the benchmark with markets are good.

During the 2009-10 fiscal year, the Plan collected a total of $47,916,000 in contributions, representing amounts paid by Memorial University and its employees and funds transferred from other employers’ plans. The Plan paid out a total of $37,276,000 in benefits to eligible retired employees or their beneficiaries and $2,410,000 in administrative expenses.

In July 2010, 1,017 retirees and survivors received a 0.18% indexing adjustment to their pensions. Indexing was introduced under the Plan in July 2004, with yearly adjustments calculated as 60% of the annual change in the consumer price index, as measured by Statistics Canada, to a maximum yearly increase of 1.2 per cent.

In November 2010, the University was advised by the Superintendent of Pensions that the March 31, 2010 valuation of the Plan be prepared in comparison to the March 31, 2008 valuation and that it be filed with his office. The Superintendent also required that the funding recommendation take into consideration changes since the 2008 report.

The two key funding recommendations of the March 31, 2010 valuation were:
1. Increase the University’s annual special payment to liquidate the portion of the unfunded liability not attributable to indexing, namely $218.6 million. The special payment required for 2010-11 is $17.748 million. To date the pension plan has received $4.745 million towards the 2010-2011 payment.
2. Increase the current contributions of both the university and employees by 0.1%. The rate will increase as of April 1, 2011.

Submitted by
Patricia Adams
Family Leave:

Family Leave is defined by sections 31.09 of our contract. It has been improved with a provision allowing members to take non-emergency leave for any reason. However, there are restrictions on the non-emergency leave and on how the 6 day maximum family leave bank works.

Only emergency leave can be used for periods greater than one day. Non-emergency leave can only be taken for one day at a time and up to 3 days in any fiscal year (April 1 to March 31). Non emergency Leave must be approved by your supervisor prior to when you want to take it and notice is required. Operational requirements will have to come first if you are requesting Non-emergency leave. If a member uses all the six days leave in one year (6 days emergency leave, or some combination of emergency and non-emergency leave), they will have no days remaining until the start of the next two year period (i.e. April 1, 2010 to March 31, 2012). As of the April 1, 2012 they can avail of six more days from the next two fiscal year period (i.e. April 1, 2012 to March 31, 2014).

If a person takes three days family leave (emergency and non-emergency) every year they will have a bank of at least three days for the next fiscal year and this will change to six day bank starting on April 1 the next two fiscal year period (2012 – 2014). Example: I have 6 days in my Family leave bank in 2009. If I use 3 in 2009 this leaves 3 until March 31, 2010 at which time the bank is topped to a maximum of 6 days on April 1, 2010 for the 2010 -2012 two year period.

If I don’t use family leave the bank will never go above 6 days meaning that if I don’t take any days in a two year period (2008 to 2010) I give up those days at the end of the fiscal year (March 31, 2010). However I would still have a bank of 6 days as of April 1 of the new fiscal year when a new two year period begins.

If I only use 1 day in a two year period I lose the remaining days at the end of that two year period but my bank would return to 6 days on April 1 of that next two year period (i.e. 2012 -2014).

Submitted by Mike Murphy
Oct. 2010
Family Responsibility Leave.

In the four year contract we signed earlier this year there were a number of improvements made. One such improvement was with the Family Responsibility Leave article 31.09. Human Resources brought this to the table as they had a number of changes that would benefit members. Both Memorial and your Negotiation Team realized that while some staff were using the three days for Family leave every year, many more were using very little if any.

Not all staff has young children to care for; some individuals have many demands on them outside work. The question before us during negotiations was; how could we improve Family Leave so that all staff would be able to avail of at least some of the days set aside for that purpose? In an attempt to make it fair to all employees, and for other good reasons that I've outlined below, CUPE 1615 and Memorial agreed to make this leave easier to access and use. To Human Resources credit, they recognized the unfair application of this leave and authentically believed that some of it should be available to all employees when it was needed. Both sides also agreed that employees who hardly ever avail of leave should be able to take a day off from work for reasons that some of us would argue are not emergency situations. The employee requesting leave may consider it a legitimate reason to take a day off, no matter how others view it. These employees should be allowed to take none emergency leave when they believe it necessary.

The department of Human Resources is beginning to embrace the idea - one that the union believed for a long time: A good employee is a happy employee. Those members that do not use many sick days or family leave days deserve an option of leave for those times when coming into work may cause them more stress in their lives. Dedicated employees have lives outside of work and there are times when family, friends or personal matters should be put ahead of the workplace. In addition to this, when employees realize that they can take a day off on occasion to attend to matters outside of work on short notice, they will be better employees when they are working.

We are becoming more aware of how stress in our lives, whether caused by work or not, affects our ability to do good work and can negatively impact others in the workplace. Many of us do not realize the level of stress we have in our lives, most of us will probably be oblivious to our stress level until something occurs in our lives that overwhelms us. It is only then that we realize how stressed we are and by that time the damage to our health or our relationships may be severely compromised. There is also overwhelming evidence that allowing individuals to take time for things they believes important outside work will actually make them better employees.
Proactive intervention is another reason why both Human Resources and your Union agree that employees need a break at times to take care of the important things in their lives that are not defined by, or related to work. Many of us don't realize the positive impact taking a day to deal with personal or family matters will have in the long run. For many of us at Memorial, we have X amount of work to get done. How well we perform is not only dictated by how many hours or days we put in but also by how we feel - how we approach the work, our coworkers, students and others. In short, if we are content in our lives there is a much better chance of being content in our work. Taking a day off now and then, whether for life’s other necessities, or just for the others in our lives, will make us more healthy, productive and valuable employees of Memorial.

There are many good reasons why employees should be able to call in and ask for a day off. These good reasons are as simple as doing something that will make a big difference to themselves (day at the spa) or those that they love, and at the same time reduce the stress in all our lives. What better than to allow employees a day off just to have a nice breakfast with a loved one, bring a child to some event, take a pet to the vet, or close that deal on a new house?

Now that I've convinced you of the good reasons for the changes in Family Leave, I would like to quote the two articles that were added to this recent collective agreement between CUPE and Memorial and I want each of you to interpret these new clauses with Memorials and your locals agreed views on work/life balance - how our lives outside of work can so greatly impact us as valued employees. Interpret these clauses keeping in mind the atmosphere in which they were agreed during negotiations.

By Mike Murphy

31.09 Family Responsibility Leave

(d) There are no restrictions on the use of emergency family leave except for the total family responsibility leave restrictions of a maximum of six (6) days in a two (2) year period as specified in 31.09(a). The first two (2) year period shall commence April 1, 2008.

(e) Employees may access the above noted leave by requesting up to one (1) day at a time and three (3) days per year non-emergency family leave and the employer shall approve subject only to work requirements. Work demands, applied reasonably, shall be a legitimate reason to deny non-emergency requests.
On The National Scene

Privacy in the era of Facebook
by Mikael Swayze/CUPE

THERE WAS a recent brouhaha at York University surrounding Facebook comments made by a teaching assistant (TA) with respect to her students. From the media coverage, we learned that a teacher’s assistant in Sociology, frustrated with the level of student writing, posted a status update in which she called her students stupid. The university investigated and the TA apologized. Was the university right to investigate? Was the TA entitled to consider Facebook to be private? Here’s the situation in law. Generally speaking, a employer does not have the right to police an worker’s off duty conduct unless there is a clear and legitimate employer interest at stake. So, generally speaking, a worker can say what they like on Facebook and it’s none of the employer’s business. However, in this case, the comments could give rise to a reasonable concern that, as a result of the comments, the students might not trust the professional judgment of the TA. In this case, such concerns were not warranted. The students, in fact, showed support for the TA and her judgment. However, the employer’s concern was enough to bring about the investigation. There are cases where workers have been discharged and disciplined for comments made on Facebook. Last year, an arbitrator in the Wasaya Airways LP and ALPA decision upheld the dismissal of worker by Wasaya Airlines for posting allegedly racist (anti-First Nations) material on his Facebook page. Wasaya is a First Nations owned and operated carrier in Northern Ontario. The arbitrator found that “Because the grievor’s Facebook statements do not reflect company values but are disrespectful and impugn the dignity of its First Nations clients, the matter of harm to its reputation is a necessary consideration... The evidence is incomplete as to the total number of individuals who may have viewed the grievor’s Facebook note, or, whether or not access to it was limited in some way by locks on that account. Be that as it may, the medium chosen by the grievor to express his statements lies within the public domain.” The arbitrator applied a general test of discipline involving off-duty conduct and found that the employer’s concerns about reputation were “substantial and warranted” and that the conduct had a “real and material” connection to the company. The worker’s conduct rendered him unable to perform his duties because the company’s senior managers and his supervisors were unwilling to work with him. As a result of these factors, the discharge was upheld. The law is slightly different with respect to email messages. A recent decision of the Ontario Court of Appeal in a criminal matter (R. v. Cole) involving child pornography on a school laptop used by a teacher resulted in a finding that the
teacher had a reasonable expectation of privacy with respect to the email on the computer even though the computer belonged to the employer. The law is rapidly changing in respect of reasonable expectations of privacy of email. What is clear, however, is that employers do have access to worker email accounts by virtue of owning the system. What is at issue is the extent to which they may use that access to do surveillance or monitoring of worker activity or an investigation of worker activity. In that regard much turns on the specific industry and any relevant employer policies. With respect to Facebook and other public or quasi-public forums, users are encouraged to view them as no different than a public billboard. Engaging in activity on your Facebook page that is likely to give rise to employer concern may result in consequences at work. Apply the billboard test and you should be okay.

When it comes to email, we like to think workers have a reasonable expectation of privacy for their electronic communications. But bear in mind how easily electronic communications can be forwarded. If you have any questions or concerns, contact your union.

• Mikael Swayze is a staff representative with CUPE 3902 and CALM Secretary-Treasurer.
Is an $18,000 pension gold-plated?
by Paul Moist/CUPE/CALM

Try as they might, those attacking public sector unions can’t seem to figure out why exactly they are so bad for Canada.

For whatever the reason—it doesn’t seem to matter much—many from Canada’s corporate classes insist public sector unions are a blight, and spend much time and energy mounting their hyperbolic attacks.

The threadbare nature of these arguments is best exemplified in opposition to the labour movement’s efforts to expand the Canada Pension Plan as the best way to help Canadians save more for their retirements.

By gradually increasing CPP contributions made by both employees and employers, we could greatly improve retirement security of all Canadians, and help the millions who cannot afford a private retirement savings plan.

Of course, under this approach, Canada’s banks and finance industry will lose out on opportunities to charge their exorbitant investment management fees.

Instead of offering solutions for low-income Canadians, it is much easier to portray CPP contributions as a payroll tax. CPP contributions help fund a deferred salary for Canadian workers and supply no revenue to the federal government. It is not a tax.

When it comes to debating pensions, however, disingenuous arguments are commonplace—such as corporate Canada’s insistence on pointing to public sector pensions as prime examples of union-led extravagance.

The typical public sector pension—for someone who has worked for 30 years—is $18,000 per year. Most Canadians sure don’t think this is excessive.

An Environics poll conducted in August 2010 shows that 80 per cent of Canadians thought public sector pensions were at an appropriate level or too low. No matter how often the mantra is repeated, few Canadians genuinely believe $18,000 per year is a gold-plated pension.

The weak foundation of these pension arguments is little different than lies offered in favour of privatizing public services. The Canadian right’s new hero of privatization, Toronto mayor Rob Ford, is similarly trying to cover an ideological position with the façade of protecting taxpayers.

Ford’s promises to save untold millions by contracting out services, such as waste and recycling collection, are missing one key element—any proof it will save Toronto taxpayers one dollar. In fact, a detailed analysis of available data on costs of private waste collection in neighbouring municipalities shows Toronto stands to pay substantially more if waste collection is contracted out.

This, however, is only a footnote in the real agenda of Ford and other attackers of public sector unions, which has nothing to do with saving taxpayers any money at all. It has everything to do with wrestlling away the modest power of workers.

The large majority of public sector workers are in health care, schools, social services, and local government. They are mostly women and are far from highly paid. The average annual pay of CUPE members is less than $40,000. To portray
these workers as privileged stretches even the most inventive imaginations. No position, however, is too outlandish for those looking to cast public sector workers as a plague on the taxpayer. Instead of tackling the economic policies that caused the global recession, they take up this diversionary strategy of attacking public sector workers to protect economic policies that are great for profits, but bad for working Canadians.

While crying out against the so-called extravagances of public sector worker salaries, benefits, and pensions, they continue to promote extending even more irresponsible and reckless corporate tax cuts to Canada’s banks and the oil industry without any proof these cuts provide the new jobs or investments they’re supposed to generate.

While claiming to be looking out for the best interests of taxpayers, those who attack public sector workers are also taking unjustified aim at our communities—large and small. Canadians are being asked to shoulder the deficits and also sacrifice the high quality public services we have developed over generations.

It is undeniable that Canada is facing fiscal challenges after weathering the global economic meltdown. Stimulus spending that kept the economy afloat during a crisis created by speculation and fraud has left a public debt. Canadian governments have a responsibility to ensure all Canadians contribute their fair share to the ongoing recovery. Public sector workers are prepared to do their part, but the responsibility should not fall on their shoulders alone.

High-quality public services are crucial to our economic recovery and help make Canada a great place to live. They are reliable, accountable and are there for all people when they need them most. Public sector workers across the country are dedicated to these principles, and are focused on making our communities stronger for all Canadians.

• Paul Moist is president of the Canadian Union of Public Employees. This opinion piece was first published in the Financial Post on March 11, 2011.
Cash for your Words

Do you have a flair for writing? Would you like a chance to win a cash prize? Well, sharpen your pencil and get to work. CUPE on Campus wants writers – all kinds of writers – to fill its pages. You can write fiction, poetry, an opinion piece, or anything you choose. Keep it to two pages and make sure you follow the CUPE Equality Statement. That means that your writing should not contain anything that is discriminatory on the basis of ability, age, class, religion, language or ethnic origin, nor should it be racist, sexist, transphobic or homophobic. All writers will be entered in a draw for a cash prize.

Coffee Break

CUPE 1615 Contest

Below are four questions about information found on the CUPE 1615 website (http://www.mun.ca/cupe1615). The first five members of CUPE 1615 who submit all correct answers via email to Sheldon Huelin (shuelin@mun.ca) will receive a $25.00 cash card. Participants can only enter the contest once and emails must be delivered after 9:00 AM on August 15th, 2011 and the deadline for entries is 5:00 PM on August 19th, 2011. Please use the following text, "2011 CUPE 1615 Website Contest", as the subject of the email.

Questions:
1. Who is the website editor?
2. What page can the current collective agreement be found?
3. What is the date of the 2011 CUPE 1615 picnic?
4. What is the name of the article on page 5 of the November 2010 Newsletter?
CUPE 1615 LABOUR DAY PICNIC

SUNDAY SEPTEMBER 11, 2011

PIPPY PARK, NORTH BANK LODGE

AT 1:00pm – 4:00pm

EVERYONE IS WELCOME (YOUNG AND OLDER)

FUN THINGS PROVIDED BY

SKYHIGH AMUSEMENTS

BBQ (hot dogs, burgers, veggies burgers)

chips, cheesies, cookies, juice, soft drinks

And much more !!!!!!!

Mark it on your calendar.

IMPORTANT:

The Social Committee has to know how many will be attending (food, loot bags & prizes). Please email one of us with the following information:

Name, dept, # of adults, # of children (ages)

(Ingrid Verbree-Barnes ingrid@cs.mun.ca ; Susan Kearsey skearsey@mun.ca)
Scholarship Committee Report
Cupe 1615

In the past year (2010-2011), the committee received 17 applications for the CUPE scholarships. Five scholarships were awarded. Congratulations are extended to the winners! All other applicants are welcome to apply again next year. The following is a list of the winners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th>PARENT/SPOUSE</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY DEPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mario Dimitrov</td>
<td>Ilana Dimitrova</td>
<td>Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher McGee</td>
<td>Debra McGee and Gerald Porter</td>
<td>DELT, Distance Education and Learning Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Simmons</td>
<td>Jay Simmons</td>
<td>Department of Physics and Physical Oceanography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Skinner</td>
<td>Evelyn Skinner</td>
<td>Discipline of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Stapleton</td>
<td>Karen Stapleton</td>
<td>QE II Library, Circulation Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applications for 2011-2012 scholarships will be available on the CUPE website http://www.mun.ca/cupe1615 in early February, 2012. Union members are reminded that this scholarship is available not only to full time university students but also to students enrolled in a two year program at other recognized post-secondary institutions.

CUPE 1615 Scholarship Committee

Carol Kennedy
Diane Johnson
Nathalie Vanasse
Ingrid Verbree-Barnes

The real pirates of the Caribbean
HEU Guardian/CALM

IN TODAY'S globalized world, tax evasion is occurring on a massive scale, writes Peter Gillespie in a recent edition of the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives’ publication, The Monitor.

As corporations and wealthy individuals shift their assets into offshore tax havens, the annual loss in global tax revenues is more than $500 billion. This huge revenue shortfall is restricting the ability of governments to provide vital services.

Gillespie reports that in 2002, Canada's Auditor-General warned that corporate tax arrangements with foreign affiliates have eroded Canadian tax revenues of hundreds of millions of dollars in the past ten years.

A June 2008 study by the University of Quebec concluded that the five major Canadian banks avoided $16 billion in federal and provincial taxes through offshore affiliates between 1991 and 2003.

And, Statistics Canada reported that $88 billion of Canadian corporate assets were held offshore in 2003, mostly invested in the tax havens of Barbados, Ireland, Bermuda, the Cayman Islands, and the Bahamas.
Overqualified immigrants at risk of poorer mental health

At Work/Institute for Work & Health/CALM

MANY RECENT immigrants end up in jobs for which they are overqualified, putting them at risk of poorer mental health, according to a recent study from the Institute for Work and Health.

Recent immigrants who are working at jobs for which they are overqualified are more likely to report declines in their mental health than immigrants who are in jobs suited to their education, experience and expectations. This is a concern, given that about half of recent immigrants and up in jobs that they are overqualified for.

The study found that about 52 per cent of the immigrants in their sample group were overqualified based on their education levels, 44 per cent based on their experience and 43 per cent based on their expectations.

Moreover, immigrants who were overqualified in any of these three ways reported declines in their mental health over the four-year period (although not in their general health), and this decline could be traced to their general dissatisfaction with their job situation.

Immigrants receive very little information when applying to come to Canada about the types of work they are likely to end up in and how long they may remain in jobs for which they are overqualified.
You oughta know
HEU Guardian/CALM

CANADA IS changing. And there are things about those changes oughta know. These facts are compiled from various reports issued by the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.

• A universal, public pharmacare plan could save Canadians up to $10.7 billion on prescription drugs.
• Canadian military spending is higher now than at any time since the end of WWII.
• In 1992, 45 per cent of workers had a workplace pension. That’s dropped to 38 per cent.
• 14 per cent of Canada’s female seniors who live independently are in poverty.
• Canada’s municipal buildings and road, water, waste and transit systems needed $123 billion of maintenance in 2007.
• From 2000 to 2005, average earnings for workers from visible minorities declined by 0.2 per cent compared to other workers whose wages rose by 2.7 per cent.
• In 2005, workers from visible minorities earned only $0.81 for every dollar paid other Canadian workers.
• In 2009, the richest 3.8 per cent of Canadian households controlled 66.6 per cent of financial wealth. And, the portion of financial wealth controlled by this richest group of Canadians is headed for 70 per cent by 2018.
Meeting Schedule

Tuesday, September 13, 2011 5:00 p.m - 9:00 p.m.
Room ED 1014 for St. John's members

Agenda
Roll call of officers
Reading of the Equality Statement
Reading of minutes from last meeting
Business arising
Treasurer’s report
Communications
Executive board report
Reports of committees
Unfinished business
New business

Newsletter Note:
CUPE on Campus is now a bi-monthly newsletter.

For up-to-date info please visit the temporary website at http://1615.cupe.ca/. Stay tuned for the launch of our new website happening soon.

Need a sitter so you can get to the meeting?
Your union will pay for your childcare so you can attend the monthly meetings. Just contact Mike Murphy at 737-2393, or email mjmurphy@mun.ca

Next Issue
If you have anything to submit or any great ideas for newsletter content, please contact us.

Contact:
Editor: Jerry Smith
jerryl@mun.ca

Assistant Editor: Linda Carroll
lcarroll@swgc.mun.ca

Layout Artist: Pat Shanahan
rshanahan@mun.ca

Union meeting tonight and you don't have time to get home and have supper?

Come and enjoy delicious food with us. Before we start the proceedings, WE lay out the spread. Let's enjoy a meal together.