ASSOCIATION OF POSTAL OFFICIALS OF CANADA

ASSOCIATION DES OFFICIERS DES POSTES DU CANADA

21ST NATIONAL CONVENTION

21e CONGRÈS NATIONAL

TRANSCRIPTION

Fairmont Chateau Whistler
4599 Chateau Blvd.
Whistler, British Columbia

July 21-23, 2026

Fairmont Chateau Whistler
4599 boul. Chateau
Whistler (Colombie-Britannique)

21-23 juillet 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Tuesday, July 21, 2026 1

Welcome from the Sḵwx̱wú7mesh Líl'wat7úl Cultural Centre 1
Welcoming Words from the National President 6
Introduction of the National Office and Executive Committee 8
Acceptance of Convention Parliamentarian 9
Roll Call 14
Budget Presentation 16
Introduction of the Constitution Committee 39

Wednesday, July 22, 2026 168

Roll Call 169

Thursday, July 23, 2026 320

Roll Call 321
Elections 321
Venue Selection for 2029 Convention 345
Swearing In of New Officers 347
Tribute to Steve Gustard 348
Closing Remarks from the National President 349
Collective Agreement Update 351

RESOLUTIONS / RÉSOLUTIONS

No.	Page	Result / Résultat
1	41	Amendment not passed / Amendement pas adopté Not passed / Pas adoptée
2	63	Passed / Adoptée
3	84	Withdrawn / Retirée
4	85	Not passed / Pas adoptée
5	88	Not passed / Pas adoptée
6	90	Not passed / Pas adoptée
7	93	Withdrawn / Retirée
8	93	Passed / Adoptée
9	96	Not passed / Pas adoptée
10	98	Passed / Adoptée
11	99	Amended resolution passed / Résolution modifiée adoptée
12	102	Not passed / Pas adoptée
13	105	Not passed / Pas adoptée
14	123	Withdrawn / Retirée
15	124	Amended resolution passed / Résolution modifiée adoptée
16	126	Not passed / Pas adoptée
17	128	Amended resolution passed / Résolution modifiée adoptée
18	137	Amended resolution passed / Résolution modifiée adoptée
19	142	Amendment not passed / Amendement pas adopté Passed / Adoptée
20	159	Withdrawn / Retirée
21	160	Withdrawn / Retirée
22	147	Amendment not passed / Amendement pas adopté Passed / Adoptée
23	160	Passed / Adoptée
24	52	Not passed / Pas adoptée
25	169	Not passed / Pas adoptée
26	175	Amendment not passed / Amendement pas adopté Amended resolution passed / Résolution modifiée adoptée
27	194	Not passed / Pas adoptée
28	196	Passed / Adoptée
29	203	Withdrawn / Retirée
30	204	Withdrawn / Retirée
31	204	Withdrawn / Retirée
32	204	Amended resolution passed / Résolution modifiée adoptée
33	207	Withdrawn / Retirée
34	67	Amended resolution passed / Résolution modifiée adoptée
35	218	Withdrawn / Retirée

RESOLUTIONS / RÉSOLUTIONS

No.	Page	Result / Résultat
36	207	Passed / Adoptée
37	218	Passed / Adoptée
38	219	Amended resolution passed / Résolution modifiée adoptée
39	225	Not passed / Pas adoptée
40	227	Amendment not passed / Amendement pas adopté Amendment not passed / Amendement pas adopté Amendment not passed / Amendement pas adopté Withdrawn / Retirée
41	242	Amendment not passed / Amendement pas adopté Not passed / Pas adoptée
42	248	Passed / Adoptée
43	249	Passed / Adoptée
44	63	Withdrawn / Retirée
45	251	Passed / Adoptée
46	257	Withdrawn / Retirée
47	261	Passed / Adoptée
48	262	Passed / Adoptée
49	74	Passed / Adoptée
50	264	Passed / Adoptée
51	267	Passed / Adoptée
52	268	Passed / Adoptée
53	271	Withdrawn / Retirée
54	272	Amended resolution passed / Résolution modifiée adoptée
55	272	Amended resolution passed / Résolution modifiée adoptée
56	281	Withdrawn / Retirée
57	281	Withdrawn / Retirée
58	281	Withdrawn / Retirée
59	282	Withdrawn / Retirée
60	282	Withdrawn / Retirée
61	282	Withdrawn / Retirée
62	282	Withdrawn / Retirée
63	283	Passed / Adoptée
64	316	Withdrawn / Retirée
65	301	Amended resolution passed / Résolution modifiée adoptée
66	316	Withdrawn / Retirée

Whistler, B.C. / Whistler (C.-B.)

--- Upon commencing on Tuesday, July 21, 2026
at 9:00 a.m. / L'audience débute le mardi
21 juillet 2026 à 9 h 00

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Good morning everyone. Bon matin. S'il vous plaît, prendre vos places. Please take your seats. We'll get started.

Thank you. Merci.

I'm going to take a moment to introduce our guests from the SLCC that will be opening the convention this morning.

WELCOME FROM THE SḴWX̱WÚ7MESH LÍL'WAT7ÚL CULTURAL CENTRE

MS. T'EC GEORGINA DAN (Líl'wat Nation): Good morning everyone. Can you hear me? Good morning everyone. (Ucwalmícwts spoken / Ucwalmícwts parlée)

So what I just said in the Líl'wat language is hello everyone. My ancestral name is T'ec, which translates to sweet. I was given that name by my late uncle. My English name is Georgina. I come from the Líl'wat, which is a part of the St'át'y'emc Nation, And I speak the language of Ucwalmícwts. I work at the Squamish Lil'wat Cultural Centre, and it is very good to see you all.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

UNKNOWN (Líl'wat Nation): (Ucwalmícwts spoken / Ucwalmícwts parlée)

Loosely translated into English, what I just said is: Hello everyone, my ancestral name is Áykvlitna(ph). My English name is Quinn. I come from the Líl'wat Nation, which is a part of the St'át'y'emc Territory, and we are people of the land. I work at the Sḵwx̱wú7mesh Lil'wat7úl Cultural Centre, and it is very good to see you all. It is good that you have arrived safely. Welcome.

My friend and colleague are here today to welcome you to the shared unceded territory of the Sḵwx̱wú7mesh Úxwumixw and the Líl'wat7úl. And to do so, we would like to share a few songs with you. The first song that we'd like to share comes from the Líl'wat Nation, and it is known as our friendship song. We would traditionally sing this song to welcome any guests that are travelling through our territory or passing by to visit.

--- Song / Chanson

--- Applause / Applaudissements

UNKNOWN (Líl'wat Nation): And for this next song, it comes from the Squamish Nation and is known as the Chief Jimmy Jimmy. Chief Jimmy Jimmy, like many others, was very well known to travel short to long distances to be able to gather with one another. Right now, there's

actually a Tribal Canoe Journey happening. Yesterday, they were actually in Ambleside Park, and there were several large canoes that were parking to have a ceremony before they continue their travels down to the bottom of Vancouver Island.

There's several communities that will travel from the four different directions, often the furthest one starts first. And as they make their way down, they'll make pit stops along the way to rest, to ceremony, and to pick up more people along the way. So if you see people along the coast here, you may actually see many of the canoes along the water.

And the reason why I bring this up is because, often in this ceremony, it will take many days to weeks to be able to complete. And often they'll take time to celebrate each and every family and person that had come to the ceremony. And just like how everybody's seated today, they'll actually arrange everybody to be seated with their families and where they come from, so that way they could acknowledge everybody that had come.

And at this time I'd like to invite you all to join us in this song to dance with us. I'm going to split you up into three different groups since you're already laid out in three different groups. The group on this side over here, you folks are going to be the Takaya. Can you

say the Takaya? Takaya is the wolf in Squamish Nation language. So you'll have your arm in front of you for your snout, your other arm behind you for your tail -- don't forget to wag your tail.

And what do wolves do best? (howls) So when I call you up, you can dance in your spot or make some room in the aisles there and show off your stuff to everybody else.

Here in the middle, you folks are going to be the Yéẅyews. Can you say Yéẅyews? Yéẅyews is the orca whale. And the orca whale is known as the guardian spirit. And the way they dance is they'll have their arms in front of you, side by side, or on top of one another. And you're going to make big, deep dives.

And the Yéẅyews, they are mammals. They need to breathe. So you can let out a nice (pssssh)

And last but not least, we have the Sḵewḵ', which is the raven. The raven, he's the haughty bird, but he's also the trickster. He goes around like he doesn't do anything wrong.

So what you're going to do is have your arms on your hip, your nose up in the air, and you're going to make nice, graceful steps -- because the raven's graceful; if you're marching around, you're just going to look like a chicken.

So you could stand up, make some room for yourselves. We're going to sing a verse first, and we'll point out to your group when it's time for you to dance.

I hope you enjoy the Chief Jimmy Jimmy. I'd like to thank the Baker family for continuing this song for it to be here with us today.

--- Song / Chanson

--- Applause / Applaudissements

UNKNOWN (Líl'wat Nation): Thank you, guys. You all make a great bunch of wild animals.

--- Laughter / Rires

UNKNOWN (Líl'wat Nation): Give yourselves another round of applause.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

UNKNOWN (Líl'wat Nation): You will see some of us ambassadors throughout the week. I hope you enjoy your time here in Cwítima Sḵwiḵw, or otherwise known as Whistler. And I believe we'll see you at the Sḵwx̱wú7mesh Líl'wat7úl Cultural Centre tomorrow night.

Thank you so much.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you, thank you so much once again.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): So

thank you for participating. And good morning. Welcome to Whistler!

--- Applause / Applaudissements

WELCOME BY RACHEL LAFONTAINE, NATIONAL PRESIDENT

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Before I begin, I want to recognize the hosting branch again. This is a fantastic event. It just started last night, but I think it's going to be a great ride. So thank you, Pacific Coast.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): I would also like to get to know the room. So how many of you with a show of hands, this is your first convention?

Wow.

And how about those of you that it's your second or third? Okay.

Fourth and fifth? And how about six or more? Wow.

Merci. That's fantastic.

And I hope for those of you that are new, this is your first, that you will take it all in, that you'll participate, that you'll let your voice be heard. And for those of you that have been here a long time or more than once, thank you for being here again. And I hope that you'll help guide the discussions that we'll have over the

next three days.

So the purpose that we're here for is very important work. We're going to be looking at our proposals and, on day three, we will be doing a very important job: electing your next Executive Committee.

The only thing I will add at this point in time is, if you could turn off your cellphones or put them on vibrate -- I should have done that beforehand. And I would ask that we keep our discussions respectful and very productive over the next three days.

So I'm just going to go through a few housekeeping items. So, every day, breakfast is going to be served at eight, just like this morning. And we're going to try and start at 9 o'clock. The day will end around 4 p.m. each day. We will also have breaks at 10:30 as well as 2:30, which will be 15-minute breaks.

Washrooms, les salles de bain, sont à l'extérieur de la salle. Il y en a dans le corridor à droite, puis il y en a aussi à la gauche.

Convention badges are very important. This will tell everyone who are delegates, the blue people, and who are alternates. So very important to wear your badge.

You will be receiving ballots. You need those ballots to vote. When we ask you to raise your hand for the vote and ask you to vote, you will have to hold your

ballots up in the air so our Nominations Team can count those ballots. They will not count empty hands.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL OFFICE AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): And with no further ado, I will ask the National Office to introduce themselves and then the Executive Committee.

I am Rachel Lafontaine, your National President.

MS. DANA LE BLANC (2nd National Vice President): Hello, everyone. Good morning. I'm Dana Le Blanc, Second National Vice.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, First National Vice President.

MS. DAWN-MARIE GAYLE (Divisional Vice President, York): Dawn-Marie Gayle, Divisional Vice President, York.

M. DANIEL LAROUCHE (Vice-président divisionnaire, Quebec): Daniel Larouche, Vice-président divisionnaire, Québec.

M. KEINSY LAINÉ (Vice-président divisionnaire, Montreal): Keinsy Lainé, Vice-président divisionnaire, Montréal.

MS. RONDA LUDWIG (Divisional Vice President, Pacific): Ronda Ludwig, Divisional Vice President, Pacific.

MS. KAREN TAYLOR (Divisional Vice President, Foothills): Good morning, everyone. Karen Taylor, Divisional Vice President, Foothills.

MS. SUZANNE SCHMIDT (Divisional Vice President, Midwest): Good morning, Suzanne Schmidt, Midwest.

MS. LAURA DOREY (Divisional Vice President, Rideau): Good morning, Laura Dorey, DVP, Rideau.

MR. RICH DINON (Divisional Vice President, Huron): Good morning, everyone. Rich Dinon, DVP for Huron.

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Divisional Vice President, Atlantic): Morning, all. Joe Blanchard, Divisional Vice President for the Atlantic.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): I also want to announce Luc Dufresne, First Vice President of Finance and Administration, is in absentia.

You'll note that I have Lyn Shannon to the left. Typically, we would have her on the floor, but as Luc is absent, she will be taking over the French screen duties on his behalf.

ACCEPTANCE OF CONVENTION PARLIAMENTARIAN

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Merci, Rick. Parliamentarian, would you like to introduce yourself?

I've just been instructed that we need a motion

to vote our parliamentarian in. Do we have a motion on the floor to vote the parliamentarian? André? Seconded? Sharon? Merci.

All those in favor? Thank you.

MR. GEORGE RONTIRIS (Convention Parliamentarian): Thank you. George Rontiris, your parliamentarian.

I should note that I've also got my assistant with me. I needed somebody to carry my bags.

--- Laughter / Rires

MR. GEORGE RONTIRIS (Convention Parliamentarian): He deserved that for showing up six minutes late. Patrick Twagirayezu is a colleague and a close personal friend. He will be taking over once I retire.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): We have simultaneous translation. This is why we have the mics and the earphones. It will be important that before you turn on your mic to please set it so you're ready to speak into it. Once we turn it on, if you move the mic, it kind of pops in our translator's ears. So we ask that you please take care of setting the mic first and then turning on the mic to speak.

Once you're ready, once you're called upon to

speak, just press the button. You will have to give your name and your branch and then you can ask the question. The reason we ask that you state your name and your branch, we do have someone transcribing the whole meeting and it's important for them to be able to identify who asked what question.

So, the booklets. The booklets will be handed out later this morning, so before we start with the regulations -- the proposals, my apologies. Only the blue tags will get booklets.

And if you look around the room, you see easels. This is where those of you interested in running for a position will be -- your names will be placed on there.

I will ask the nominations committee to stand up. These are the individuals that would be taking care of the votes. They will also be distributing the ballots to those of you with the blue tags. It will be very important for you to make these visible for them as they are distributing the tags out.

Additionally, for those of you who are interested in running for a position, you will have to see one of these individuals for a form where you will place your name, and the position you are running for. You will need someone to nominate you and a seconder on that form.

You will need to return this form to them. They will validate the criteria and write your name on the appropriate easel. So, very important, nobody puts a name by themselves on the easel; this is the nomination committee's responsibility to do.

So let's start distributing the ballot books, please.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): So ladies and gentlemen, for those of you that have a blue tag, please make sure that it's easily visible while they distribute these ballot books. We do know that there is likely to be a number of individuals who are in absentia and that the alternates will be taking over that responsibility. Don't worry about that for now. The alternates will be announced during roll call, at which time the nominations committee will bring a ballot to that alternate becoming delegate at that time.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): So after roll call, we will have a formal count of delegates.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you, everyone. So, as mentioned, those of you interested at break, you can go see the nominations committee for your form, have it filled out, and return it to them. All names, all people who are interested must

have their names up on the board by noon tomorrow. Then it's closed until Thursday where we'll do the votes.

So next on the agenda is our budget -- oh, roll call. Thank you.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): So I did my very best when everybody came up to registration last night to pronounce your name. I know I'm not going to get 100% of them right, but I'm going to try as many as possible.

So when you hear your name, just say "present".

ROLL CALL

Substitutions:

- **Greater Niagara: Keith Cross substituted for Kathy Goertz.**
- **N.B. West: Shane Fraser substituted for Michael Ling.**
- **Edmonton/Branch 11: Laura Gee substituted for Mahram Quilzada.**
- **Edmonton/Branch 11: Abraham Ndhlovu substituted for David White.**

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): That is everybody. So I'll ask Kelly to come up to the booth and we will give you the names of those that have to be given additional ballot books.

Okay, so can I have, for the distribution of

the ballots, Keith Cross, Shane Fraser, Abraham, and Laura Gee all stand so that we can deliver the books to you.

Thank you everyone.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you very much. On the screens, you can see the convention rules of order. Very important that we respect these during the next three days.

I would like to talk to the voting process. Can you put that up on screen as well, Rich?

So when the question is put, myself, the chairperson, will announce the question, Are you ready for the vote? If no delegate wishes to speak to the question, then the question will be put. And the vote, as explained, will be shown by a show of hands with the ballots in your hand. And if there is a tie, it's the Nominations Committee that will have to count to make sure that it is a tie and then we will have to recast the vote.

Additionally, you will see that there are voting booths across the room for elections of the Executive Committee. We will ask the teams to go to the voting booths. So on the day of, we will explain how the room will be divided and which voting booths that you have to go in. Perfect.

And I'll say it again, on Day 3, that's when we

vote. So votes close tomorrow at noon -- or nominations close tomorrow at noon, and then we vote on Day 3.

So I think we are at the point where we can go to budgets.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Just to mention before we go to budgets, you'll notice that -- you'll note today, I should say, when we get into the proposals view in the past, we've unfortunately, if we ever had any amendments from the floor, we would often capture the amendment in the language that it was proposed. And we would put it on the screen and unfortunately, the opposite language would have to just hear it verbatim through the microphones. It'll be a little bit of give and take as we manage through this new process, but, with any luck, we're going to be able to broadcast any amendments from the floor on the screens in both official languages.

Do bear in mind that if there's any errors in the translation from where it was proposed, it's always adopted in the language that it is proposed in, and proper translation is done after the fact. But it's something that we're trying to do to improve the quality and the experience on the convention so that you know exactly what we're voting for and try to clean up some of the verbal stuff versus written stuff.

So with that, I'm going to ask that you have a

little bit of patience with Lyn and I as we slowly transition because you're going to see screens coming in and leaving the screens on a frequent basis. This is only to be able to make sure that we know what we're voting for.

Okay? All right.

BUDGET PRESENTATION

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): So what I'm going to do is I'm going to speak to the nuance of how this budget was created and some of the projects and some of the things that we're planning on doing in the future. And then what I would like to do is turn it over to Joseph Blanchard, our DVP out of the Atlantic, because he was our gentleman who really crunched the numbers and put the data together so that we could have this presentation and to be able to capture everything that we want to achieve over the next three years.

I'll say thanks to Joe in advance for doing that. It was a lot of work and he did a great job.

So what we've done for the next three years is we've made some significant changes to some of the projects or some of the processes that we want to do. Some of the things that we want to move forward: first of all, we've given a much more robust budget driven towards the Divisional Council. You won't see them broken up into buckets like I'm saying now. The Divisional Council is

broken up to things like per diems, transportation, hotels, and whatnot. So it's all built into the overall numbers, but some of the things, the major projects that we have that are driving these numbers are.

And again, one of them is going to be a very robust budget for the Divisional Council.

And you've already seen that there's a proposal on the floor to move towards a more collaborative Divisional Council approach where we would be able to, staying within the budget confinements, is move people around, combine Divisional Councils and things of that sort.

Your DVPs will have full control over that Divisional Council budget. And however they foresee the best way to give you that experience, that knowledge, that training, if you will, through that venue, is how they will do it. And the only thing we're going to be asking is stay within budgetary confinements. So I think it's a lot more opportunity.

But this, by the way, was not built by the National Office. This, for the first time ever, was 100% collaboratively done by the entire EC. And for that particular reason -- I see there's a microphone on over there. I just don't want you to catch it. Here we go -- For that purpose, we really do believe in the numbers that

we've put forward.

So the Divisional Council is one thing. We've also built in a much more robust budget for training. We're building a lot more training programs. We're still looking at some of the Queen's stuff that we have in the past. I think that was a very successful venture when we did the fact-finding and investigation. It certainly helped everybody to move forward, but there are some other key courses out there that are either going to be driven in-house or that they'll be done through a venue of that sort, perhaps attached to a branch presidents meeting like we had done in the past. But we've built in a good deal of money into that.

Some of the other things will continue. The EC budget will stay. Those are some of the biggest ones that we want to move forward with. Communications is going to change a little bit.

We certainly know that the company is moving in a direction of a lot more punitive nature. We used to have six or seven terminations on the go. Now we're sitting around 26 or 27. So with that comes a cost as well. So we built a lot of the transportation and whatnot past figures over the last couple of years in order to be able to accommodate that as well.

I am going to turn it over to Joe now, who's

going to be able to talk to the numbers on a more precise basis, and he'll be able to give you a full breakdown on where we are, and you'll see the bottom numbers when we get to them at the bottom. But that's some of the big initiatives, but certainly not the only initiatives. So I'll turn it over to Joe.

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Divisional Vice President, Atlantic): Thank you, Rick. Joe Blanchard, Atlantic Divisional Vice President.

So what you have on the screen is a significant alteration in approach towards the financial numbers of the association. Years past, we just kind of followed a path of, well, we have the money we've spent in the past. Let's increase it by a little bit and keep doing what we're doing. We've taken a step back and a step forward.

So we took a step back in the sense that, instead of just having it hand out there, let's go back to formula. We brought it in, looked at forecasts, looked at perspectives, actual potential increases in dues, actual -- when I say *actual*, we used our best judgment across the EC to dig through and model increases in costs, increases in revenues that come in from the dues, all our various revenue and expense sources.

Keep in mind, from a principle perspective, first and foremost, we are a not-for-profit. So we're not

looking for big numbers at the bottom of these screens. If we do, great. Big positives? Yeah, throw that in the bank account for a rainy day. Big negatives? Okay, pull from that bank account. The ideal would be a zero at the bottom of those screens.

What we've done is build our best -- I wouldn't say guess, but prediction into the future for the association. Adding initiatives, adding a more robust training perspective, adding in actual counts of delegates and things like that.

If you have questions, feel free, ask. But we did a fair bit of work modeling these right down to formula.

So what you'll see across the top is our revenue, expected revenue. And it's an educated guess based on assumptions that we have going forward. From a revenue perspective, we can make reasonable assumptions. Actually, we know a little bit more now than we did when we built this, but there will be some salary increases. I think that's a fair guess.

But to the other side of that coin, I think we can all say that there's likely to be some headcount reductions. And we're the association, right? We're not here to -- we're here to fight for people's rights, not just worry about headcounts on the floor. If everybody can

do their job successfully, we've won.

So we factored in some reductions based on best guesses, really, best assessments of the future and some conversations that the company has given us, which we've taken with a significant grain of salt.

So from a revenue perspective, we are looking at seeing about $4.5 million in total revenues from the dues from our members. That then gets split out into what stays with the national office and what gets rebated to all of you. You will note, the rebates to the branches, that's not a straight 25%, so don't do the math and think you got it right because there's more that goes back and forth. Some branches have salaries, honorariums and things, so it's all factored into those numbers.

We do have other revenue streams. We have a revenue stream from our group life, which is offset by the payments we make out when people pass away or otherwise claim monies from that group life insurance policy, and that goes in the top and comes out at the bottom. Not always balanced; sometimes it's a negative, sometimes it's a positive.

We do have rental income, so we do get some rent from the other units that we purchased when we purchased the current office in 2016. All that brought down to the bottom, as well as the return on our

investments that we have, most of which in very, very low return, low risk investments, brings us to about $4.2 to $4.4 million per annum 2026-2029.

Down to the expenses. We have seen significant growth in our expenses over the time period since COVID, really, and we have had to kind of truncate our models and increase our models, unlike we have had to in the past. Just looking at a 2% inflation growth is just not reasonable in the current world. Hopefully we're there. We haven't really stayed there for the past really six, seven years. So we had to increase some costs from that perspective.

I won't get into the nitty gritty on each level of cost, but it's all in there. We spent a lot of time digging through our cost structure, digging through our accounting system, and building the models for that.

All told, expectations on expenses with the increases that we put into this budget for training, for divisional councils and other things, we're expecting our total expenses and our total revenues to be about balanced. As you can see in the bottom, we're sitting $800 positive in 2026. It's a convention year. If we can stay in the black, that's a good thing at a convention year, folks. 2027, $9,000. 2028, $18,000. And 2029, convention year again, folks. Just keeping that number as low as possible

so that our surpluses versus our deficits, we don't require us to dig too heavily into our back pocket to pay the bills would be a positive. Keeping things around zero is the goal.

So that's basically the gist of the budgeting exercise. Keep in mind, folks, it's a plan. These numbers will change, some for the positive, some for the negative. But down the road, this is our best educated assessment of the state of the Association, given our current structures and our current plans.

Rick?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Thank you, Joe. So with that being said, this is the budget as presented by the Executive Committee. Is there any questions from the floor?

Is that Michael? No, Donald.

MR. DONALD MAK (Pacific Coast): Donald Mak from Pacific Coast. Just wondering, every year we have approximately that 2% increase, right? On the group life, on 2029 it's identical to '28. Is there a reason behind that?

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Divisional Vice President, Atlantic): Yeah. When we were looking at the numbers on that, I didn't feel real comfortable altering it that far in the future because of the significant

variability in the numbers we've had over the years. I didn't mind tweaking it a little bit in 2026, 2027, forecasting those increases. But in the past, it was so up-down-up-down-up-down, I just said, you know what? 2028, we're just going to leave it alone and just copy and paste it into 2029.

MR. DONALD MAK (Pacific Coast): Thank you.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Chris?

MR. CHRISTOPHER ALAIN (Ottawa): Yeah, hello everybody. Christopher Alain, Ottawa Branch. Just one question on the membership dues side. You mentioned we're anticipating declining membership numbers, but the dues are going up. So I'm just curious if we're just doing it based on today or what went into that? Thank you.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): The reason we're still going up on that is just the anticipated raises versus the anticipated decline in membership. We felt that even with the membership versus the salary increase that we should still see a gain between the two. So that's why you see that it still goes up even though we're anticipating a loss. It should have gone up a lot more if we planned on maintaining.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Anyone else? Roy?

MR. ROY PALA (Pacific Coast): Roy Pala, Pacific Coast Branch. I know we're not really talking in details, but I'm kind of curious, travel here, we're at $1 million. So that's a lot of travel and it's increasing. That's the second highest expense we have over wages. Wages is understandable. Can we justify that $1 million in travel, please?

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Divisional Vice President, Atlantic): So, with the travel, we broke it down into -- within our accounting system, we capture things in what are called funds. So divisional councils, they're a fund. Conventions, they're a fund. Branch presidents, they're a fund. So everything gets captured into these groups. So we took each of these various groups and analyzed our expectations going forward from membership, from attendance, number of delegates that go to certain things. So this is based on historic use, forecasted forward.

So yeah, a million bucks. That's a lot of money. We have consistently spent around that for the past number of years, and I expect it to get higher and higher.

Hotels, when I pulled the numbers from the hotel cost, good heavens! We went from spending $110, $120, $130 a night for our hotel expenses in 2019-2021, to $250, $300, and worse. So if we looked at our numbers 10

years ago, travel wasn't as significant a component -- it was always a significant component, folks, because, well, look around. This isn't free. But it has actually started to eat up a lot. It's grown, and I think the only one that's grown even worse is, I think, legal. We have never had so many terminations in the hopper as we have today, and those are expensive.

But yeah, that's travel. We break it out into hotels, transportation, per diems, tolls and stuff. But each individual component of that $1 million, we analyzed each piece right down to where it went. It was for DVP travel, EC travel, branch presidents' meetings, divisional councils, conventions, all of it.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you, Joe. Bernard?

M. BERNARD CÔTÉ (Montréal) : Bernard de Montréal. J'ai deux questions d'information, peut-être que c'est moi qui ne comprends pas, mais je veux juste être sûr. Dites-moi, le budget comme tel cette année, en 2026, il va coûter quand même de l'argent, j'imagine. Il est à quel endroit là-dedans dans le budget?

Le congrès, excusez, je parle du congrès cette année, on a un congrès en 2026.

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale) : Peux-tu répéter, s'il vous plaît, la question? On n'a pas

entendu.

M. BERNARD CÔTÉ (Montréal) : Je voulais savoir, en fait, j'ai deux questions d'éclaircissement. La première, le congrès cette année, c'est en 2026, les montants, les coûts qui sont reliés au congrès, est-ce qu'ils sont répartis sur les quatre années ou sont-ils? Ça, c'est la première question.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): So at least for this year, for the convention -- sorry, the convention costs, the budget that we have for 2026 is not a budget that we built this year. The 2027 through '29 is what we built this year. '26 is a reflection of the budget that was created back in the convention in 2023.

As far as realistic numbers, if we're talking about this year's convention, just hotel alone, I can tell you is somewhere around $500,000. So it's certainly expensive. We're hoping that we still come in within budget, but it's going to be close.

As far as what you can see, you don't see them broken down into different buckets in terms of the costs of any one in particular. What it is broken down into is -- your travel is made of... Let me just take a look here.

So travel itself is comprised of hotels, transportation, per diems, tolls, and parking. We compile all travel that occurs. We do break it down in terms of

divisional councils, in terms of the convention costs and whatnot, which typically you can read every year in the Standing Committee on Finances report. They give a breakdown in the different categories on what the kind of costs are for those. We typically don't put it in here. We break them down all the way down to the brass roots of how much we're paying in hotels, transportation, per diem, tolls, and parking.

M. BERNARD CÔTÉ (Montréal) : O.K. Est-ce que je peux me permettre un autre petit éclaircissement?

J'aimerais juste savoir au niveau des intérêts, je vois qu'on a quand même budgété 175 000 $ d'intérêts. Est-ce que je pourrais savoir le montant du capital? Parce qu'il doit y avoir un capital...

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): So that's based on our investments that we have online right now. We have somewhere in the vicinity of $5.5 million, and that's our gains on those investments there.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Merci, thank you. Stone?

MR. STONE BLEMANO (York): Stone Blemano, York branch. Can you give me an idea about a group life insurance, what are your highs and your lows within the last probably few years, and what happens when we have extra? Do we reinvest or what happens there?

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Joe?

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Divisional Vice President, Atlantic): So, 2026... So we focused on 2026, $343,000 going... was that going in or out? Just one second here, I gotta get to the right page.

So the variability in the group life: in 2022, we spent $300,000. In 2023, we spent $327,000. 2024, we spent $330,000. 2025, we spent $200,000. The revenue that we see that comes in, I think there was two sides of that, what was the numbers and what's the revenue done? The revenue that comes in from that, once a year comes into the association's accounts after we pay our insurance provider for the monies that we send out. Any residuals left go into the investments and sit there and wait for us to need them for a rainy day.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you, Joe.

Andrew? Andrew Watts?

MR. ANDREW WATTS (Halifax): Andrew Watts, Halifax branch. The question I have is, in the budget, in revenues, did we consider what we get as part of our collective agreement from the corporation and the training? Does that reflect that as well?

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Divisional Vice

President, Atlantic): Good question. If everyone will look down in the training section, that's where it's factored. So that number is less what the company has contractually offered us annually. So when you see $111,298 for 2026, the true spend is probably $260,000. That's the expectations.

So this is what the Association has to pay. So it's net of any reimbursements from the company. So if they're funding our training, we don't put it on here. So it's all factored in there. And so that's actually a great, great question, Andrew, thank you. Because yeah, our expectation isn't to spend a hundred thousand and change on all of you, it's to spend $260,000 because we get $150,000 in Appendix L, $75,000 for joint stuff with the company and $75,000 for stuff amongst ourselves.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Louise?

Mme LOUISE LEROUX (Montréal) : Merci beaucoup pour la parole. Par souci de transparence...

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale) : Excuse-moi Louise, ton nom, puis ta section.

Mme LOUISE LEROUX (Montréal) : Excusez. Louise Leroux, section Montréal.

Par souci de transparence, étant donné que c'est le premier congrès auquel j'assiste, j'aimerais

savoir concernant les salaires. Parce que là on parle de 1 417 000 $, est-ce possible d'avoir au moins une idée des salaires qui sont payés, juste pour avoir une idée globale par rapport à ça? Parce que c'est quand même une grande masse salariale. Merci.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, First Vice President. So the salaries are built up of the executive salaries, the four national officers. It's also built up of the office salary for our two administrative assistants. It comprises of all of the salaries that we pay for the 20% for the DVPs. But it also includes salaries that we pay for divisional councils, salaries that we may pay to the branches for their honorariums that we bill back to them. So it's both an expense and an income.

In terms of the total amounts, you're looking at about $700,000 for the executives. You're looking at about $160,000 for the office. You're looking at about $550,000 for all other salaries. So the salaries for the first two are contractual based on our constitution itself. And then the rest can be variable based on the activities that go on through the year.

So it's broken down quite well. I don't know if there's a lot of room to be able to move on being able to adjust them, but that's how they're broken down.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Scott?

MR. SCOTT McPHERSON (Pacific Coast): Scott McPherson, Pacific Branch. I wanted to go back to the question with regards to travel in the budget. You mentioned that this weekend is going to cost approximately $500,000 just for the hotel. That's half of this year's budget already. That doesn't include all the travel costs to get here, and then the rest of the year as well.

And when I look at the budget, it steadily shows a million, a million twenty-eight, a million forty-eight, so on. I'm wondering if you've budgeted each year to account for the excess that my colleague there was looking for in terms of the cost of the next convention. Are you trying to absorb some of those costs in the other years?

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Divisional Vice President, Atlantic): So that's -- absorbing costs to convention is an interesting question -- Sorry, thank you; I keep forgetting to do that. Joseph Blanchard, Atlantic Divisional Vice President. There's goods and bads there.

So we actually ran into this question just over the last couple of years. So we can take our money and book a hotel. Next convention is in, just for the sake of argument, let's say it's in Ottawa. So we go out, we get a

contract, find a hotel, we start paying the bills. Is that the right thing to do? Maybe. Might make our numbers balance.

But if our overall hotel, food, meeting room, etc. expense comes in at $500,000 again, do we want to give that money to them for the two years prior to convention? Or do we want to leave it in our pockets, put it in the investments, earn a little interest?

So it's a balance point of decision that the National Office and the Executive Committee have to talk about. It'll likely be a conversation we start having in October. In the past, we've just spread them out. $100,000, here you go, $100,000, here you go. But is that the right thing for us to do? Yeah, it makes the budgets look better and you will -- reports that we give you all in the branch presidents meetings.

But the opposite side of that is we could probably have an extra $6,000, $7,000, $8,000, $10,000, $12,000, $15,000, $20,000 coming in by taking that $100,000 and putting it into -- or $200,000 or $300,000 -- into a reasonable investment, getting us $5,000, $6,000, $7,000 hopefully. But we'll talk about those through the amendments.

So yeah, there's no right answer. One makes the numbers look flatter. One puts a little more money in

our pocket. It's a decision for the EC to kind of take going forward.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): José?

M. JOSE ANTONIO ARIAS (Montréal) : José Antonio Arias, Montréal. C'est une précision. Est-ce que j'ai compris que le 75 000 $ du fonds B est systématiquement utilisé à chaque année?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Are we talking about the training budget?

M. JOSE ANTONIO ARIAS (Montréal) : On parle du fonds B, l'annexe L. Oui.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): So the $75,000 is not in this budget. This is strictly from the income that we have out of the Association's funds itself. And the extra $75,000 is also allocated towards training. So if you see $110,000 up there, it's actually $185,000.

M. JOSE ANTONIO ARIAS (Montréal) : Merci.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Did we have other questions? Kirk?

MR. KIRK VON WISTINGHAUSEN (Cape Breton): Kirk from Cape Breton. Employee benefits. What kind of benefits are those, and which employees are benefiting from these?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, First National Vice President. So the benefits themselves are actually tied to the Canada Post benefits. The four national officers and two administrative assistants, we pay into the benefits to Canada Post, but the Association covers the employer share of those benefits. But they're exactly the same as what you receive. So the same drug plan, the same pension plan.

The two administrative assistants, unfortunately, do not benefit from the pension plan, but what they do benefit from, which is built into, I believe, the regulations, is 6.5% towards an RRSP from the company.

So that's what comprises the benefits section.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Nesha?

MS. NESHA IRVING (York): Nesha Irving, York Branch. Morning, everybody.

The budget, the budget, the budget. So, we know that your budget right now is a prediction because, 2026, it's now July, so we just hit half of the year. It would be appreciated going forward if we use the year before, 2025, because the 2026 was based on last convention's budget. Showing what we actually spent. That's the first thing.

My second issue, it may not be a question; it's

just a concern. For those of us that will not be there to question the financial side of it when it comes out from the auditing group or the financial committee, is a proper breakdown. Travel expenses covers food, hotel, travel, all these things. But yet still, it seems that there's no transparency.

The training budget, $111,000. Understandably, there is going to be a share from the corporation, so this is just our share. But at $111,000 currently in 2026, I don't know about the rest of the crowd, but I feel I'm spending more money in travel -- and you know how I feel about the food budget -- than I am spending training our own. And we're paying dues, we need the training, we need the help. So as APOC, I would really like to see our training budget go up a bit.

But I would really like more transparency on these numbers when we come to convention, proper broken down. I feel like last convention they were broken down a lot better. And due to some questions, this convention they're just lumped together. So is there a way that if it's going to be proposed like this, that maybe in our book there's a proper breakdown of what's going to happen, or what the plan is, or the prediction is for all of this money?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President):

Rick Williams, First National Vice President. Duly noted, and that's what we will seek to get as much transparency as we possibly can for all future events. We apologize if we don't seem as transparent as we want it to be. We certainly are prepared to answer the questions, but we'll look at having something material that you can look at so that it might eliminate some of your questions and concerns.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Okay. Do we have a motion to adopt the budget? Duncan? And a seconder? Travis? All in favour?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Ladies and gentlemen, for an all in favour, please make sure you raise your ballot books. Thank you.

Budget adopted

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you very much.

I think this is a natural opportunity to take our break. So 15 minutes. It's currently 10:20, if everyone can be back in the room --

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Don't leave just yet. Jimmy, just before you leave, we want to let you know that we did create the supplemental documents that we had talked about. They are over on that back desk. So what that is, is a full second edition of

all of the corrected pages. We know we sent you out a complete digital version of that, but if you want just the corrected pages, that is in the third and fourth stack, and the first two stacks are the amended proposals from the Constitution Committee so that you'll have a hard copy of what's being proposed by them. It'll be up on the screens as well, but if you want a hard copy, they are there. The Nominations Committee will manage the handout of it. They'll rotate through it. Okay? Sorry, folks.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): And please bring your ballot books with you.

--- Upon recessing at 10:20 a.m. /

Suspension à 10 h 20

--- Upon resuming at 10:42 a.m. /

Reprise à 10 h 42

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Merci tout le monde, thank you.

I will be ringing the bell to call you guys back into the room just to make sure that we stay on time.

Before we do get started, I have a very kind gentleman that pointed out that I forgot to tell you where the muster point is should there be a fire drill or a fire alarm. So it's -- you know what, that is funny, so keep that in mind. So it is a two-tier alarm. You will hear somebody come on to the speakers and tell you that it's the

first tier. Should everything be clear, they will let us know as well. Then there will be a second alarm with an announcement to say we need to evacuate.

With the bar in mind, the muster point is at Milestones. So I don't know if everyone knows where Milestones is, but the fire exits are out the door right here and Milestones is to the left around the path there. So you pass in front of Montebello's and you keep going around the path. So that's our muster point. So thank you.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): With that said, I will call up the Constitution Committee, please. The members of the Constitution Committee.

Has everyone been able to grab those extra documents if you wanted them? Perfect.

One more thing before I ask the Constitution Committee to introduce themselves. We have a very difficult time hearing you here at the stage because the speakers are facing yourselves, so we would ask that you state your name, your branch, and speak loudly so we can comprehend exactly the questions you're asking. And Monsieur, over to you.

Is it possible to get the lights back on?

Thank you very much.

MR. GEORGE RONTIRIS (Convention Parliamentarian): Good morning, George Rontiris, your parliamentarian. This is your Constitution Committee. I'm going to ask them to introduce themselves at this point.

MR. NEIL MAKSYMIW (North Saskatchewan): Good morning, Neil Maksymiw, North Saskatchewan.

MS. MARIE TANYA MACDONALD (Greater Niagara): Good morning everyone, Tanya Macdonald, Greater Niagara branch.

MR. DUNCAN GILLIS (N.B. East Regional): Duncan Gillis, N.B. East Regional.

M. PIERRE-YVES CARRIER (Québec) : Bon matin, tout le monde. Pierre-Yves Carrier, section Québec.

MR. GEORGE RONTIRIS (Convention Parliamentarian): Thank you. George Rontiris, your parliamentarian. We had 66 resolutions, which we met in Ottawa about a month ago, had a chance to review everything, and you'll hear from each of the members of the committee shortly. They've divided the 66 amongst themselves. There's going to be some twists. We're going to deal with a couple of the later resolutions up front because they will have an impact on people putting their names up to run for office.

So I guess without further ado, we could start with number one, unless there's any other questions or

comments, and we'll move on from there.

RESOLUTION #1

MR. NEIL MAKSYMIW (North Saskatchewan): Neil Maksymiw, North Saskatchewan.

Resolution No. 1 - National Office

Article 2 - Constitution.

The article speaks to two-thirds of the delegates voting at a national convention, which can lead to confusion as to whether this means two-thirds of the votes cast or two-thirds of the registered voters at Convention. Whereas 2.3 of the Constitution states:

> "Any amendment of this Constitution shall become effective by approval of two-thirds (2/3) of the delegates voting at a National Convention of the Association and unless otherwise specified, shall be effective at the time of its adoption."

Whereas consistency in the process is required as this may lead to confusion on the target required to pass a vote should a delegate or delegates abstain from voting.

Therefore, be it resolved to amend Article 2.3 to read:

> "2.3 Any amendment of this

Constitution shall become effective by approval of two-thirds (2/3) of the registered voters at a National Convention of the Association and unless otherwise specified, shall be effective at the time of its adoption."

The Constitution Committee is recommending non-concurrence with the resolution as drafted. Should this resolution be put into effect for this convention, there are 118 registered voters. Therefore, a total of 79 votes would be required to pass each and every resolution. A delegate choosing not to vote or abstention or choosing to void their ballot or not be in the room when a vote is taken would in fact be a "no" vote.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have questions from the floor? Are we ready for the question? Stone? Oh, sorry, my apologies, Stone?

MR. STONE BLEMANO (York): My name is Stone Blemano from York branch. I think I need a little bit of clarity why non-concurrence because I think if it's adopted at the time of this convention, it will help to eliminate the previous problems that we had.

MR. NEIL MAKSYMIW (North Saskatchewan): The Constitution Committee does not believe that the current language causes any problem. It's clear in the language

currently that two-thirds of those voting would pass the vote.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Jean-François?

MR. JEAN-FRANÇOIS CHARTRAND (Montreal): Jean-François Chartrand, Montreal branch. I would like just to clarify, if someone don't use his vote right, his vote will be disregarded?

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): It will be considered as "no".

MR. JEAN-FRANÇOIS CHARTRAND (Montreal): "No". So it will not be counted.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Correct.

MR. JEAN-FRANÇOIS CHARTRAND (Montreal): Okay, thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Rich?

MR. RICH DINON (Divisional Vice President, Huron): Rich Dinon, DVP Huron. I just want to make sure we're clear on what this means. And I think you made a good point in terms of anyone who exercises their right to abstain is now going to be -- or is now -- understand it is considered a "no" vote. So even though you have the right to abstain from a vote, it will be considered a "no" vote.

Correct? So I just want to make sure we're all on the same page, everybody understands that.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Rick?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, First National Vice President.

What we have now in the current system is something that we need to abbreviate if we continue the way the Constitution is now. In the past, if we had a close vote, we would count all of the ballots in the air. We have missed on many an occasion having all the noes raise their ballots in the air.

Because as it stands right now, it's two-thirds of the *voting* delegates, not two-thirds of the registered. So if, what do we say, 79 was the mark for this year? So if we look and we figure that we're within four or five of 79, we would ask you to keep your ballots in the air. We would count all the yeses.

This means that we're going to have to also then have all those voting no put their ballots in the air so that we can count those as well, do the math, and find out if it does actually pass because the 79 might become 77, it might become 76. That's why this was put in. I love both opportunities. The only difference is this would make it cut and dried, whereas it'll be a process that's a

little bit longer, but it still gives you an opportunity to be able to find whether it's truly two-thirds of the voting people. And it eliminates the idea of people going out into the bathrooms and being cast or, I guess, being counted as a no when truly they just weren't in the room. So that's the idea between both the current system and the future one.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Nathan?

MR. NATHAN LAABS (Ottawa): Nathan Laabs, Ottawa branch. So just to clarify, if the new change would require us to count off the yeses, count off the noes, we would also have to then have a third step of counting the people who are abstaining, checking the people that aren't in the room. It's just yeses and noes. So those people who decide to lock themselves out or refuse to vote are still impacting the vote by not doing that. They're changing the math by abstaining.

So, I mean, to me, I know that the point of this is to make things clearer, more transparent, I suppose, but having the ability to kind of change the math on the fly like that, to me, muddies the water even more.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Andrew Watts.

MR. ANDREW WATTS (Halifax): Andrew Watts,

Halifax branch. I'd like to make an amendment to the 2.3, please.

So therefore be it resolved to amend Article 2.3 to read:

"Any amendment of this Constitution shall become effective by an approval of two-thirds (2/3) of the registered votes cast..."

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): One moment. Sorry, Andrew, I'm just going to pace you because I'm trying to capture it as you go.

So I have:

"Any amendment of this Constitution shall become effective by an approval..."

MR. ANDREW WATTS (Halifax):

"...of two-thirds (2/3) of the registered votes cast at a National Convention of the Association unless otherwise specified, and shall be effective at the time of its adoption."

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have a motion to accept and a seconder?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): I just want to clarify:

"Any amendment of this Constitution shall become effective by an approval of two-thirds (2/3) of the registered votes cast at a National Convention of the Association unless otherwise specified, and shall become effective at the time of its adoption."

So the change would be "registered voters" to "registered votes cast", would I be correct, Andrew?

MR. ANDREW WATTS (Halifax): That is correct.

MS. DANA LE BLANC (2nd National Vice President): Correct.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have a motion to accept the change?

Do we have a seconder to Andrew's amendment?

MR. ALWI MOHAMED (York): Alwi Mohamed, APOC, York region.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Are we ready for the vote?

My apologies. OK, so we had quite a few hands up. Yeah, we have Scott McPherson that had his hand up first. Scott?

MR. SCOTT McPHERSON (Pacific Coast): Scott McPherson, Pacific branch. My question is, if I understand the proposal and how it would change things at Convention,

who would adjudicate a dispute in the numbers to get to that two-thirds?

And the second part of my question is, the reason for this proposal change, is it because there's been an issue with a vote in the past? Because we all understand how the Convention works at the moment.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, First National Vice President, the reason for this was I look back at 2019, and we had a vote for the four-year for anybody that was in Calgary in 2019. It was a very close vote. And I believe that the vote may have passed. It was so close that the vote may have passed if this condition was in place. No, sorry, the other way around. I believe that the vote may have passed if we went and counted the noes, and I'm not sure that we did. I looked at the numbers and it would have passed if we would have just been, if we would have gone on the counting the yeses, counting the noes, adding them together, doing the math, we would actually be at a four-year convention right now versus what we are right now, which was we went and did the math based on registered voters and we missed it by, I think, two.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Laura?

MS. LAURA DOREY (Divisional Vice President,

Rideau): Laura Dorey, DVP, Rideau. So just for clarification, is this amendment to say we're going to count the total of the yeas plus the nays but not count the abstains?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, First National Vice President. Perhaps we can ask for some clarity from Andrew who proposed it?

MR. ANDREW WATTS (Halifax): Andrew Watts, Halifax Branch. Short, yes. That is no different from when we cast a vote by ballot. If there are spoiled ballots, we put them aside and do not count them as a no. We only count those that are yes and a no. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Joe?

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Divisional Vice President, Atlantic): Joe Blanchard, Divisional Vice President for Atlantic. We have two different ideas here on the table. We have one that's going to provide flexibility, a mix of strategies, a mix of voting, and that really is what we have today. So which is, it's the votes cast that matter. So if five people go and don't vote at all, they should be counted as abstains. That's how the language -- if I understand things correctly, that's how the language is written today. That's how we should be doing things. And to Rick's point, had we done things

better in Calgary, there might have been a different outcome.

What's being proposed from the National Office -- not specifically to Andrew's because I think Andrew's kind of brings us back to the original spot -- what's being proposed is a simpler, cleaner system. I'm not necessarily in favor, I'm not sitting here talking in favor of that one, I'm just trying to point out what it is. It's a simpler, cleaner system. It is, simply put, we will set the number at the beginning of the conventions, and that's the number for the week, unless something extreme happens, you know, 10 delegates get hospitalized or something like that.

So that's the two things on the table, two ideas that we need to talk about. So I just -- I was really concerned that we don't have a clear picture here, because there seems to be a lot of mix-ups, but that's the idea. One, flexibility, strategic voting. The other one, simple, can't really mess it up.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Andrew?

MR. ANDREW HVARREGAARD (Edmonton): Andrew Hvarregaard, Edmonton Branch. Just two quick comments. First, the amendment just points us back to exactly what we already have in place. It changes nothing. The initial

proposal is just a way of counting the yes votes and then treating all other results -- noes, abstentions, and spoiled ballots -- as a no. I think that would be better served to pick a threshold and if we're too close to decide it, then we count them all.

Thank you.

Jean-François? No?

Angela?

MS. ANGELA BURNETT (Pacific Coast): Angela Burnett, Pacific Coast. So with not coming forward with the exact amount of voters and stuff like that, it just seems kind of a little bit shady that it can be to manipulate how the votes go in a way is how it's kind of coming across.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you.

Do we have any other questions?

Do we have a seconder for the amendment?

MR. ALWI MOHAMED (York): I already seconded. Alwi Mohamed, York branch.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Okay, thank you.

Are we ready for the vote -- for the question, sorry. Are we ready for the question?

All in favor? Raise your hands, your

ballots -- on the amendment.

All those against?

The resolution has not passed.

Resolution #1 (as amended) - not passed

Now we are going back to the original proposal?

The Constitution Committee recommended non-concurrence. Do we have any questions?

Is the floor ready for the question?

All in favor, raise your ballots.

Those who are not, please raise your ballots.

The resolution does not pass.

Resolution #1 - Not Passed

We will ask the floor to go to Resolution 24.

--- Pause

RESOLUTION #24

MR. GILLIS DUNCAN (N.B. East Regional): Duncan Gillis, N.B. East Regional Branch, Resolution No. 24, North Saskatchewan Branch.

Article 7 - Association.

Technology has proven that work can be performed remotely, and in an effort to allow more opportunities for qualified members who are unable to move to Ottawa, the Second National Vice President and National Vice President of Finance and Administration not be required to reside in Ottawa during their term.

Whereas a qualified member wishing to run for national office may not be able to relocate to the national headquarters.

Whereas technology has allowed for business to be conducted remotely anywhere in the world.

Whereas the Association should be looking for the best candidate available for the position regardless of their residence in Canada.

Therefore, be it resolved to add new Article 7.4.1 to read:

> "Notwithstanding Article 7.4, not all national officers need to have residence in the city of the National Association headquarters. During their elected term, the President and 1st Vice President shall be required to be located in the city of the Association's headquarters; whereas, during their elected terms, the 2nd National Vice President and the National Vice President of Finance and Administration, should they so choose, not be required to relocate and reside in the city where the National APOC headquarters are."

The Constitution Committee is recommending non-concurrence with the resolution as drafted.

It should be noted that this resolution would be more appropriately moved to Article 15.16, which is addressed in the Resolution Number 44. The Constitution Committee believes there are significant advantages to having all officers of the National Executive working from the National Office to foster greater collaboration so as to benefit the membership.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Rick?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President.

We know that we have a really difficult time coming up over the next three years; it's going to be very challenging. We've seen the landscape that's going on with the Corporation. We've seen the changes, the drastic changes that are almost assuredly going to touch us. We also know that I've got my name up for the National President, so I'm going to speak as though I would be in that position.

For me as a National President to be having to deal with my team in a remote situation when collaboration is going to be so key in the next three, six, nine, twelve years, it's going to be so important that I have the

feedback from all four of the national officers together on a regular and consistent basis to continue to try to plan, to continue to try to strategize for all of these changes that are going on, that I can't possibly foresee that doing this over a Teams is going to be as effective as it needs to be.

Research would show that, especially in a national union situation, it is very disadvantageous to have a remote situation of that nature. I also want to speak towards the VP of Finance and Administration. Having done that job, I can tell you that doing that, learning that remotely, would be extremely difficult at best. This is not a branch treasurer's job. We're talking about CRA calculations. We're talking about budgets. We're talking about bill payments. We're talking about staff.

This is not a job that can be done remotely. It needs to be done from the National Office. Not to mention the fact that that position also oversees the affairs of the Association from the National Office perspective as well.

So, for those reasons, I'm asking that you defeat this motion because, quite honestly -- and I'm going to say now, from Rick, I need the team around me.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President):

Nesha.

MS. NESHA IRVING (York): Nesha Irving, York Branch. And to back what Rick just said, I don't want my money in your house. It needs to be in the office. It cannot be controlled from someone's house. Okay?

That's the long and short of it. If you get voted out tomorrow, what guarantees do I have that everything is going to be returned to the office and everyone else?

Also, the next position, there's a privacy concern. I don't want that in your house either. So no. Please keep our money where it is, at the APOC office.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Do we have any other questions? Donald?

MR. DONALD MAK (Pacific Coast): Donald Mak, Pacific Coast. So we have purchases of the office already. So the money that we spend to pay for office space is already paid for. So now, if people work remotely, then we now have to increase our expense for renting part of the home being the office. Second, with national coverage, with time zone difference, like, the West Coast is three hours behind Ottawa. So how do you expect an 8 o'clock meeting to happen when it's 5 a.m. in the Pacific Coast? And same thing if you're going to the other Atlantic Coast where they are two hours ahead. It just makes operations

very difficult with the different geographic locations.

And lastly, we already talked about that we spent a million dollars in travel. That's going to escalate quickly if someone is to work remotely and now have to travel into Ottawa to conduct meetings for the Association. And we understand that technology is available, but we also understand how difficult it is to moderate a Teams meeting when you want to raise a point or you have a question. The moderation requires significant manpower to be fair and concise to make sure everybody's heard. Where if everybody's in the room, your focus is 100% in the room and not your cat running around behind you, or your puppy coming to you, or your kids running up to try to ask for breakfast and stuff.

It's more professional to work in an office environment and I back up Rick that he needs his team beside him in the same time zone in the same room to focus on one task at a time. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Dawn?

MS. DAWN-MARIE GAYLE (York): Dawn-Marie Gayle, York DVP. I concur with everything Donald just said. And in addition, just to add to what Nesha said, those two portfolios are very heavy in privacy and in documents of the Association. So if someone were to leave on not so

good terms, it would be very difficult to garnish all of that back -- the APOC property back into the Association's hands. And we'd likely have to involve police and all that to get into their personal residences to try to garnish what belongs to us. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Andrew Watts?

MR. ANDREW WATTS (Halifax): Andrew Watts, Halifax Branch. Dawn, you stole the words out of my mouth. I completely concur that we need to work as a team. Yes, from time to time we could have meetings via MS or Google or any of the others. However, being there clarifies, safeguards, and protects everything we stand for.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Stone.

MR. STONE BLEMANO (York): Stone Blemano, York Branch. I don't know who proposed this and what they were actually thinking, but it gives me a picture of a very selfish-minded individual that really wants to think just about their own advantage. People work remotely and actually it's like no fixed address. They could be in Dubai having a meeting. This is a proposal that should be not agreed to.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Dana?

MS. DANA LE BLANC (2nd National Vice President): Dana Le Blanc, 2nd National Vice. I know we talked about, for sure, for this position that I'm in, the privacy, because I see all medical across the entire country and, like Nesha says, that medical should not be in my home, it should be in the office.

But the most important thing is this: We all know that, through COVID, we heard the term "keyboard warriors" and how gutsy people get when they're sitting behind a computer. And when we're negotiating or having our committees with the Corporation, I prefer to have those discussions in person. It's a lot harder for them to say no and listen to our arguments when we're sitting at the table with them. And I think when we're sitting at that table -- I just don't like when we're behind a screen. I think it's just so easy for people just to ignore you and say no. And it's a lot harder to be ignored when we're in a room sitting across a table from them. And I think we get to make our point a lot better when it's face to face.

And I'm trying to find a more appropriate word than this in my head, but it's less ballsy of them -- I know that's a bad word, but -- of them when we're sitting at a table than when they're hiding behind a screen.

So I think in person is where it needs to be.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Nathan?

MR. NATHAN LAABS (Ottawa): Nathan Laabs, Ottawa Branch. I just wanted to make some clarifications here. I think the conversation has gone from relocating to Ottawa to working remotely. I think I'd be confident to say everybody up on the dais right now brings their work home with them. They work from home remotely on their computers. To have this conversation around trusting people with our private information at home, we have done that for how many years now? I think that the focus on this resolution and, what was it, 44, that's similar down the road, isn't about where people can work occasionally, it's where they need to be located as far as their primary residence.

So the crux of this is do people need to -- for these two positions, do they need to move to Ottawa to do the job? Not can they work remotely from time to time?

And again, I've had a lot of comments here -- and I share the concerns for privacy reasons, but we elect our officials based on trust. We currently trust them to take their work home with them. I don't want that to be the focus of this debate. It really is: are we moving people or requiring people to move, or not?

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President):

Thank you. Sam?

MR. SAM HAYMOUR (Edmonton): Sam Haymour, Branch 11. I forgot what I was going to ask, but can we just vote?

--- Laughter / Rires

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): J-F?

MR. JEAN-FRANÇOIS CHARTRAND (Montreal): Jean-François Chartrand, section de Montréal. Mes collègues ont dit plusieurs choses que je voulais dire, mais une chose que je voulais rajouter, c'est que selon moi, lorsqu'on décide d'être un des quatre officiers nationaux ou nationales, c'est un engagement. Puis l'engagement comprend plusieurs choses, dont aller à Ottawa avec les autres membres.

Je pense aussi que lorsque l'équipe de quatre est ensemble, ça fait une équipe forte. Puis c'est aussi une question de représentation. Lorsque les gens de l'extérieur nous voient, c'est important d'avoir une équipe... qu'ils voient une équipe ensemble, qui travaille ensemble, qui sont présents ensemble. Le travail remote a certains avantages, mais je ne crois pas que ça peut enlever nos gens à distance. Merci.

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente Nationale) :

Merci. Sheryl.

MS. SHERYL DEWEY (North Saskatchewan): Cheryl Dewey, North Saskatchewan. So I just wanted to state that it wasn't done for selfish reasons. Nobody from North Saskatchewan is looking to run for a position on the national executive. It was simply brought up as a question from the last convention where there was a lot of conversation about the financial cost of moving to national office to the point where we were being asked to possibly purchase four condominiums for people to be able to move into.

There was quite a conversation about families not being able to relocate, having to move independently from your family and the cost of that, to the point where we were asking -- or you were asking to provide living accommodations for people.

And there was a resolution at the time on the floor and it was removed by the branch, and so no conversation was able to be held. So our resolution was simply put in front of this committee just so a conversation could actually be held and not to have it removed and therefore not to have the conversation.

So I resent the implication that we did it for selfish reasons. We did it simply so a conversation could be held.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Wes? We're good?

Are we ready for the question? All in favour, raise your ballots. The resolution is not passed -- oh! All against?. Thank you.

The resolution is not passed.

Resolution #24 - Not Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): I will ask you to go to resolution 44. Caroline.

RESOLUTION #44

MS. CAROLINE ROTTEAU (N.B. West Regional): Caroline Rotteau, N.B. West Branch. The branch would like to remove -- withdraw this resolution.

Resolution #44 - Withdrawn

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. And we will go back to resolution number two.

RESOLUTION #2

MR. NEIL MAKSYMIW (North Saskatchewan): Neil Maksymiw, North Saskatchewan. Resolution number two. N.B. East Regional Branch.

Article 2.

A secondary signature should be obtained from

any other member of the local executive, not just exclusively the secretary. Being a smaller branch, oftentimes the executive seats may be unoccupied.

Should this be the case with the secretary position, it puts the local executive into a predicament where they need to seek permission to use the signature of another member of their executive as a secondary signature.

Whereas the wording of the article can simply be adjusted to reflect a second member of the local executive without changing the intention or meaning of the Article.

Therefore, be it resolved to amend article 2.3.1 to read:

> "All resolutions to a National Convention must be in writing and must have been discussed and passed at a Branch membership meeting and be endorsed with the signatures of the President and a second member of the Branch executive."

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the resolution as drafted.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Any questions from the floor? Nesha.

MS. NESHA IRVING (York): Nesha Irving, York

branch. Question for the parliamentarian. Isn't there something in place right now that, if no one is available on their end, it comes to the national office?

MR. GEORGE RONTIRIS (Convention Parliamentarian): George Rontiris, your parliamentarian. I don't know, Nesha.

MS. NESHA IRVING (York): Can I ask a follow-up, then, behind that? So current -- Nesha Irving, York branch. So currently, how is it resolved?

East Regional branch? Anyone?

MR. DUNCAN GILLIS (N.B. East Regional): Duncan Gillis, N.B. East Regional branch. We approach the National executive and ask permission to use another signature rather than the secretary since we don't have a secretary.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. Yeah, it's just a matter of who can actually sign off on a Branch -- after it being endorsed at a Branch meeting, who can actually sign it. So at one point it was just the President and the Secretary. Now this allows it to be a President and an additional Branch executive to allow for the flexibility where you may not have somebody available in a timely manner to be able to sign off on it and things like that, that you can pivot.

I think the key one here is the President and then you can have a secondary signature from an executive.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Are we ready for the question? All in favour, raise your ballots. Passed. All against? Thank you.

It's passed.

Resolution #2 - Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Joe, you had a question?

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Divisional Vice President, Atlantic): It's a bit of a point of order. We addressed some resolutions out of order because they had effects on the pending elections. We have at least two other amendments that would affect pending elections. Are we going to address them out of order as well or are we going to let them sit until we get there?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. Joe, could you do me a favour and actually pull those resolution numbers so that we can address them in a -- I know which ones you're talking about because I believe there are a couple that are dealing with the alternate Divisional Vice Presidents and who can be part of that.

We did actually capture it and it just got mistaken. So once we get the numbers...

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Please go to resolution 34.

RESOLUTION #34

MR. NEIL MAKSYMIW (North Saskatchewan): Neil Maksymiw, North Saskatchewan. Resolution number 34. Kitchener and District Branch.

Article 10 - Divisions.

Article 10.7 is contradictory to itself and to Article 10.8.1 and should be rewritten. At the start of the Article 10.7, it clearly states that the Alternate DVP must be a Branch President but also later goes on to state, "unless the Alternate is someone other than a Branch President."

The definition of an Alternate DVP in 10.8.1 should be consistent throughout. Whereas Article 10.7 is contradictory in nature and inconsistent with the definition of the Alternate Divisional Vice President and Article 10.8.1.

Whereas Article 10.8.1 states that the Alternate DVP shall:

> "...be a President of a duly established Branch within that Division, or be a duly elected executive of a Branch within that division and a delegate to the National

Convention."

Therefore, be it resolved 10.7:

"In each Division, there will be an Alternate Divisional Vice President. The Alternate shall be selected from among the delegates in the Division at the Convention and shall not add to the members at the National Branch Presidents' Meeting or Divisional Council Meeting."

Delete 10.8.1 as this becomes redundant.

The Constitution Committee proposes an amendment to this resolution. Therefore, be it resolved, 10.7:

"In each Division there will be an Alternate Divisional Vice President."

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the amended resolution.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): We're going to put the amendment up on the screen for you in both official languages.

Do we have any questions? Andrew?

MR. ANDREW HVARREGAARD (Edmonton): Andrew Hvarregaard, Edmonton Branch. I'm a little confused how this would affect selection of an Alternate DVP outside of

an election at Convention. Because outside of an election at Convention, the status of Delegate becomes a little bit fuzzy.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Anyone else? Dawn?

MS. DAWN-MARIE GAYLE (Divisional Vice President, York): Dawn-Marie Gayle, DVP York. The concern that I have in regards to the original proposal on this is with York Division and how it's structured. We have 28 delegates that come to Convention. We only have eight as part of our executive team. So if the original proposal went through, then technically one of the delegates could put their name forward and not be part of our executive team or a rep within the York Branch.

So the Alternate to the DVP would not be part of, I guess, our numbers.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Stone?

MR. STONE BLEMANO (York): Speaking to Dawn's point, I think -- Stone Blemano, York Branch -- I think what I'd like to know is what's the role of the Alternate? Because currently, if they are not part of the National Branch Presidents' Meeting and not a part of the Divisional Council, it becomes challenging and confusing.

In York, we are going according to what is

currently there and it works better for us. Also, financially, it eliminates all those things that go to the Alternate DVP. So we need some kind of clarity.

Other than that, what is currently working in York works for us.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Anyone else? Joe?

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Divisional Vice President, Atlantic): Joe Blanchard, Divisional Vice President, Atlantic. I'm in favor of this amendment. I think it provides clarity. Dawn's concerns around the original proposal is quite valid, but I think with the amendment that the Constitution Committee has put forward, it eliminates that.

As we can read in 10.8.1, a President of a duly established --

> "Alternate Divisional Vice President shall:
> 10.8.1 be a President of a duly established Branch within that Division, or be a duly elected executive..."

-- so they must be an executive, and I have actually had to deal with this twice in my tenure --

> "...and be a delegate to the National

Convention."

So when I ran across this twice in my time as a DVP, those that were eligible to run in between conventions for the now vacant role of Alternate Divisional Vice President, they had to have attended the preceding National Convention. That was the understanding I had at the time. That's what we used at the time for those elections.

So I am in favor of this.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Rich?

MR. RICH DINON (Divisional Vice President, Huron): Rich Dinon, Divisional Vice President for Huron. A couple of things from what Joe has just -- to clarify, I agree with what he was saying. The only thing, and I think... Pardon?

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Speak up, please.

MR. RICH DINON (Divisional Vice President, Huron): You need me to be louder? Wow, I never heard that before!

--- Laughter / Rires

MR. RICH DINON (Divisional Vice President, Huron): Just to clarify, I know there's a couple of comments that came up about elections between conventions, and the Constitution speaks to that directly in a different

Article.

So it speaks to it in 10.9, so it doesn't really have an impact of what we're looking at today of what we do if it happens between. So this would be only specific to the elections at Convention. This change will only make that different. Elections between speaks to it in 10.9, which would be the same. So there would be no change to that.

So I'm not sure if that answers your question, Andrew, that you brought up.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Andrew? You had your hand up.

MR. ANDREW HVARREGAARD (Edmonton): A couple of minor points. Andrew Hvarregaard, Edmonton Branch. A couple of points. Joe referenced 10.8.1, which is slated for deletion if this passes. So we can't really include it as a reference.

Also, what the definition of the Alternate is and the pre-requirements, I don't think are spanning clearly. It's this in one situation, this in another situation, and they overlap. That's why I said "fuzzy".

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Scott? Are we ready for -- oh, Rich.

MR. RICH DINON (Divisional Vice President, Huron): Rich Dinon, Divisional Vice President Huron. Just

to clarify, Andrew, what you're saying there, that this amended resolution does not eliminate that Article. So if you look at the amended resolution, it does not state to delete 10.8.1. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Nathan?

MR. NATHAN LAABS (Ottawa): Nathan Laabs, Ottawa Branch. Sorry, I'm adjusting to the Pacific time zone here. Did we get a second on the proposal for the amendment yet? Like, is it the -- no? We don't need it from the committee? No? Good to know. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Bill?

MR. BILL HATESOHL (Kitchener): Bill Hatesohl, Kitchener Branch. As the initial proposer of this amendment -- or of the initial resolution, I want to say I support the amendment because it is actually doing what we were looking to achieve in the first place.

So as the person who submitted the original resolution, I do support the Constitution Committee's amendment.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Are we ready for the question?

All in favor, raise your ballots. Thank you. All those against, raise your ballots. The resolution has

passed.

Resolution #34 (as amended) - Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Please go to resolution 49.

RESOLUTION #49

MR. DUNCAN GILLIS (N.B. East Regional): Duncan Gillis, N.B. East Regional. Resolution number 49, Kitchener and District Branch.

Article 17 - Elections at Convention.

Article 17.5.3 specifies that Alternate DVPs must be elected from the Executive Council, limiting the ability of all delegates to run for this position.

When your division is expecting a large turnover within the Branch President ranks, this clause is constricting the pool of qualified candidates.

Whereas Article 17.5.3 states:

> "Alternate Divisional Vice-Presidents will be elected from their respective Divisional Council by their delegates at National Convention."

Whereas Article 10.8.1 states that the Alternate DVP shall:

> "... be a President of a duly established Branch within the Division, or be a duly elected executive of a

Branch within that Division and a delegate at the National Convention."

Whereas Article 17.5.3 is restricting the ability of a duly elected executive of a Branch within that Division and a delegate to the National Convention to run for this position, contradicting the language in 10.8.1.

Therefore, be it resolved to amend Article 17.5.3 to read:

"17.5.3 Alternate Divisional Vice-Presidents will be nominated, seconded, and elected by the delegates from their respective Division at the National Convention."

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the resolution as it is drafted. In keeping with Resolution 34 and the amendments in Article 10.7 and 10.8.1, concurrence would provide greater clarity and eliminate any possible contradiction.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have questions? Stone.

MR. STONE BLEMANO (York): Stone Blemano, York Branch. I have a problem with this because most Branches after this convention goes to run for elections for various positions. This makes it difficult as if anyone that goes to run for election either wins or loses changes who will

be the Alternate Divisional Vice President. So it's kind of a little bit confusing because then that changes the rule -- that person -- you would then have to nominate and elect a Divisional Vice President. The current system where the President rolls into the Alternate Vice President seems to work out better as proposed in the Article that we just passed.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Any other questions? Travis?

MR. TRAVIS SHALLA (Ottawa): Travis Shalla, Ottawa Branch. I have a similar concern to Stone, but we're not addressing the format of electing the DVPs at National Convention.

I think maybe at future Conventions we should be looking at electing DVPs after National Conventions, but that's not what we're talking about today. So we'd have to kind of delineate the issues, right? Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Rick?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. The combination of these resolutions is to be able to open up the opportunity for the executive members of a Branch to be able to run for Alternate DVP. And the reason for this is we actually do have a number of Branches that have, in both

the present and the past, they actually desire to be a Branch President -- they enjoy it and they do it very well, but they don't desire to be an Alternate DVP because they don't want to move into the role of DVP because they also happen to enjoy their Canada Post position very well.

So with that being said, this is opening the opportunity for us to be able to cleanly elect an Alternate from within the executive Branch of our members so that we can allow those Branch Presidents the comfort to be able to move into that Branch President's role without the concern of wanting to go to DVP.

Listen, there might be an argument out there that says that, if you want to be a Branch President, you should want to be an Alternate DVP. I don't support that idea. I think that we need all the best people we can, and sometimes that's exactly where they want to stay.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Scott?

MR. SCOTT McPHERSON (Pacific Coast): Scott McPherson, Pacific Branch. Rick, I support what you just said. My concern with the proposal that is before us is that an Alternate Divisional Vice President can be nominated and seconded and elected by the delegates at Convention. And as Dawn mentioned earlier, they have 28 delegates here, and 28 people could potentially nominate

somebody who's not on their executive, which means, if they're not on their executive, how are they privy to the things that are going on within the Branch at a level that would allow them to be successful as a Divisional Vice President? And how would you incorporate them into the executive Branch meetings, the President's Meetings, and their Divisionals? Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Rick?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. Because we still have 10.8.1 in existence, which means that the Alternate Divisional President shall be a President of a duly established Branch within that Division or a duly elected executive, it eliminates anybody that's not an executive member.

So when you talk about the situation with, say, York, who brought 30 delegates here, only the executive members would have the opportunity to be able to run. So although it does say in the amendment that it'll be nominated, seconded, and elected by the delegates from their respective division, it still doesn't bypass the criteria required in order to be an Alternate DVP. So what happens there is you have a nomination, you have a nominations committee that is going to vet that, and the

first thing they're going to vet is, are they a duly elected Branch President or a duly elected executive member of the Branch? And if either one of those -- or actually, if they don't have a yes somewhere in there, then they are eliminated from the possibility.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Nesha.

MS. NESHA IRVING (York): Nesha Irving, York Branch. So help me clarify this. When we leave here...

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Can you please speak up, Nesha? We have a hard time hearing you.

MS. NESHA IRVING (York): Oh, sorry. Help me clarify this, please. So when we leave here -- the York Branch; can't speak for any other branch -- when we leave here, we actually go and choose our own executive committee. Again, it's time for us to make a choice.

So, Rick, my question is, if we choose the Alternate here, and then I'm not voted in as part of the next executive committee as the VP of AJPC, then does that say I got it here as the Alternate, does that kick me out?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National VP. That's actually a great question that I actually would have to turn over to our parliamentarian, because this talks about election -- you

have to be at the time of election, but does that mean that you continue to have to be during your tenure as Alternate? So if you don't mind, I'll turn that over to Mr. Rontiris for clarification.

MR. GEORGE RONTIRIS (Convention Parliamentarian): Thank you. George Rontiris, your parliamentarian. The language is clear in 10.8.1. You have to meet that qualification in order to be able to be elected. This particular article, 17.5.3, tells you who gets to elect you. So it's two separate, totally different things.

Unfortunately, I didn't hear your full question, Nesha, so I don't know how to answer your question. Don't worry.

MS. NESHA IRVING (York): Don't worry, Nesha Irving, York Branch, can repeat it.

So my question is, George, right now at Convention, I'm part of the executive team. When I leave Convention at the end of July, August, we now go and we vote for a new executive team, or basically we vote to see who will keep their positions, if they're interested in running, stuff like that.

If I am voted out, but here at Convention right now, I am part of that executive team, and I do become the Alternate DVP. Do I lose the Alternate DVP after I am

voted out?

MR. GEORGE RONTIRIS (Convention Parliamentarian): No, you do not lose your Alternate DVP status.

MS. NESHA IRVING (York): Okay.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Stone.

MR. STONE BLEMANO (York): Stone Blemano, York Branch. I think that's exactly the question I asked at the beginning. If you win to be the Alternate, and I think George has clarified it, you still hold your position.

That brings a lot of confusion then in the Article that we just passed, putting the Branch President being the Alternate after being an automatic Alternate DVP.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Travis?

MR. TRAVIS SHALLA (Ottawa): Travis Shalla, Ottawa Branch. This is exactly the point that Stone made earlier, and I made a few minutes ago. We probably should be looking at this at the next Convention. There is an irony that you could be elected an Alternate today and not be elected, because all of our executives have to be re-elected after national, that you might not get elected -- if you get elected DVP here and you don't get on your executive in your own Branch.

And so I guess there is maybe just a little grey area. But again, that's not a resolution that is actually to be discussed at this Convention.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Scott?

MR. SCOTT McPHERSON (Pacific Coast): Scott McPherson, Pacific branch. I was hoping to add an amendment to this language in the hopes of making it a little more clear.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Scott, can you speak up, please?

MR. SCOTT McPHERSON (Pacific Coast): I was hoping to add an amendment to the language in the hopes of making this a little more clear for everybody at Convention, to read:

> "Alternate Divisional Vice Presidents will be nominated from among the current list of existing members of the Branch's current executive..."

-- or words to that effect; you can clean it up. And then continue on, seconded and elected by the delegates from their respective Divisions at the National Convention.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Scott, could you text that to me?

--- Laughter / Rires

MR. GEORGE RONTIRIS (Convention Parliamentarian): Does everybody want to go for a break?

MR. SCOTT McPHERSON (Pacific Coast): Okay, I can repeat it slower.

"Alternate Divisional Vice Presidents will be nominated, from among the current list of existing members of the Branch's executive, ..."

And then continue on as it's currently written:

"...seconded and elected by the delegates from their respective Division at the National Convention."

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Okay, give us a few moments to put that together.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Rich?

MR. RICH DINON (Divisional Vice President, Huron): Rich Dinon, Divisional Vice President for Huron. So I just want to clarify a couple of things. So I understand we've already adopted a resolution. So the resolutions -- I think we're going back and forth in terms of what the problem is here. So if it's an issue of this specific article here is to speak of who can nominate. We've already passed a resolution on who can run. This is

on who can nominate.

And secondly, the issue that came up with not holding your DVP status if you're voted out, there's no change to today. If you're a President, you're not guaranteed to be a President for the three years between elections, unless your bylaws do that. So there is no change here, folks. It is no different than what we have today, other than it may not be the President.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Scott, are you maintaining your amendment after the explanation given by DVP Huron?

MR. SCOTT McPHERSON (Pacific Coast): I'll withdraw.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you.

Are we ready for the question? Those in favor, lift your ballots. Thank you. Those against? Thank you.

The resolution has passed.

Resolution #49 - Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): We shall go back to resolution number three. Daniel?

RESOLUTION #3

M. DANIEL LAROUCHE (Vice-Président Divisionnaire, Quebec): Daniel Larouche, vice-président divisionnaire du Québec. La section de Québec veut retirer

l'amendement numéro 3, compte tenu de l'adoption de l'amendement numéro 2.

Résolution nº 3 - Retirer

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente Nationale) : Merci.

Did everyone hear that? Peux-tu parler dans le micro, Daniel?

M. DANIEL LAROUCHE (Vice-Président Divisionnaire, Quebec): Daniel Larouche, vice-président divisionnaire du Québec. Québec désire retirer la résolution numéro 3 compte tenu de l'adoption précédemment de la résolution numéro 2.

Mme. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente Nationale) : Merci. Resolution number four.

RESOLUTION #4

MR. NEIL MAKSYMIW (North Saskatchewan): Neil Maksymiw, North Saskatchewan. Resolution number four, National Office.

Article 2 - Constitution.

The Article 2.3.1.1 states:

> "Notwithstanding article 2.3.1, resolutions which have been passed at a Branch membership meeting, may be presented at a meeting of a Divisional Council which may combine or amend

resolutions or prepare a composite to cover the intent of the question at issue."

The process of amending resolutions or combining resolutions already exists and is the chief function of the Constitution Committee.

Whereas the Article may lead to legitimate proposals from branches being unjustly withdrawn or amended.

Whereas the association wishes to extend all opportunities for the membership to propose legitimate changes to the process and the policies of the association.

Therefore, Article 2.3.1.1 should be deleted and all sub-articles renumbered. Article 2.3.1.1 should be deleted and all sub-articles renumbered.

The Constitution Committee recommends non-concurrence with this resolution as drafted. The Constitution Committee does believe that removing this step in the process may have the effect of stifling discussion at the Divisional Council.

Furthermore, in the spirit of unity at the Branches within a Division, removal of this article would suggest removing the right of the DVP to meet with their Branches to discuss and propose resolutions. There would be no benefit in removing this article.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have questions on the floor?

Are we ready for the question? All in favor, raise your ballots. Thank you. All against?

The resolution has not passed.

Resolution #4 - Not passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): And with that, we will go for lunch. I will ask you to be back in your seats by 1:00. You will hear the bell a couple of minutes beforehand.

Thank you.

--- Upon recessing at 11:58 a.m. /

Suspension à 11 h 58

--- Upon resuming at 1:01 p.m. /

Reprise à 13 h 01

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Can everyone take their seats? Prenez vos sièges, s'il vous plaît. Merci beaucoup, thank you.

Now I will ask a question. Is anyone missing a phone? Samsung. It looks like a Samsung 21, maybe 23. It's an Ultra. Look at the lenses here. There's lots of camera lenses. No? No, there's nothing. Okay, then we'll figure it out.

The other little housekeeping note I wanted to say is we were having a difficult time hearing you when you

were speaking. What's important is for you to take your earphones off because you probably hear yourselves in your earphones and so you're talking lower. And because you're talking lower, our crew has to try to raise the volume and it doesn't work. That's why we're getting feedback.

So please, those of you who have your earphones on your ears asking questions, just remove them around your neck and we should hear you fine. Perfect.

Are we ready to start with resolution number five?

RESOLUTION #5

MR. NEIL MAKSYMIW (North Saskatchewan): Neil Maksymiw, North Saskatchewan, resolution number five, national office.

Article 2 - Constitution.

Article 2.3.2 reads as follows:

> "The Association shall not receive resolutions from any individual member."

This is factually incorrect as the Association is defined to include our branches which is the avenue to which a member would tender their proposals as already outlined in article 2.3.1.

Whereas article 2.3.2 appears to restrict any one member from tendering resolutions for consideration.

Whereas our language should invite ideas and change.

Therefore, article 2.3.2 should be deleted and all subclauses renumbered. Article 2.3.2 should be deleted and all subclauses renumbered.

The Constitution Committee recommends non-concurrence with this resolution as drafted. The Constitution Committee does not believe this provision in the constitution prevents the free exchange of ideas from individual members.

Even with this provision in the constitution, individual members maintain the right to submit resolutions under article 2.3.1.

The constitution currently provides a process that works and does not stifle individual ideas. It merely directs the member to the branch for further discussion.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have a question? Any questions in the room? Are you ready for the question? Those in favor, lift your ballot. Your ballot books.

Passing the resolution. Correct, non-concurrence.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. Just as a point of order, any time that you hear that the question is being

called, the question is always going to be whether or not the resolution passes, not the recommendation of the Constitution Committee.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Are you ready for the question? Those in favor, raise your ballot books. Those not in favor? The resolution is not passed.

Resolution #5 - Not Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution #6.

RESOLUTION #6

MR. NEIL MAKSYMIW (North Saskatchewan): Neil Maksymiw, North Saskatchewan. Resolution number six, North Saskatchewan.

Article 2 - Constitution.

To increase the representation of the West provinces on the committee as 50% of the geographical country, West, has only one representative on the committee, we would like it to be two individuals representing the geographic region of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia, Yukon, Northwest Territories, and Nunavut.

Whereas, to increase the number of representatives from the Western provinces, from one to two members on the committee, therefore be it resolved to amend

Article 2.4.2 to read:

"The Constitution Committee shall be comprised of one representative from each of the following areas, Atlantic, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland, Quebec, Ontario, and two representatives from Western Canada, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia, Yukon, Northwest Territories, and Nunavut."

The Constitution Committee recommends non-concurrence with this resolution as drafted.

The Constitution Committee's goal to render decisions based on resolutions submitted as a group for the whole of the membership and geography or regional bias should have no relevance on the work of the Constitution Committee or the value of a resolution. Constitution Committee members are there to advocate for all members, not just the members of their region.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have any questions? Donald?

MR. DONALD MAK (Pacific Coast): Donald Mak, Pacific Coast. So if the Constitution Committee is saying that the regional representation does not matter, then we

should completely amend it to have 'X' amount of representatives across the nation instead of a regional number.

Because if you think that everybody speaks for their region -- because every region will face different challenges. So to have it the western side where the representation is less -- yes, the Constitution Committee can raise it up, but now my counterpart is now, then, we should scrap all saying that we should have eight people in the committee itself, two from Ontario, one from Quebec, or whatever, right? Because that contradicts what the committee had recommended. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Anyone else? Donald, are you making a proposal to change or amend?

MR. DONALD MAK (Pacific Coast): Yeah, we can amend it and make it into 'X' representatives. I don't have the Constitution in front of me, so I don't know the exact number. But if regional is not an important part of the consideration, then we should amend it into just having a committee member for National Constitution Committee without having any regional restriction on it.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, First National Vice President. So what we'll need from you, Donald, is a specific amendment

proposal that would come from the floor that we can vote on. We can't piece it together.

MR. DONALD MAK (Pacific Coast): Yeah, give me two minutes, please. I withdraw my amendment.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Are we ready for the question? All in favour, raise your ballot books. Thank you. Those not in favour, raise your ballot books.

The amendment does not pass.

Resolution #6 - Not Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution No. 7.

RESOLUTION #7

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): J-F?

MR. JEAN-FRANÇOIS CHARTRAND (Montreal): J-F Chartrand, Montreal Branch. We would like to remove, please, the Resolution No. 7.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you, J-F.

Resolution #7 - Withdrawn

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution No. 8.

RESOLUTION #8

MR. NEIL MAKSYMIW (North Saskatchewan): Neil

Maksymiw, North Saskatchewan, Resolution No. 8, N.B. East Regional Branch.

Article 2 - Constitution.

A secondary signature should be obtained from any other member of the local executive, not just exclusively the secretary. Being a smaller branch, oftentimes the executive seats may be unoccupied. Should this be the case with the secretary position, it puts the local executive into a predicament where they need to seek permission to use the signature of another member of their executive as a secondary signature.

Whereas the wording of the article can simply be adjusted to reflect a second member of the local executive without changing the intention or meaning of the article.

Therefore, be it resolved to amend Article 2.5.1 to read:

> "All resolutions to a National Branch President's meeting must be in writing and must have been discussed and passed at a branch membership meeting and be endorsed with the signatures of the president and another member of the local executive of the branch. Notwithstanding, resolutions which have

been passed at a branch membership meeting may be presented at a meeting of the divisional council where they may combine or amend resolutions or prepare a composite to cover the intent of the question at issue."

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the resolution as drafted. The Constitution Committee agrees with the rationale set out by the N.B. East Regional Branch.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Any questions?

MS. NESHA IRVING (York): Nesha Irving, York Branch. Who do they go to right now for permission?

MR. DUNCAN GILLIS (N.B. East Regional): Duncan Gillis, N.B. East Regional Branch. We approached the National Executive and requested permission to use a secondary signature from one of our executives since we don't have a secretary.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Any other questions before I go back to you, Nesha?

MS. NESHA IRVING (York): Nesha Irving, York Branch. Does this take a while for you? Meaning, does it take time for you to get permission from the National Branch to get that signature?

MR. DUNCAN GILLIS (N.B. East Regional): Duncan Gillis, N.B. East Regional Branch. No, it was timely.

MS. NESHA IRVING (York): Pardon?

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): It's timely.

MS. NESHA IRVING (York): Go ahead.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Are we ready for the question? Those in favour, please lift your hands with your ballots. Thank you. Those not in favour.

Resolution #8 - Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): The resolution has passed. Resolution No. 9.

RESOLUTION #9

MS. MARIE TANYA MACDONALD (Greater Niagara): Tanya MacDonald, Greater Niagara Branch. Resolution No. 9, National Office.

Article 2 - Constitution.

2.5.3 reads as follows:

> "The Association shall not receive resolutions from any individual member."

This is factually incorrect, as the Association is defined to include our branches, which is the avenue to which a member would tender their proposals as outlined in

Article 2.5.1.

Whereas Article 2.5.3 appears to restrict any one member from tendering resolutions for consideration.

Whereas, our language should invite ideas and change.

Therefore, be it resolved, Article 2.5.3 should be deleted and all subclauses renumbered.

The Constitution Committee is recommending non-concurrence with the resolution as drafted.

The Constitution Committee does not believe this provision in the Constitution prevents the free exchange of ideas from individual members. Even with this provision in the Constitution, individual members maintain the right to submit resolutions under Article 2.3.1.

The Constitution currently provides a process that works and does not stifle individual ideas. It merely directs the member to the branch for further discussion.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have any questions? Scott?

MR. SCOTT McPHERSON (Pacific Coast): Scott McPherson, Pacific Branch. I just wanted to clarify because you had mentioned the Article 2.5.3 is actually, according to the sheet here, 2.5.2.

MS. MARIE TANYA MACDONALD (Greater Niagara): Tanya MacDonald, Greater Niagara Branch. When you look at

the resolution as stated at the very top, it says 2.5.3, then it goes into whereas Article 2.5.2. It should actually read 2.5.3.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Any further questions? Are you ready for the question? All in favor raise your ballot books. Thank you. All against raise your ballot books. Thank you. The resolution has not passed.

Resolution #9 - Not Passed.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution No. 10.

RESOLUTION #10

MS. MARIE TANYA MACDONALD (Greater Niagara): Tanya MacDonald, Greater Niagara Branch, Resolution No. 10, Pacific Coast Branch.

Article 3 - Objectives and Policies.

The reason for the amendment of this article is to allow for more clarity and more options or choices for our members. It sounds like training programs are offered to everyone in both languages and not one of their choice.

Therefore, be it resolved to amend Article 3.5 to read:

> "To offer and conduct training programs for members in one of the official languages of their choice."

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the resolution as drafted.

The Constitution Committee agrees with the rationale that has been set out by the Pacific Coast Branch.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Do we have any questions? Are we ready for the question? All in favour, raise your ballot books. Thank you. Those that are not in favour, please raise your ballot books. The resolution has passed.

Resolution #10 – Passed

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente Nationale) : Résolution N° 11.

RESOLUTION #11

MS. MARIE TANYA MACDONALD (Greater Niagara): Tanya MacDonald, Greater Niagara Branch. Resolution No. 11, Montreal Branch.

Article 4 - Membership.

As we are in 2026, technology allows us to modernize our way of assigning a membership card to a new member.

Whereas each new member is eligible to receive a membership card.

Whereas a membership card is transmitted or given to a supervisor when they become a member in good

standing.

Therefore, be it resolved to amend Article 4.3.1 to read:

"The issuance of a virtual membership card sent electronically."

The Constitution Committee proposes an amendment to the resolution. Be it resolved, 4.3.1:

"The issuance of a digital membership card sent electronically."

The Constitution Committee believes that digital better reflects the intent of the proposed resolution. The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the amended resolution.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have any questions? Stone?

MR. STONE BLEMANO (York): What is the actual cost now in getting the membership cards? I think the last time we met a lot of people were really interested in really having the actual card rather than the virtual one.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we know the cost? J-F?

MR. JEAN-FRANÇOIS CHARTRAND (Montreal): J-F Chartrand, Montreal Branch. We had this conversation in Niagara Falls. I think for our member, the only important thing is that they receive their digital number, their

member number. If they receive this through official letters or, as you said here, if they receive an electronic membership, I think for us it's fine. But to have the process to ask Linda Molloy to send all the cards to every branches. After we receive this, we have to send this again one by one to every member. It's not just to save some money, but also some time.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Merci. Nathan?

MR. NATHAN LAABS (Ottawa): Nathan Laabs, Ottawa Branch. I was all wound up about this one in Niagara Falls, so I can answer Stone's question. Rick, you told us it was about 15 cents to generate that card. That obviously doesn't include the shipping cost, but the cost itself, Stone, is negligible. The conversation around it is obviously a lot. I'll stop talking. It's emotional for me here. Thanks.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Are we ready for the question? Oh, Andrew?

MR. ANDREW HVARREGAARD (Edmonton): Andrew Hvarregaard, Edmonton Branch. I still have my original card. As I've been the branch president in the past, I use the opportunity to meet and spend time with new members. It's an opportunity to bond with them. I don't think we should be giving that up so casually. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Anyone else in the room before I asked the question? Are we ready for the question? All in favour of the proposed amendment from the Constitution Committee, raise your ballots. Thank you. Those not in favour, please raise your ballots. Thank you. The resolution has passed.

Resolution #11 (as amended) – Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution No. 12.

RESOLUTION #12

MS. MARIE TANYA MACDONALD (Greater Niagara): Tanya MacDonald, Greater Niagara Branch, Resolution No. 12, National Office.

Article 4 - Membership.

Article 4.5 reads as follows:

> "Members in the Association, by virtue of their membership, authorize Canada Post Corporation or other appropriate employer to release the Association information deemed pertinent to membership."

The information in question may appear broad in scope and could lead to privacy concerns within the membership.

Whereas, Article 4.5 may create privacy

concerns with members.

Whereas, the Association only gathers information for the requirement of administration of membership.

Therefore, be it resolved to amend Article 4.5 to read:

> "Members in the Association, by virtue of their membership, authorize the employer to release information necessary for the administration of membership in accordance with applicable privacy laws."

The Constitution Committee is recommending non-concurrence with the resolution as drafted. The Association's position is that there are no applicable privacy laws.

There is a Privacy Act that applies to Canada Post because it is a government entity, but there are no actual privacy laws that apply to the Association.

Furthermore, the change from the terminology of deemed pertinent to necessary will in fact limit application of the information sought from Canada Post as the language of deemed pertinent is broader in scope than the concept of necessary.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President):

Rick.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, First National Vice President. I don't know if that's factually correct. Privacy law does not apply to us with one exception in that we don't use the information for commercial use, which could be circulating it for one reason or another. That's the whole reason behind the actual proposal itself is that there is a portion of the privacy law that states that unions cannot use the information for circulation -- for commercial use.

So that's why I said that that law has to apply because we could literally, I mean, we wouldn't, let's be honest, but nevertheless, it's to put the membership's concerns at ease. It's not about whether we would or we wouldn't.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Andrew?

MR. ANDREW HVARREGAARD (Edmonton): Andrew Hvarregaard, Edmonton Branch. I don't think we should be in a position where we have to make note in the Constitution every law that we are in compliance with.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Anyone else? Are we ready for the question? Those in favour, please raise your ballot book. Thank you. Those against, please raise your ballot books. The resolution was

not passed.

Resolution #12 - Not Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution No. 13.

RESOLUTION #13

MS. MARIE TANYA MACDONALD (Greater Niagara): Tanya Macdonald, Greater Niagara Branch. Resolution No. 13, National Office.

Article 4 - Membership.

Article 4.7 reads:

> "A member who holds a position within the Association shall immediately resign their office and any roles or responsibilities on behalf of the Association at any time they obtain an acting assignment outside of the bargaining unit. Such individuals will not be entitled to run for positions within the Association or attend membership meetings until such time as they return to the bargaining unit."

This language is very restrictive and can lead to our executive members having to choose between their executive position and progression in the company.

Whereas, we want to both retain good executive

members but also offer them the chance to progress in their career.

Whereas, 4.7 creates a clear choice between the two options.

Therefore, be it resolved to amend Article 4.7 to read:

> "4.7 A member who holds a position within the Association and accepts an acting assignment, or temporary position, outside the bargaining unit shall have their rights and privileges as an elected or appointed representative, including meeting attendance and voting rights, suspended for a period of up to three months from the commencement of such assignment.
>
> 4.7.1 Where the acting assignment or temporary position extends beyond three months, or where the member permanently leaves the bargaining unit, the member shall be deemed to have resigned their position within the Association and the position shall be declared vacant.
>
> 4.7.2 Upon return to the bargaining unit within the three-month period, the

member's rights and privileges as an elected or appointed representative shall be reinstated."

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the resolution as drafted. This would allow those that wish to experience an acting assignment on a temporary basis of up to three months the opportunity to return to their substantive representation positions within the Association.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Andrew?

MR. ANDREW HVARREGAARD (Edmonton): Andrew Hvarregaard, Edmonton Branch. I just have a question for the National Office. Why three months and not six?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, First National Vice President. It just seemed reasonable. Three months sounded reasonable to me. Six, well, not to me, to us. And it's something that we even discussed with the EC. We tossed around the idea of six weeks, three months, six months. We did go through the gamut of them all and we fell on the three as it sounded like the most reasonable. It's certainly open to conversation, but nothing beyond that.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Nesha?

MS. NESHA IRVING (York): Nesha Irving, York Branch. Just for clarity, George, my question is -- statement then question. The corporation has a habit of this three-month period, they send you back a day less three months, you work for two days, and then they put you back in that position. So my question is, when this person comes back a day less three months, and they take a break in between, say maybe a week or so, and they go back into that acting position, does it start all over again? Or can it be interpreted that way?

MR. GEORGE RONTIRIS (Convention Parliamentarian): George Rontiris, your Parliamentarian. Yes, it can be interpreted that way.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): J-F?

M. JEAN-FRANÇOIS CHARTRAND (Montréal): Jean-François Chartrand, section de Montréal. En passant, Nesha, ce qu'elle vient de poser comme question, c'est une très bonne question. Effectivement, c'est renouvelable. C'est un peu comme quand nos gens sont prêtés six mois. Souvent, la corporation arrête ça puis le reprend le lundi après.

Pour venir à la résolution 13, moi, je trouve que cette proposition-là sécurise les deux parce qu'il y a un conflit d'intérêts qui peut arriver des deux bords de ce

côté-ci. Ça protège les gens parce que quand quelqu'un passe du côté de la gestion, puis qui en même temps revient avec l'Association, ça peut faire un conflit d'intérêts. Surtout si cette personne-là travaille pour la corporation, ça va être difficile de revenir avec l'Association ensuite et de parler du même sujet, mais d'autres objectifs différents.

Donc, je pense que ça protège les deux parties. Merci.

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente Nationale) : Merci. Michele?

MS. MICHELE EYDT (Greater Niagara): Michele Eydt, Greater Niagara Branch. I see a few problems with this. I agree with Nesha -- the whole, you know, do three months, come back for two days, and then you're back off.

But I'm also looking at this from a member's point of view. Currently, we have members who don't trust superintendents that are on our executive. How are they going to feel if somebody on our executive keeps popping out into an MGT position and then coming back? There's a trust factor here. We know a lot of things about our members. And you're straddling both sides.

I understand people want the opportunities to try other things. I've been in this company a long time, but I made a choice. I made a choice to stay with APOC.

And there's nothing to say if you want to go and act, you give up your position on the executive that you can't run again. If you come back and you decide APOC is where you want to be, that you can run again. I have some real concerns with this. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Travis.

MR. TRAVIS SHALLA (Ottawa): Travis Shalla, Ottawa Branch. I get to reference Trent-Severn. I'm going to keep that alive as long as I can. So before Nikki and I joined this branch, I was in a situation where I did acting MGT for 15 months, and doing that helped me eventually get an OP2 position.

So I'm going to make a statement, and I don't know if I have an amendment yet, and I do not mean to add conflict to our session. Objectively, I'm wondering if this shouldn't be reworded to say that branch presidents are exempt, or branch presidents are not eligible to act, but maybe other members of the executive could. Because now that I've been a branch president for a spell, I could see why people would be uncomfortable with a branch president acting, but maybe a regular executive member or vice president, maybe not as much. So I'm just putting that out there as a ball in the air for maybe a discussion point.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Stone.

MR. STONE BLEMANO (York): Stone Blemano, York Branch. My concern is with the limit of the time. Generally, people go for MGT positions longer than three months, so it's kind of a little tricky, and the whole controversy about trust is also an issue, but my concern is the time limit. Is it only three months? Can they go for six, or should we stick it to the collective agreement where a member can go up to about 12 months? So that's my concern.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Anyone else in the room? Scott?

MR. SCOTT McPHERSON (Pacific Coast): Scott McPherson, Pacific Branch. I spoke out against this in Niagara, so it's not going to be a surprise to anybody who was there.

Trust is everything in our business. In the APOC side of things, we are in the membership promotion and protection business. That's our job. That's what we're here for. We're here to make sure that our members get the best representation and the fairest deal that they can get in whatever interaction they're having with management.

On the management side, your role and your focus is completely different, and they are not things that

can coexist. I'm sorry, but if I'm a member, I'm not even sure I totally trust the superintendents to be perfectly honest with you. And yet, now you want me to trust that my president will eventually be my manager, and I may have divulged something to that now manager that I would never have said. And that's how our members think.

When you blur the lines to such a degree, you start to wonder about collusion. This is not a line you can cross. You can pick one or the other. If you want to be a manager, be a manager. And if it doesn't work out or you decide it's not for you, we have a mechanism for you to come back, run for election, and win. And our current president used to be a manager.

So it's not like it's going to be the be all, end all of your career, one or the other. There is a mechanism to come back. And it works fine. But in our role, it is such a difficult thing when I go into a meeting with somebody and they're fighting for their job, and I need to know everything I need to know about what's going on in their career. Because if I say, well, this person's been there for 18 years, and they don't tell me that prior they'd done something even worse than what we're here for, that's not a record.

And what happens is, for those of you who have been in these meetings, people are afraid to tell you the

truth. And now you want to become a manager as well? It's going to be impossible to get them to open up and tell us what we're dealing with so that we can give them the best possible representation to possibly save their jobs. And I don't think we can come back from this. I really don't. I think this is the end.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Go ahead, Wes.

MR. WESLEY FUNSTON (London): Wes Funston, London Branch. I'm going to wholeheartedly agree with the last speaker. For me, with this issue, there are some key elements that APOC and management do not align. Trust, their priorities, their morals, and as was mentioned, the fear that is left with members coming to us and with the potential that we're going to be looking at going beyond.

They need to know that when they come to us looking for guidance, assistance, that we are here for them 100%. Not 50-50, not 75-25. We're here. And we're not looking at what's the next step in my career. And for people that want to do that, that's great. Don't be on the executive. It's that simple.

In my opinion, those key elements do not align with those two roles within this corporation. Thank you very much.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Nesha?

MS. NESHA IRVING (York): Nesha Irving, York Branch. I'm a little bit torn here because I do believe that if you choose to be a manager, it's your choice. But I also believe that life be life-ing. So what I want today, I may not want tomorrow.

What I don't agree with, or one of the things I don't agree with here, is that this stream of period, and as we heard from George, it can be interpreted I can come back one day or less, three months, take a break, and it starts all over again.

Maybe the committee can consider putting a cap on it per calendar year or something like that. Because three months in a calendar year, if you choose to act, when you come back, you know whether you want to be in that role or the other. It's giving you a choice to make a decision for yourself, for your family, whatever is best.

But also, we also have to remember that when we take these positions, there's a lot of trust, there's a lot of information, all of these things. So what are we doing? Trusting but verifying? But what am I verifying with? APOC or management? So this should at least -- should we consider a cap on the three months? Three months per year? Or none at all? I don't know. Just a thought.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Go ahead.

MR. AARON DELORME (North Saskatchewan): Aaron Delorme, North Saskatchewan. There are, in Saskatoon, four superintendents. In the local area, there's maybe ten. Two of those are on our executive. And if my manager steps away for three weeks of holidays, we can be tapped to act in that position for up to three weeks covering his holidays. I wish to propose an amendment.

> "Whereas the acting assignment or temporary position extends beyond six weeks once during your term, the member permanently leaves the bargaining unit, the member shall be deemed to have resigned their position and the position declared vacant."

Rick, are you comfortable with that? Did I go too fast?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): I'm going to read back what I have because I know I missed a little bit at the end of it. "If the acting assignment for a temporary position extends beyond six weeks once during your term the member permanently leaves the bargaining unit." Am I good so far?

MR. AARON DELORME (North Saskatchewan): Sorry.

Or the member permanently leaves.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Or the member permanently leaves the bargaining unit, and then what's beyond that?

MR. AARON DELORME (North Saskatchewan): All the wording remains the same after that.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Okay.

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale): Pour les Francophones, le deuxième paragraphe est en français. For the Francophones, the second paragraph is the French paragraph.

Do we have a question? Please go ahead.

MR. ALWI MOHAMED (York): Alwi from York Branch. Just need clarification to that. It says you permanently become a not-member. Is that just an executive or just not-member?

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Can you take your earphones off? Because we can't hear you. Thank you.

MR. ALWI MOHAMED (York): I just want a clarification to that it says you become permanent. Is it as an executive or not-permanent member completely out of APOC? It doesn't clarify. Because you could be not-executive, but you could still be a member of APOC,

correct? Can we clarify that? That means you still -- let's say if you go back, you're not a management anymore, are you still a member of APOC or not? Because it says "permanent". So I'm not management anymore, but I can't be an executive, fine, but you still have to be a member.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): So this speaks to if you permanently leave the bargaining unit. Not permanently leave your position. Is that your question? So this is basically giving you a cap of six weeks to go outside once in your term. Or if you permanently leave, you will vacate your APOC executive position.

MR. ALWI MOHAMED (York): So you're saying after six weeks you will terminate me? Is that what it is?

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Yes.

MR. ALWI MOHAMED (York): Okay. I was just kind of confused at first when they say that I actively come back to it. I'm not an executive but I can still be a member of APOC.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Correct.

MR. ALWI MOHAMED (York): Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): I believe we have Sam. Did you have your hand up, Sam? No?

MR. SAM HAYMOUR (Edmonton): Sam Haymour, Edmonton branch. I'll raise my voice. A wise man once told me, "If you're part of the Hells Angels, do you leave the Hells Angels to go work with the police for three months? Do you think they're going to let you back in?"

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you, Sam. Claude-Éric?

M. CLAUDE-ERIC HÉBERT (Québec) : Claude-Éric Hébert, section Québec. Ma question est, si, par exemple, je remplace ma gestionnaire cette année pour ses vacances, l'année d'après si je la remplace encore, c'est fini, je ne suis plus partie de... Est-ce que c'est une fois?

Est-ce que j'ai raison ou est-ce que j'interprète mal ce qui est écrit?

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): That's the way I read it.

M. CLAUDE-ÉRIC HÉBERT (Québec): C'est ça?

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale): Oui.

M. CLAUDE-ÉRIC HÉBERT (Québec): O.K.

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Divisional Vice President, Atlantic): Joe Blanchard, divisional Vice President Atlantic. I spoke vehemently against this in Victoria 15 years ago. I'll speak that way about it today.

Not specifically to the amendment, but the original proposal.

Folks, we're sitting here talking amongst ourselves about ourselves. Do we think we don't have integrity? Do you look at your other executives sitting beside you and say, this person will stab me in the back the moment they go management? Come on, folks.

This is our co-workers. These are our friends. Do we honestly look at that person beside us and say they're going to stab our members in the back the second they get the first opportunity?

Our friend, for years, Marc Gaudet, we laughed, we drank with him, we laughed when he didn't show up on time, many times, is sitting in a management role today. When I have issues and I go to him, they get fixed fast. And the way APOC looks at them the right way.

This proposal that's on the table is asking us to give our people some grace to cover their boss for short stints, three months.

Could it be six weeks? Sure, no problem. But just because their boss goes on vacation and they're the superintendent -- we've got lots of superintendents in here -- doesn't make them bad people that they're superintendents. Doesn't make them not trustworthy because they're superintendents. Sometimes they have to change

hats. Sometimes you gotta have the APOC hat on. Sometimes you gotta have the corporate hat on.

And I believe that everyone in this room and all of your executives that aren't in this room, if they had an opportunity to act as a manager for three weeks, for four weeks, guess what? I'm going to believe they still have integrity. I don't believe a light switch goes off when someone steps out of the role for a short stint and becomes management and then comes back. Thank you.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Wes.

MR. WESLEY FUNSTON (London): Wes Funston, London Branch. Question for the executives, probably primarily Rick, but any that wish to speak to it, as far as the short-term coverages of managers, is it APOC's position that we can be forced into covering those positions? Or is it still the choice of the individual whether they're going to take that role and cover a management position? And if we are being forced, what's the response on that? Because clearly this is going to create an issue for people in that situation. Thank you.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. I would dearly love to know who's forcing you into a management position.

Now, it's the association's position that in no way, shape, or form can that occur. You can't force our membership into doing something that's outside of our certificate, first and foremost. So, no.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Vikas.

MR. VIKAS JOSHI (Manitoba): Okay, Vikas Joshi, Manitoba branch. I'm not going to keep beating this dead horse, but I just want to say something about what Joe said. For sure, I trust my brothers, but that's not what it's about. It's about the membership. They'll see it as we're not trustworthy. They may not break bread with us the same way we do in this room, so they don't understand that. And it takes a lot for us to even have them trust us, because as you know, we always get blamed for everything.

Going to a word that Scott used there, collusion. I hear that word quite a bit, because I can't get stuff done for them. So when someone leaves and they're in the executive, it's going to do something. I'm going to use a word that the company used, breach of trust, and that's the word that I'm going to get at my breakfast meeting.

So it's not about us not trusting each other. You know, I'd love to see some of us able to do that, but

it takes a lot for us to have the membership trust us, because let's face it, we can't always get everything that they want, and they need someone to blame. And that's usually Sammy. Never mind. Anyways.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (President): Thank you, Mona.

MS. MONA ASSAF (Edmonton): No, I just wanted to say the same thing as Vikas. It's not a personal thing against anybody in this room about trust.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (President): Your name and branch?

MS. MONA ASSAF (Edmonton): Oh, sorry. Mona, Edmonton Branch.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (President): Thank you.

MS. MONA ASSAF (Edmonton): But it's not a personal thing about anyone in this room, or trust, and that stuff. It's exactly about the membership. And Joe, you know how it is with members. They see you do one thing because they see the corporation dangle that carrot in front of you.

And hey, look, everybody wants a paycheque. Everybody wants to make more money. But at the end of the day, if you want to be the executive, you have a choice to make. We work so hard to build trust with these people.

We're the ones getting the calls at two in the morning when they have mental health issues and breakdowns for what happens. And they open up to us and we take care of them and we do everything for them.

So when they see us turn our backs on them, that's what goes through their head. They're like, oh, look how quick. Now she's going to go say everything she knows about me because they dangled the carrot. That's all we're trying to say. It's not about us and our positions in this thing. Why are we executives? For our members and the membership. That's all.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Okay, do we have a seconder for Aaron's amendment to the proposal? No? Okay, we're going to move to the original proposal. Are you ready for the question? Those in favour, please raise your ballot books. Thank you. Those against? Thank you. The resolution does not pass.

Resolution #13 - Not Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution 14.

RESOLUTION #14

MS. MARIE TANYA MACDONALD (Greater Niagara): Tanya Macdonald, Greater Niagara Branch. Resolution No. 14.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): One moment. Point of order, Tanya.

MS. MARIE TANYA MACDONALD (Greater Niagara): Sorry.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): It's okay. We have, Don just addressed me the -- where are we? Jennifer, did you want to speak on that?

MS. JENNIFER DIMEO (York): Jennifer Dimeo, York Branch. We're going to withdraw this.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you.

Resolution #14 - Withdrawn

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution No. 15.

RESOLUTION #15

MS. MARIE TANYA MACDONALD (Greater Niagara): Resolution number 15. Sorry, Tanya MacDonald, Greater Niagara Branch. Resolution no. 15, Executive Committee.

Article 4 - Membership.

The absence of an executive member at all levels has been ambiguous as to their rights and the rights of the branch.

Whereas the Constitution needs clarity surrounding the absence of an executive member.

Therefore, amend Article 4.9 to read:

"4.9. Any representative on approved leave of absence from Canada Post for a period of up to three months from the commencement of the leave of absence shall continue in their elected, or appointed office, including meeting attendance and voting rights.

4.9.1. Where the approved leave of absence extends beyond three months, the member shall temporarily step back from their office and be temporarily covered in accordance with the applicable Local or National Constitution coverage rules.

4.9.2. Upon returning from approved leave of absence within the current term of office, the member shall return to their elected or appointed office.

4.9.3. If the current term of office ends during the representative's approved leave of absence period, the member shall be entitled to stand for election.

4.8.3.1. If the member is elected during their approved leave of absence,

Articles 4.8, 4.8.1, 4.8.2, and 4.8.3 shall apply."

The Constitution Committee proposes an amendment to the resolution. Be it resolved, 4.8.1. Any representative on an approved leave of absence from Canada Post Corporation or any other appropriate employer shall not be entitled to continue in their elected or appointed office, including meeting attendance and voting rights, until they return from the leave. The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the amended resolution.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Any questions on the floor? Are you ready for the question? All in favour, raise your ballot books. Thank you. Those against? Thank you. The proposed resolution amendment has passed.

Resolution #15 (as amended) - Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution No. 16.

RESOLUTION #16

MS. MARIE TANYA MACDONALD (Greater Niagara): Tanya MacDonald, Greater Niagara Branch. Resolution No. 16, National Office.

Article 5 - Associate Members.

Article 5.1.2 reads as follows:

"5.1. The Association or any of its branches may extend associate membership to a member.

5.1.2. Who occupies a bargaining unit position for a term or on a temporary basis."

This conflicts with Article 4 in that membership is extended to indeterminate members only.

Whereas we have already determined earlier in the Constitution that only indeterminate employees in the bargaining agent are eligible for membership, full or otherwise.

Therefore, Article 5.1.2 should be deleted. Article 5.3 is to be amended to remove reference to the removed article as follows.

"5.3. Associate members shall not be required to pay dues to the Association and shall not count as a member for the purpose of Article 15."

The Constitution Committee is recommending non-concurrence with the resolution as drafted.

The Constitution Committee believes that bargaining unit positions staffed by a term or temporary employee are still entitled to representation and in accordance with the Constitution may be extended associate

membership.

The Constitution Committee does not believe that the current 5.1.2 of the Constitution conflicts with Article 4.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have any questions? Are you ready for the question? All in favour, raise your ballot books. Thank you. All against, please raise your ballot books. The resolution has not passed.

Resolution #16 - Not Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution No. 17.

RESOLUTION #17

MR. DUNCAN GILLIS (NB East Regional): Duncan Gillis, NB East Regional Branch. Resolution 17, N.B. East Regional Branch.

Article 6 - Discipline of Members.

From time to time, a member of the local branch may become disgruntled with another member and engage in conduct that may be reasonably interpreted as bullying, harassment, or otherwise causing unreasonable annoyance or distress to another member or members. Such conduct is unwelcome and inconsistent with the Violence in the Workplace policies of Canada Post as well as APOC.

Accordingly, it is proposed that the

Constitution of the Association includes provisions recognizing these circumstances.

Whereas, the unwanted attention is a violation of the rights of the member.

Therefore, be it resolved to add Article 6.1.10.

> "A member repeatedly performs any actions that amount to bullying, harassment, or unreasonable annoyance of another member of the Association."

The Constitution Committee proposes an amendment to the resolution. Be it resolved.

> "6.1.10 engages in conduct that constitutes bullying and harassment towards a representative."

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the amended resolution.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have questions? Scott?

MR. SCOTT McPHERSON (Pacific Coast): Scott McPherson, Pacific Branch. I'm not quite clear. Does this refer to our membership and how they engage us when we're visiting a workplace? I mean, I've certainly had my share of, how do I clean up some of the language… APOC isn't meeting their expectations, let me say. Is that what this

is referring to, or is this speaking to something else? Because I wasn't clear on that.

MR. DUNCAN GILLIS (NB East Regional): Duncan Gillis, NB East Regional branch. The intention of this article was to protect the representatives and the executive from members that repeatedly bully and harass the executive, not necessarily on a one-off or on a situation where you go and visit and you get questions that you're not comfortable with. This is just something more towards the constant or a continuation.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have any other questions? Stone?

MR. STONE BLEMANO (York): Stone Blemano, York Branch. Is this not covered under ethical review from the National office? I thought there was a mechanism to deal with this.

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Atlantic Divisional Vice President): Yes, to answer your question. Oh sorry, Joe Blanchard, Divisional Vice President Atlantic.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Take your earphones off.

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Atlantic Divisional Vice President): Joe Blanchard, Divisional Vice President Atlantic. Yes, this is Article 6, the mechanism to assess the behaviour or actions of the individual is in the bottom

of Article 6.

But the intention here is this. Right now, our Article 6 does not provide any avenue to address bad behaviour. And it shouldn't just address, you know, someone calling someone a bad name someday. But the intent of this clause is to have a venue for us to initiate either the branch-based or national-based Ethics Committee, review, investigate, and follow the appropriate steps as is outlined in the bottom of Article 6.

Because right now, as far as our Constitution is considered, not that this would necessarily fixed that, but I could literally walk up to one of our members, punch him in the face, and there's nothing this Constitution could do to address that. Because this Constitution only has those offences. And unless you've breached one of those, the ethics review will not be successful.

So what this tries to add is that if there is some kind of bullying and harassment, which have definitions in society, they're not specific, they're not individual, "hey, I called you a bad name," that's I'm bullying you and harassing you. As we've all seen with our MLO complaints that have come across our desks, there's a bar you have to cross.

I think this is a good thing. Let's add a little bit of teeth into Article 6 so that you, your other

members, your executives can say, "hey, stop! Or else I'll ask for help." And there's a provision in here to ask for help now.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Scott.

MR. SCOTT McPHERSON (Pacific Coast): Scott McPherson, Pacific Coast Branch. So my understanding, and if I hear you right, is it would be the same mechanism that we currently have for any member accused of major misconduct. Is that correct?

And to Joe, I would say don't forget the first rule of Fight Club. But that's what you're talking about, right? You're talking about the ethics committee gets involved and does the interviews. And so the final solution is to remove the person from membership in APOC. That's the consequence? Because a punch in the face on the work floor would be covered by the employer.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): So it actually covers the latter part of Article 6, right? All the action that can be taken if somebody breaches Article 6. Any of the points between 6.1 and now what we're proposing is adding 6.10. We're adding it to the end. Nesha?

MS. NESHA IRVING (York): Nesha Irving, York Branch. Who dictates what the bullying is? Because me

saying to someone that I don't agree with what you're doing, that person can decide I bullied them. And I've seen it happen. Without even raising my voice, I was called aggressive.

So who dictates what bullying is? Article 6 allows National to investigate and preferably do a proper investigation before they make a decision. So in this case, who dictates what the bullying, what the harassment is?

MR. DUNCAN GILLIS (NB East Regional): Duncan Gillis, NB East Regional Branch. The Ethics Committee would determine whether or not it was bullying or harassment. This is just adding to the criteria what they look at.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Can you repeat?

MS. NESHA IRVING (York): Can you repeat please?

MR. DUNCAN GILLIS (NB East Regional): Duncan Gillis, NB East Regional Branch. The Ethics Committee would determine whether it was bullying or harassment. This is just adding the criteria what they would look at.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Joe?

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Atlantic Divisional Vice

President): Joe Blanchard, Divisional Vice President Atlantic. Nesha, I'll try and clarify. I'll try and help with this question you have.

So Article 6 is governed in two levels. There's a branch level to it, and there's a national level to it. So if someone gets accused of, we'll just say bullying, and we've put this in place, then first and foremost, the branch level of a complaint process would be initiated. Depending on what you have in your branch, it could be different, okay? If the individuals are not satisfied with that outcome, it then can go national.

Now, if your branch doesn't have a process, it just immediately goes national. The national process would be the president would look at the complaint, assess if it meets the criteria of the clause, and then strike an ethics board. And the ethics board is three individuals -- there's criteria around it. I'm not getting into the weeds of that -- and that body would then review the evidence, have a hearing, etc., do some pre-work, post-work, etc., and come up with an answer; yes, no.

And if yes, there are levels of response that that committee has the ability to do -- and we're going to talk about more of this stuff later in this process -- and those levels currently stand. And it could be as light as a letter, don't do it again, or as heavy as removal from the

Association. And I think there's three currently, and it depends if you're a rep or not a rep, but we have those things to address later on.

So whatever process, whether there's the branch process or the national process, that body that gets struck to assess the situation would make that determination if they've met that threshold. But the key piece that I would like to make clear on all of this is even if that body gets it wrong, Article 6 provides an outlet. There is an appeal process.

So if that body, maybe they got struck and they're all friends of the complainant, and they say, yeah, yeah, you're a terrible person, here's your big punishment. And that person disagrees with that, there is a way to get it done right, because it then goes up the chain all the way to the Executive Committee, and then they do a sober second review of the evidence and the individuals involved, and then it's final at that point in time.

So there's a lot of outlets, there's a lot of stages. Article 6 is a good clause. It needs tweaking, and we've got a lot of that this week, but I hope that helps, Nesha.

MS. SONIA LEVY (York): Sonia from York Branch. I concur with this. The key word that I like is repeatedly. A lot of us are suffering in silence as

members, they're not speaking. And bullying and harassment is happening more than we are aware.

So I'd like to have something that we can look at that can back that person that's suffering in silence, and that something could be resolved for our members. Management is not doing enough for us.

So I'm hoping that through APOC, something could be resolved. So I concur with this article. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Sonia, I just want to point out, if you look at the screen, repeated is not in the amendment that is proposed by the Constitution Committee.

MS. SONIA LEVY (York): I hear you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Okay.

MS. SONIA LEVY (York): But the word repeatedly, I'd like to see that in.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have any more questions? Are you ready for the question? All in favour of the proposed amendment on your screen, please raise your ballots. Thank you. All against. Thank you. The amendment is passed.

Resolution #17 (as amended) – Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President):

It's 2:22. Make a wish. We'll take the break right now. If everybody can be back in the room at 2:40, that would be fine. Thank you.

--- Upon recessing at 2:22 p.m. /

Suspension à 14 h 22

--- Upon resuming at 2:43 p.m. /

Reprise à 14 h 43

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you everyone. Please take your seats. Merci, prenez vos places s'il vous plaît. Welcome back. We are looking at Resolution 18. Résolution 18.

RESOLUTION #18

MR. DUNCAN GILLIS (N.B. East Regional): Duncan Gillis, N.B. East Regional Branch. Resolution 18, Executive Committee.

Article 6 - Discipline of Members

The article has expectation of an investigation at the branch level. This will serve to assist this process for the branch.

Whereas the branch is expected to conduct an investigation under Article 6.

Whereas there are many branches that do not have an investigation process embedded in their bylaws.

Whereas Article 6.2.4 currently states:

"The branch must conduct an

investigation and/or hearing in accordance with the Branch Constitution and/or ByLaws. The Branch shall provide both parties within twenty-five (25) calendar days of the receipt of the charge(s)."

Therefore Article 6.2.4 be amended to read:

"Article 6.2.4 the branch must conduct an investigation and/or hearing in accordance with the established national investigation guidelines. The Branch shall provide both parties within twenty-five (25) calendar days of their receipt of the charge(s)."

The Constitution Committee proposes an amendment to the resolution.

"6.2.4 The Branch must conduct an investigation and/or hearing in accordance with the established national investigation guidelines. The Branch shall provide both parties their decision within twenty-five (25) calendar days of the receipt of the charge(s)."

The Constitution Committee is recommending

concurrence with the amended resolution.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have any questions? Are you ready for the quest -- oh, Donald?

MR. DONALD MAK (Pacific Coast): Donald Mak, Pacific Coast. So I just wanted to make sure that the difference is we took out the ByLaw.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Rick?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. Yes, that's correct, because we know that a lot of the ByLaws out there actually don't contain any guidelines on how to conduct the investigation.

So, what we'll be doing is actually putting together a national investigation guideline that will be provided to all the branches so that they can be guided through this process in a consistent manner.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have any other questions? André?

M. ANDRÉ BEAUDET (Montréal): André Beaudet, section de Montréal. Pourquoi 25 jours, celui versus 25 jours... work days? Why not work days? The reason I'm saying this is because if it happens during let's say the Christmas period where you have like two, or three, or four

holidays. 25 days is pretty quick. That's what I think anyway.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Joe?

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Atlantic Divisional Vice President): Joe Blanchard, DVP. That's a really good question, and you're right. But as one of the DVPs who's done one or two of these in their days, it's really hard on both parties. Yeah, 25 days can actually seem really short when you're in the committee to get it done, to get it assessed, and get it out there, and get it to that number.

But you've got to really see the other side. If you're the victim on that, we want to keep it as short as is feasible within administrative guidelines, right? But we really want to get it done fast. I mean, if I could do it even faster, I would say we do it even faster. But the times I had to deal with one of these, they are hard to get done in that time period because there's so much to it. But you got to deal with the parties, they need their answer because it's hanging over their heads. So that's why we want to keep the 25 days.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): André?

M. ANDRÉ BEAUDET (Montréal): André Beaudet, section de Montréal. Mais c'est pas plus important d'avoir

une bonne enquête que de mettre de la pression pour la finir dans les 25 jours? Je calcule les fins de semaine là-dedans, je calcule les holidays s'il y en a. Il te reste plus grand temps à faire une bonne enquête.

Je comprends que ce n'est pas bon pour celui qui est accusé, mais je crois que c'est important d'avoir une bonne enquête, de prendre le temps de faire une bonne enquête aussi. Ça, c'est mon opinion à moi personnel.

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale): Merci André, juste pour préciser, depuis qu'on a l'article 6, tous les délais c'est 25 jours. Dans l'article, ça a toujours été comme ça.

Are we ready for the question? Oh, Rick?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, First National Vice President. Yeah, we wanted to, we actually didn't look at the 25 days at all to Rachel's point. The biggest thing that we wanted to get out of this is that we have found out that the branches were a lot of times in their Constitutions or their ByLaws are just not prepared for these kinds of investigations.

So the biggest portion of this article was really so that we could get the national investigation guidelines out there so that we could give you some guidance that is consistent and it's actually in line with what we would do at a national level as well.

So honestly, the 25 days was already there and it's just not something we had thought of. That was the bigger part of this.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Are we ready for the question? All in favour of the proposed amendments, please raise your booklets. Thank you. Those against? Thank you. The amendment has passed.

Resolution #18 (as amended) – Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution 19.

RESOLUTION #19

MR. DUNCAN GILLIS (N.B. East Regional Branch): Duncan Gillis, N.B. East Regional Branch. Resolution No. 19, Executive Committee.

Article 6 - Discipline of Members

Article 6.2.10 currently states:

> "Article 6.2.10. The committee shall render a decision within twenty (20) calendar days of the completion of a hearing and provide it to the parties immediately."

This may present issue to arrive to a fair and just finding in more complex investigations.

Whereas the article may be limited to arrive at a just and fair determination on more complex

investigations, whereas an additional ten days should provide the efficient amount of time for a full and complete finding.

Therefore, amend 6.2.10 to read:

> "Article 6.2.10. The committee shall render a decision within thirty (30) calendar days of the completion of the hearing and provide it to the parties immediately."

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the resolution as drafted.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Rick?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. And just like that, this one we did take it into account how about that? So we, I guess the funny thing is, is that we at the national office have been through a number of these ethics committee reviews and found out just how constricting it was at the 20-day mark. So we moved to the 30-day and completely missed it on the first one. But that's our rationale, is that in order to make sure that we make a good and just finding, we want to afford ourselves as much time as possible to be able to give everybody their just results.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have any other questions? Stone?

MR. STONE BLEMANO (York): Stone Blemano, York branch. Are we going to go back then to the one that we just reviewed to add more time to it?

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Rick?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (First National Vice President): Rick Williams, First National Vice President, the motion has been passed. Typically we wouldn't go back on and then re-evaluate it. It should have been done at the time of its proposal.

It's something that we can keep for the future to be able to consider and see how it's going. Honestly, we haven't had a lot of branch investigations happen thus far. They've almost all come straight to the national office because of the priorities that were involved.

So let's give it a test. Well, let's not give it a test, let's hope we never have to. But if in the event that we do, let's see whether or not the 25 days holds up or not.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Any other questions before I ask the question? Andrew?

MR. ANDREW HVARREGAARD (Edmonton): Andrew Hvarregaard, Edmonton branch. I'd like to propose an

amendment. It's a fairly simple amendment where we just change it to 25 days, no other substantive changes.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have a seconder? André?

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have any questions before I ask question to the amendment to the amendment?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President, so just for clarity sake, this means that the new amendment is going to read -- just got to bring it up so I can actually see it on my screen here as well.

> "The committee shall render a decision within 25 calendar days of the completion of the hearing and provide it to the parties immediately."

So please just disregard the 30, change it to 25, save us a little bit of typing.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Are we ready for the question? All those in favour of the amendment from the floor, please raise your hands with your ballots in them, and leave your hands up so the Nomination Committee can count.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President):

Please raise your hands with your ballots. Keep them up.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Excuse me, let's keep quiet in the room to allow the Nominations Committee to do their count. Thank you.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you very much. All that are against, please raise your hands with your ballots in the air. Leave them up please, we need to recount, please.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you everyone. The resolution has failed, it does not pass. The amendment from the floor has not passed.

Resolution #19 (as amended) – not passed

Now we go back to the resolution. The Constitution Committee recommended concurrence. Are you ready for the question? All in favor, raise your hands with your ballots. Thank you. Those against? Please raise your hands with your ballots. The resolution has passed.

Resolution #19 – passed

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale): Résolution 20.

MR. DUNCAN GILLIS (N.B. East Regional): Duncan

Gillis, N.B. East Regional Branch. The Constitution Committee would like to park Resolution 20 and 21 to speak to Resolution 22.

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale): Résolution N° 22.

RESOLUTION #22

MR. DUNCAN GILLIS (N.B. East Regional): Duncan Gillis, N.B. East Regional Branch. Resolution 22, Executive Committee.

Article 6 - Discipline of Members.

The article's choice of reprimand is very limited and can lead to penalties that may be deemed as either too lenient or severe, with no opportunity of adjustment due to mitigating factors.

Whereas, the article's choice of reprimand is very limited and can lead to penalties that may be deemed as either too lenient or severe, with no opportunity of adjustment due to mitigating factors.

Therefore, Article 6.4 be amended to read:

> "Article 6.4 Should Article 6.1 be violated by any Association representative, any combination of the following actions shall be taken by either the Branch Executive or the National Ethics Committee.

6.4.1 Written reprimand

6.4.2 Suspension from office

6.4.3 Removal from office

6.4.4 Expulsion from the Association

6.4.5 Being barred from holding any office within the Association."

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the resolution as drafted.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Rick?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. So we've had an opportunity, as we talked about before, and it's an unfortunate opportunity to have had to run a number of these ethics complaints. We did have an incident where the ethics complaint was justified. Unfortunately, this is where we ran into the idea of it being too severe.

We didn't have the option to be able to award a penalty that fit the crime, if you will. So the EC itself, we all sat down and we put this together in order to be able to allow both the Ethics Committee and/or the Branch Executive to be able to deliver a penalty that is more, I guess, where the penalty fits the crime.

We did a lot of thinking over this. We brainstormed the different ways to write it. And this is

what we came up with. We do believe that it's a firm but fair approach to be able to delve out any particular penalties that we might run into. So that was our rationale behind it.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Andrew?

MR. ANDREW HVARREGAARD (Edmonton): Andrew Hvarregaard, Edmonton Branch. I have a concern with some of these actions being taken by the Branch Executive and would therefore like to propose an amendment. Everything remains the same up to and including 6.4.2. 6.4.3 would be amended to read:

> "Removal from office, subject to DVP approval or above.
>
> 6.4.4 Expulsion from the Association, subject to national approval.
>
> 6.4.5 Being barred from holding any office within the Association subject to national approval."

Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Joe?

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Atlantic Divisional Vice President): Joe Blanchard, Divisional Vice President Atlantic. I understand where Andrew is coming from 100%,

and he is right, but what I would say is this: As I mentioned earlier in the day when we talked about Article 6, there are numerous appeal processes.

So, yeah, approvals are not necessarily a bad idea, I won't necessarily speak against it. What I will say is those relief valves that we need, those places for sober second thought, already exist within Article 6, and I don't necessarily think that we should add them in here, where this is speaking purely to the potential actions that that body can take, and should those actions not be appropriate, there is a relief valve. It is in there.

There is an appeal process where even the people who were involved in the original complaint are out of the decision-making. It's a complete fresh set of eyes.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Scott.

MR. SCOTT McPHERSON (Pacific Coast): Scott McPherson, Pacific Coast Branch, possibly the grievance officer in me, but the issue that I have with this is the expulsion from Association. It suggests that there's no redeemable qualities in anybody, and if a person makes a mistake, there's no coming back from that. They can't even vote on their collective agreement, which is the employment contract that they're expected to live under.

And I don't feel like the Association whose

role is to defend and help people should be to expel or exclude people who are still going to be governed in the workplace, people who we still have to actually represent if something goes wrong or something happens to them.

They don't lose their rights to representation, but they do lose their right to vote on a collective agreement that they have to live by. And I just feel like that's a bridge too far for an Association to say, especially if it's a one-time offense.

First offense, you make a mistake, maybe it's a bad one, but you still are not an irredeemable person or I wouldn't be doing this. So I would hope that we could revert back to resolution 21, which doesn't speak to permanent expulsion from the Association. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Andrew?

MR. ANDREW HVARREGAARD (Edmonton): Andrew Hvarregaard, Edmonton Branch. Joe is correct. There are appeal processes and sober second thought elsewhere. I just don't think we should be giving the branch the power to expel or give them powers that they're not entitled to.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Rick?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st Vice President, 1st National Vice

President. We've had situations in the past where, as an example, an executive member has stolen in excess of $20,000, $30,000, $40,000 from the Association.

I do believe that there are circumstances, however rare they should be, where expulsion would actually be the right penalty for the crime. I think it would be rare. I agree with you, Scott, that there's almost never a situation where expulsion would really be the answer, but I don't think it's non-existent.

I will need, Andrew, just to get you to read that off one more time for me. I did capture, I was trying to grab that piece and bring it over here and just add your pieces. So could you repeat it for me one more time?

MR. ANDREW HVARREGAARD (Edmonton): Andrew Hvarregaard, Edmonton Branch. I'll start at "6.4.3. Removal from office, subject to DVP or national office approval. 6.4.4. Expulsion from the Association, subject to National approval. 6.4.5. Being barred from holding any office within the Association, subject to National approval." So it's really just those little addendums to those last three points so that there's some oversight to these extreme actions.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Wes.

MR. WESLEY FUNSTON (London): Wes Funston,

London Branch. Just in regards to those changes, Article 6.5, the accused may appeal a finding of guilty and any penalty imposed by sending a written appeal to a National Officer that was not involved in the case or decision. If we add in that language, as the amendment has been put forward, it basically circumvents the appeal process because everybody will be aware of it and there'll be nobody to file an appeal with.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): That was a question or a comment? Angela.

MS. ANGELA BURNETT (Pacific Coast): Angela Burnett, Pacific Coast. So with the wording DVP and National Office, isn't that the same thing? To me, a DVP is National Office. No?

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have any other questions in that end before I go back to you, Andrew? Oh, Don?

MR. DON FORSYTHE (Lakehead): Don Forsythe, Lakehead Branch. Just looking at the list, it appears to be progressively worse the farther down you go, but I feel like 6.4.4 is more, should be, 6.4.4 and 6.4.5 should be reversed, that is all.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): We'll have Rick put it up on screen because the projector is not working.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Rich?

MR. RICH DINON (Huron Divisional Vice President): Rich Dinon, Divisional Vice President for Huron. Just a point of clarification, and I know we're used to seeing this in Canada Post progressive discipline. This isn't progressive discipline, it's just basically what's available to you when you have to impose some sort of consequence.

So I understand what you're saying, yeah, it makes sense that it's that way, and it just happens to fall that way. Sure, it's easy to flip it, but just make sure we're aware it's not, like if you do it once, you're going to get a written reprimand, and if you do something else, well, we can't give you another written reprimand, we're going to give you something more severe.

So again, remember these are not, it's not severity, it's just the options that one or more can be utilized. Thanks.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Andrew.

MR. ANDREW HVARREGAARD (Edmonton): Andrew Hvarregaard, Edmonton Branch. I hate to bother you, Rick, but I'm going to propose an amendment to my amendment. For

the three instances where I've said National Office, I'd like to change it to a National Officer. Having to speak to only one would allow for the oversight in a timely fashion and would leave others available for appeal if required.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Andrew.

MR. ANDREW WATTS (Halifax): Andrew Watts, Halifax Branch. Just a point of order I just want to clarify. We have not, I don't think I've heard a seconder for that first amendment. So we are amending the amendment without a seconder?

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): You're absolutely correct. We didn't ask if there was a seconder for Andrew's first proposal, but we are amending at this point.

MR. ANDREW WATTS (Halifax): Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): At this point. Sophia.

MS. SOPHIA ALICIA KELLY (York): Sophia Kelly, York Branch. This is my first convention, so forgive me if the question is not clear. I was just wondering what -- if we could have a grid just to say what would constitute a written reprimand and what would constitute the other serious offenses. That could probably, you know, make it

easier for everyone that if you steal, you're out. Something like that. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Go ahead.

MS. LIZ JONES (Pacific Coast): Liz Jones, Pacific Coast. Can you tell me the difference between 6.4.4 and 6.4.5, please?

MR. GEORGE RONTIRIS (Convention Parliamentarian): George Rontiris, your Parliamentarian. Point four deals with an expulsion, so you would say to somebody, you are being thrown out of the Association. And because it does not provide a time limit, it could be a permanent expulsion, it could be a temporary expulsion. And point five speaks to not being allowed to hold an office within the Association.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Tim.

MR. TIM HORNE (Pacific Coast): Tim Horne, Pacific Coast. Sorry, just a clarification on that. So you're saying that under 4.4, the expulsion is not permanent, that it could be an undetermined amount of time? And would that also apply on 4.2, the suspension, could that be a 10-year suspension, for instance?

MR. GEORGE RONTIRIS (Convention Parliamentarian): George Rontiris, your Parliamentarian.

Look, it's clear, it's open-ended. It gives the Branch Executive or the National Ethics Committee the opportunity to tailor a penalty that meets the goal of both punishing the individual and serving as a reminder to others not to conduct themselves in the fashion that led to the Branch Executive or the Ethics Committee taking both a hearing and ultimately a decision. So yes, the suspension could be 10 years. That's somewhat of a, I don't want to use the word absurd, but it's somewhat of an unreasonable penalty, but it might be. I mean, it depends what the penalty is. And yes, the expulsion could be temporary.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Marie-Josée?

Mme MARIE-JOSÉE TOUPIN (Montréal): Marie-Josée Toupin, Montréal.

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale): Marie-Josée, peux-tu enlever tes écouteurs? Nous n'entendons pas.

Mme MARIE-JOSÉE TOUPIN (Montréal): Est-ce que vous pouvez recommencer parce que tout ce que George a dit, on ne l'a pas entendu en français.

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale): O.K., la traduction n'a pas fonctionné. Can you repeat, George, for the translators, please?

MR. GEORGE RONTIRIS (Convention

Parliamentarian): George Rontiris, your Parliamentarian. I'll try to be succinct. 6.4.2 can be for any period of time. 6.4.4 can be for any period of time. We have to trust our decision-makers to be reasonable and to craft a penalty that suits the offence.

There's a couple of other resolutions that are coming up that deal with mitigating factors, and those will also be taken into account when the decision-makers are making their decision.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you.

MR. GEORGE RONTIRIS (Convention Parliamentarian): George Rontiris, your Parliamentarian. I don't want to over complicate things. 6.4 is intended to provide flexibility. You heard from your National 1st Vice President that we had a situation where we didn't have that flexibility. We were bound by the penalties that were – that are currently in the Constitution. The notion that these penalties have to be subject to somebody else's approval interferes with the flexibility that we're trying to provide, either the Branch or the National Ethics Committee. As Joe said, Joe Blanchard, your Divisional Vice President Atlantic said, there's clearly an appeal process. Frankly, you don't want the same people who are ultimately going to be responsible for the appeal to have

any say, that even if it's just one officer, now you're limiting the opportunity to have that individual as part of the appeal process. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have any other questions before I ask for a seconder of this proposal? Is there a seconder to this proposal? Mona?

Are you ready for the question? All in favour for the amendment from the floor, please raise your hands with your ballots in them. Thank you. All against? The amendment does not pass.

Resolution #22 (as amended) - Not passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): We return to the original resolution. All in favour to the original resolution, please raise your hands with your ballot in your hand. Thank you. All against?

The resolution has passed.

Resolution #22 - Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): We're going to 20, 21.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Okay, so resolutions 20 and 21 have been resolved for 22.

Resolution #20 – Withdrawn

Resolution #21 – Withdrawn

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): We are now at Resolution 23.

RESOLUTION #23

MR. DUNCAN GILLIS (N.B. East Regional): Duncan Gillis, N.B. East Regional branch. Resolution 23, National Office.

Article 6 - Discipline of Members.

To bring clarity to the newly proposed Article 6.4 as well as in support of Article 6.3, there should be clarity on factors being considered by the National Ethics Committee.

Whereas procedural fairness is to be applied when rendering consequences for a breach of Article 6.

Whereas transparency on the key factors helps to improve understanding of the disciplinary process.

Therefore, be it resolved to add a new Article 6.5 and renumber the current 6.5 to read as follows.

> "6.5 In determining the appropriate penalty, the National Ethics Committee determined fault on the balance of probabilities and if fault is determined, the Committee shall consider the seriousness of the offence, the intent of the member, the impact of the conduct on the

association, its members, or its operations. Whether the conduct was isolated or part of a pattern, any mitigating or aggravating circumstances."

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the resolution as drafted.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Questions on the floor? Bernard?

M. BERNARD CÔTÉ (Montréal): Bernard Côté, section Montréal. Écoutez, juste un petit commentaire comme ça. On vient de passer la résolution nº 22, où ce qu'on voulait c'est plus de flexibilité. C'est bien ça.

Là, c'est quelque chose où on se contraint un petit peu en rajoutant des limitations, parce que là on définit exactement comment on va prendre notre décision. Je trouve que là, la flexibilité qu'on gagnait tantôt, on la perd un peu. C'est un commentaire.

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale): Merci. Victor.

MR. VICTOR ROSSI (London): Victor Rossi, London. Would we now want to consider precedents in making some of those determinations? If we had a similar situation a year ago and the penalty was this, and now we're treating it differently and it's more severe, if they

align with one another-- do you understand what I mean? Precedents.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Go ahead, Wes.

MR. WESLEY FUNSTON (London): Wes Funston, London branch. For George, given the language in this, skipping to 6.5 in the end, the committee shall consider, and that's a semicolon, so I don't read that as limiting to the fact that they can only consider these things, but these things should be considered. Is that the correct understanding of the language in that?

MR. GEORGE RONTIRIS (Convention Parliamentarian): Correct.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Rick.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. Yeah, that's one of the things I was going to say, Wes, is that this is not all-encompassing. This isn't the exhausted list of what would be considered, but this is to allow to give some guidance to the Ethics Committee as they're put together, not just the current one, but any Ethics Committee that may present itself in the future, to be able to take these into account, along with any other circumstances that might present themselves.

But it certainly provides a guidance so that they can make a good and sound decision. That's why we wanted to put it in there. And I think somebody had mentioned earlier in one of the previous ones that we would set up a grid. Certainly, this isn't a grid of equals, you know, you do this, you get this. But what it at least does is give everybody a true direction on what they should be considering when they're doing this stuff.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have any other questions? Bernard?

M. BERNARD CÔTÉ (Montréal): Peut-être que George peut y répondre, parce qu'en français, je vois ici « prépondérance des probabilités ». Est-ce qu'on peut me définir ce que ça veut dire ça, prépondérance des probabilités?

MR. GEORGE RONTIRIS (Convention Parliamentarian): George Rontiris, your Parliamentarian. In law when a trier of fact is asked to assess the evidence and to determine if, if guilt is found, they will do it based on one of two standards of proof. One is beyond a reasonable doubt, and that is the criminal standard. And then the civil standard is on a balance of probabilities.

It's not a mathematical equation, it's not 50 plus 1 percent, it's more an assessment, a balancing of the evidence, and I guess the easiest way to explain it is, is

it more likely that the events occurred as portrayed or less likely? And if it's more likely, then you've met the balance of probabilities standard of proof. If it's less likely, then you haven't met that standard.

And obviously the beyond reasonable doubt, you have to be firmly convinced that in fact it did happen as portrayed.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Bill?

MR. BILL HATESOHL (Kitchener): Bill Hatesol, Kitchener branch. This is a question to the National Office who proposed this. The amendment in 6.4 was cleared to include the Branch Executive in the decision making, but has not included the Branch Executive on the factors in 6.5. Is there a reason why it was excluded?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, First National Vice President. So you're saying that this should apply at the branch level as well? So what we can do is -- the document that we were talking about, that we can send out, the national guidelines that we can send out, would also include a rationale for what the branch would have to take into consideration as part of the guidelines to be able to be done at the branch level. So it would encompass it there as well, just in a different document.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have any other questions before… Scott?

MR. SCOTT MCPHERSON (Pacific Coast): Scott McPherson, Pacific Branch. I understand Article 6.5 to have to do with the appeal process. So you would be appealing to the National Committee, which would make sense why you wouldn't include it, the branch, would it not?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, First National Vice President. Part of the amendment is that 6.5 would actually be renumbered to 6.6, and this would be a brand new 6.5.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Are we ready for the question? All in favor, please lift your hands in the air with your ballots. Thank you. All against? The resolution has passed.

Resolution #23 - Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): We've already done 24.

MR. GEORGE RONTIRIS (Convention Parliamentarian): We've done 24.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Yeah, we've done 24. We have 25 minutes left.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): After discussion with my esteemed colleagues, we will end

it here for the day. George did make a special request. He would like the microphone just before I close off the session for today.

MR. GEORGE RONTIRIS (Convention Parliamentarian): George Rontiris, your Parliamentarian. We all celebrate milestones in a different way, and I thought it would be fitting to give a big shout-out to somebody who's celebrating a birthday. I don't know whether or not it's a milestone, but it is a birthday and it should be noted and celebrated. Nesha, happy birthday to you.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. NESHA IRVING (York): Thank you everyone.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Okay, I want to thank you all for your participation today. Tomorrow morning, eight o'clock breakfast, nine o'clock in the room sitting down we'll get started. Do not forget your ballot books. You need them to vote tomorrow.

Oh, and I have one more little point. My apologies, I'm glad Lyn flagged it to me. There are some of you that arrived after the reception yesterday, the registration. For those of you that have not received their gifts, we would ask you to head down the hall to the right here as you go out the doors to the Montebello room, which is right past the washrooms, there's a little hallway

there, go down that hallway to the end. You'll see on the left-hand side a room called Montebello with our logo on it. Thank you.

And all those alternates that have not received the Montreal gift, please head down there as well. They have a gift for you.

--- Whereupon the Convention adjourned at 3:40 p.m., to resume on Wednesday, July 22, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. / Le congrès est ajourné à 15 h 40 pour reprendre le mercredi 22 juillet 2026 à 9 h 00

Whistler, BC / Whistler (C.-B.)

--- Upon commencing on Wednesday, July 22, 2026
at 9:00 a.m. / L'audience débute le mercredi
22 juillet 2026 à 9 h 00

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Good morning. Bonjour. S'il vous plaît, prenez vos places, please take your seats. So I hope everyone had a good evening last night, had a chance to go out, chat with your neighbours, maybe your friends from across the country, and enjoy Whistler. Beautiful evening last night. Anyone see a bear? Yeah, we did, we did. Awesome.

So I will ask you guys to turn off your cell phones today, put them on vibrate. So we did quite a good job yesterday, so we're gonna start off this morning with Resolution 25.

Yes, yes, roll call. I was gonna move on to other housekeeping items before roll call. I wanna make sure that you guys have your ballots as well. You also should be wearing your badges this morning. Crucial reminder is the nominations close at noon today. So hopefully your names are up and we're ready to rock and roll for tomorrow.

Just another thing I wanted to mention is tonight we have the event and we have our volunteers coming in today to be able to register you for this event. They

will be right out there where the hosting branch met with you on Monday. They'll be there as of 5:15, 5:30.

Once again, we have the procession walk to the museum. When you are registering, you need to bring your blue ticket to them. If you don't have your blue ticket, you can't get into the event. And there is a full buffet provided for you and your family. So come with your appetites.

I think I've done all my housekeeping. Rick, would you like to do a roll call?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Morning, ladies and gentlemen. Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. Let's see how I do today.

ROLL CALL

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you everyone, and let's commence with Resolution 25.

RESOLUTION #25

M. PIERRE-YVES CARRIER (Québec): Pierre-Yves Carrier, section Québec. Hi guys, I'll give you time to put these headphones on because part of my section will be in French and in English. So let's get started.

Résolution nº 25, section de Québec:

Article 8 - Exécutif national.

Limiter le nombre de mandats d'une personne dans le rôle de président national de l'Association.

Attendu que nous voulons favoriser l'efficacité et générer de nouvelles idées dans cette position névralgique de l'Association.

Attendu que le renouvellement démocratique est essentiel au maintien d'une association dynamique, représentative, transparente et responsable envers ses membres.

Attendu que nous voulons prévenir la concentration du pouvoir.

Par conséquent, qu'il soit résolu que l'article 8.1 indique ce qui suit:

> « 8.1 L'Exécutif national est composé des dirigeants suivants: le président national. Une même personne ne peut occuper la position de président national plus de deux mandats. »

The Constitution Committee is recommending non-concurrence with the resolution as drafted. In accordance with the Constitution, the National President does not hold sole authority over the Association. The National President's actions are subject to the oversight provided by the Executive Committee.

As such, the Constitution Committee does not support imposing a limit on length of time the position may be held.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Rick.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (N.B. East Regional): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. Of course, this one touches me because we know that my name is on the board for the position. Let me tell you what my plan was. Back in 2015, I came up to the national office, and when I came up to the national office, I had put myself together a 10-year plan, turned out to be 11, but that's okay.

The 10-year plan was that I would work into the different portfolios, the Treasurer and the 1st. I would have not done the 2nd because there are far better personalities that have stepped into that role, Rachel and Dana are perfect examples of that. But I still learned the portfolios, and the reason I did that is ten years to be able to understand how to do this job properly to make sure that I understood the ins and outs of all of the positions so that I could do the best job possible.

With that being said, I've also got a plan for the next three, six, or nine years, is to be able to do the best job that I can with the knowledge that I've acquired. Now, if we look through the history of the Association, we have, in all of the presidents that we've had, we've only had one president that has ever exceeded two terms, and that was Wilf Wilson.

Wilf Wilson is basically the godfather of the Association. The things that he accomplished over his 18 years as president has really helped to shape the Association the way it is today. Had we have had that rule in place back in that time, we wouldn't have been able to benefit from the wisdom and the guidance and the shaping that Wilf really did. That's not to say that the next president wasn't good, but Wilf Wilson is the standard to which all presidents have been held.

We have a function in place already right now that says if, as I'll use myself as the example, if I was to acquire the role and I don't do the job, you have the ability today to put somebody else into the role. If we take that away, then we remove democracy. We remove democracy for an absolute. The fear will be that even if it's not me, if it's somebody down the road, is that somebody's doing an amazing job, and after two years, you have to lose that amazing job in lieu of a forced situation. You might find somebody of lesser stature who isn't prepared for the role.

For that reason, I believe that, although I understand the drive behind it, I understand that it drives new ideas, but for those reasons that I've listed, I believe that we should defeat this one.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President):

Daniel?

M. DANIEL LAROUCHE (Québec): Daniel Larouche, VP de Québec. Le but de notre résolution à la base, c'est de provoquer une discussion et une réflexion. Si on regarde dans nos vies courantes, souvent après plusieurs mandats, on voit les gouvernements, on dit qu'ils sont usés par le pouvoir. Nous, c'est ça qu'on veut, c'est prévenir l'usure du pouvoir.

Souvent, les gens dans des positions de leadership deviennent trop confortables dans leur position, prennent les choses pour acquises. Puis on veut forcer un renouvellement du leadership, donner aux gens l'occasion de se présenter plus tard, puis entreprendre les démarches pour se perfectionner. Pas se dire, M. « X » va être là pour les dix prochaines années, j'ai aucune chance de me présenter. Merci.

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale) : Merci.

MR. MARIO MANGO (York): Mario Mango, York. Our own Canadian politics, federal and provincial, do not have a termination of terms like they do in the US. I don't see why we're even bringing this up. We're Canadian. We're in Canada and we should follow our politics. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President):

Thank you. Anyone else? Sam?

MR. SAM HAYMOUR (Edmonton): Sam Haymour, Edmonton. We come every three years to these conventions and it costs a lot of money. Like for yesterday, I think Joe said, this hotel is costing us $500,000. We do it for a reason, it's to vote and to elect new people. And if you want to do the president, then it should be the DVPs to the Presidents, to all the Executives of the local, if you guys want to change it. To me, let it stay where it is. If they're good, keep them there, wherever the person is. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Donald?

MR. DONALD MAK (Pacific Coast): Donald Mak, Pacific Coast. So as Association, we need a leader that is the strongest, the best among all. So putting a time limit to it does not pick the best people because the best people might run out of time and the best people might have the most experience.

We have convention every three years, so anybody who wants to put up the name has the capacity of doing so. And let the democratic process do its thing. And I think we all here have -- our goal here is to achieve to be better as an Association. I think this convention every three years does the thing, so I think we should stay

put where we are. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Are we ready for the question? Ballots in hand? All in favor? All against? The resolution is defeated.

Resolution #25 – Not Passed

M. PIERRE-YVES CARRIER (Québec) : Pierre-Yves Carrier, section Québec. Résolution nº 26, Bureau National.

Article 8 - Exécutif national.

L'article 8.3 stipule:

> « Les dirigeants nationaux occupant un poste à temps plein, qui font partie du conseil d'administration, sont tenus de s'inscrire à un programme de formation linguistique dans le but de pouvoir s'exprimer dans les deux langues officielles. »

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Somethings going on...

M. PIERRE-YVES CARRIER (Québec) : Oh, sorry. Ok, we start over, no problem.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution No. 26.

RESOLUTION #26

M. PIERRE-YVES CARRIER (Québec) : Alors je reprends. Résolution Nº 26, Bureau National.

Article 8 - Exécutif National.

L'article 8.3 stipule:

> « Les dirigeants nationaux occupant un poste à temps plein qui font partie du conseil d'administration sont tenus de s'inscrire à un programme de formation linguistique dans le but de pouvoir s'exprimer dans les deux langues officielles. »

L'amendement proposé est dans le but de s'assurer que les dirigeants nationaux démontrent leur sérieux pour apprendre la seconde langue.

Attendu que le Canada est un pays bilingue.

Attendu que les organismes nationaux au Canada doivent avoir des dirigeants capables de s'exprimer dans les deux langues officielles.

Attendu que l'apprentissage d'une deuxième langue et la capacité de pouvoir interagir avec tous les membres de l'Association d'un océan à l'autre sont un atout pour tous les dirigeants nationaux.

Par conséquent, qu'il soit résolu que l'article 8.3 indique ce qui suit:

> « Les dirigeants nationaux occupant un poste à temps plein, qui font partie du conseil d'administration, sont tenus de

s'inscrire et de participer activement à un programme de formation linguistique dans le but de pouvoir s'exprimer dans les deux langues officielles au cours de leur premier mandat. »

Le comité des statuts propose un amendement à la résolution, qui se lira comme suit:

"8.3. The officers of the National Executive must immediately enrol in language training in an attempt to become bilingual in both official languages."

Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the amended resolution.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have any questions on the floor? Are we ready for the question? As-tu un question?

M. FÉLICIEN NSAKANDA (Montréal) : Oui. Felicien Nsakanda, Montréal. Je voulais juste --

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale) : Felicien, pourrais tu enlevé vos écouteurs? On n'entend pas. Merci.

M. FÉLICIEN NSAKANDA (Montréal) : Merci. Felicien, Montréal. Je voulais juste apporter un point

pour savoir s'il va y avoir un suivi pour s'assurer que la personne qui va s'inscrire au cours le fera effectivement, parce que cette résolution a déjà été amenée dans le passé, il n'y a eu aucun suivi. On ne sait pas si la personne a effectivement suivi un cours et si les résultats au moins, même en partie, étaient là.

Donc, il y a moyen de mettre une mesure dans cet amendement-là pour s'assurer que la personne au moins a démontré l'intérêt et la volonté de suivre le cours. Merci.

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale) : Je peux vous confirmer que dans mon mandat, je m'étais assurée qu'on ait de la formation pour les officiers nationaux ainsi que pour les VPD qui sont intéressés.

Alors, on a Berlitz qui est offert aux officiers nationaux. C'est une formation un à un avec un professeur deux fois par semaine pour 100 heures dans l'année. Alors, oui, effectivement, Berlitz nous donne des rapports sur le progrès de la langue de l'individu qui suit la formation.

Et on a aussi Rosetta Stone qui est une formation juste en ligne. Puis, on l'a offerte aux VPD qui voulait... on a demandé à un VPD qui était Rich d'essayer pour voir si c'était quelque chose qui était viable et si c'était quelque chose qu'on devrait offrir aux autres VPD.

Alors, oui, il y a des suivis qui sont faits.

Oui, Keinsy?

M. KEINSY LAINÉ (Montréal) : Keinsy Lainé, Division Montréal. Je voudrais amener un amendement à l'amendement.

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale) : On est prêt.

M. KEINSY LAINÉ (Montréal) :

> « Les dirigeants faisant partie de l'exécutif national sont tenus de s'inscrire immédiatement, au plus tard dans la première année, à un programme de formation linguistique. »

La raison pourquoi je veux amener cette modification, c'est parce que, immédiatement, ça peut être flexé pour certaines personnes. Donc, si on met un temps, ça force la personne à s'inscrire dans la première année.

M. LYN CHARRON : Je vais juste répéter pour m'assurer que j'ai bien capturé ce que tu as mentionné :

> « Les dirigeants faisant partie de l'exécutif national sont tenus de s'inscrire immédiatement, au plus tard dans la première année, à un programme de formation linguistique. »

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale) :

Keinsy, est-ce que tu peux lire le restant de la phrase?

I'll go to the floor before I have someone second it, just so we can put it up on screen for everybody to see. Johanne, you had your hand up?

Mme JOHANNE CHIN (Pacifique) : Oui, merci. Mon nom c'est Joanne Chin, je viens de Pacific Coast. Moi je suis une des rares francophones en Colombie-Britannique, puis je peux vous dire par expérience que le français, mes amis, ça prend du temps à apprendre. C'est une langue compliquée, et puis, de mon expérience, si j'ai besoin d'une ressource pour parler des choses qui se passent au travail, je veux que ce soit communiqué de façon précise. Alors, mon choix, ce serait de parler à la personne dans sa langue natale.

La conclusion de mon commentaire, c'est que je ne vois pas personnellement le besoin de forcer le membre à prendre des cours de français. Maintenant, si la personne est intéressée, oui, ça peut être disponible, mais je ne crois pas que c'est une bonne utilisation de nos finances de payer pour des cours de français obligatoires. Merci.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Scott?

MR. SCOTT McPHERSON (Pacific Coast): Scott McPherson, Pacific. I was just going to offer a suggestion for the amendment that Keinsy put forward, just in terms of

clarity. If in the resolution it says the officers of the National Executive must immediately enroll in language training, if you plug in 'in', like 'training in', and demonstrate attendance to support their attempt to become bilingual in both languages, that could help with Keinsy's proposal, I think.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Sam.

MR. SAM HAYMOUR (Edmonton): Sam Haymour, Edmonton branch. Just a question. I know they were saying in the first year to do the course, but to be in the national office, you have to move to Ottawa. So when someone's moving across the country to Ottawa the first thing that as a member what I would want from that person is to learn the role, not to learn French or English, because that's the more important thing, because you represent the rest of the country. And we should give him at least two years, not one year. That's what I think, that's my opinion.

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale) : Keinsy, est-ce que c'est la résolution que tu proposes? Parfait. Est-ce qu'on a quelqu'un pour seconder cette proposition? Daniel? Parfait.

Are you ready for the question? Those in favor of the proposed amendment, please raise your ballots.

Thank you. Those against? It does not pass.

Resolution #26 (as amended) - Not passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Now we go back to the recommendation put forward by the Constitution Committee. Oui, Louise?

Mme LOUISE LEROUX (Montréal): Louise Leroux, section Montréal. Je voudrais juste donner quelques informations parce que je trouve que c'est important. De façon inclusive, je pense que c'est quelque chose en 2026 qu'on se doit d'avoir comme priorité : d'être inclusif, tant au niveau des nationalités qu'au niveau des langues.

Juste pour préciser que 10 % des francophones sont dans le reste du Canada. On parle quand même de 30 % de francophones au Nouveau-Brunswick, 4 % dans les Territoires du Nord-Ouest. On a un million de francophones qui vivent à travers le Canada, sans compter le Québec.

Je pense que quand une personne est rendue à un niveau national, exécutif national, je pense que c'est une chose prioritaire qui se veut d'être inclusif envers tout le monde. Et quand on parle d'inclusion, on parle aussi de langues et d'accepter les différences.

Et pour moi, c'est quelque chose qui est vraiment important, qui démontre qu'il y a une ouverture. On ne dit pas que -- je pense qu'en quelque part, c'est de montrer aussi que la personne va vouloir faire un effort,

pas nécessairement d'être bilingue parfaitement, mais d'être capable de s'exprimer et de montrer qu'il y a une inclusion envers tout le monde.

Et je pense que c'est ça, cet article de cette résolution, c'est juste mon commentaire.

Merci beaucoup.

--- Applaudissements / Applause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Rich.

MR. RICH DINON (Divisional Vice President, Huron): Rich Dinon, Divisional Vice President for Huron. I know we had some conversations, and I had some conversations prior to coming up here with the folks in Montreal. I agree with all the statements of being --ensuring and having the respect to speak in both languages. I fully support that as I go through. But to Rachel's point, and to the point that was made in the back of the room, French training for me is not easy.

This resolution will ensure that people do it. Will we ever get to the point to write something in the Constitution to make people really put the effort in and how do we measure effort? We have to take trust that the person that is going into this language is doing it for the right reasons, to ensure that they want to speak the language that they are not comfortable in to a certain

point. But again, it's not easy. It's very difficult.

So I think we have to put trust in the people that are going to be in that office, that they're going to do it for the right reasons, that they're doing it because it is the right thing to do, to be respectful and inclusive, and to go through that. But to try to find that wording to put into a Constitution is very difficult.

So I think this here puts it in to say you're going to do it and now it's on the person in there to do it in the right way. And I believe that we put the officers in there to do that.

And to the point at the back, this is -- I would assume that when you go into a role like that, this is going to be very busy. I mean, someone takes on a role in the National Office, this is part of the whole thing. And is it important? Absolutely. But we have to also understand there's a lot of important stuff to do.

So, you know, I think if we go to the resolution to try to find the right one to make sure someone's going to do it for the right reasons, or do we ensure that we put them in there, and then ensure that they take it, for one, if there's a way to do that, but also they're the ones that are going to have to put the effort to get to that point.

Because at the end of the day, is it going to

be that you have to be fully bilingual by the time your term's over? I don't think that's realistic in my opinion. But can you converse? Can you understand as you go through? I think it's great.

To Rachel's point, I've been taking some Rosetta Stone. I'm still having difficulty with it. And it's going to take a while, but this makes you ensure that that person is taking it. And then it's the responsibility of the person to put the effort in as one of you. I don't think we can get that into the resolution. Thank you.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Daniel?

M. DANIEL LAROUCHE (Vice-président divisionnaire, Québec): Daniel Larouche, VPD Québec. Je comprends la difficulté d'apprendre le français. Je suis totalement d'accord. Je fais des efforts pour apprendre l'anglais. C'est compliqué pour moi aussi. Je suis un old-timer. Je ne veux pas me limiter dans les trois prochaines années à faire des divisionnaires à seulement -- seulement inviter Rick. C'est important que les officiers nationaux puissent venir partager leur savoir avec mes membres.

Nadine, qui est ma trésorière à Québec, si elle a des problèmes de finances, je veux qu'elle puisse parler

à quelqu'un au bureau national qui puisse la guider et l'aider à faire son travail. Je veux que mes simples membres sur le plancher puissent communiquer avec les officiers nationaux aussi. C'est important. Je ne suis pas pantoute dans les idées indépendantes. Par contre, on représente quand même 25 % de la population et on est un organisme fédéral qui doit être bilingue.

Merci beaucoup.

--- Applaudissements / Applause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Mario?

MR. MARIO MANGO (York): Mario Mango, York Branch. We can see how passionate Quebec is and all our francophone members and we understand what they are saying. And as Rich mentioned, we have to trust the integrity of all of our members, especially our people that are sitting up there. And I think that instead of saying "must immediately" -- it just seems very imposing. And the integrity of the people up there will tell you that they themselves want to learn a second language, whether it be French or English. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Dana?

MS. DANA LE BLANC (2nd National Vice President): Since I'm the one living this right now, I figured I would

chime in. As an old lady trying to learn French, I will say that in my first year of taking over this position, my true focus was to learn my job and try and not mess up your files. So that was my very first focus.

I do agree that within the first year that you should enrol 100%. I can say that I can read and write perfectly in French. Well, probably not perfectly, but pretty good. It's the speaking part that has been hard for me to grasp. But I do all the French files. I do all the English files. But for people our age to learn a new language, I can say that the reading and writing comes first and then the conversation is what's a little bit harder for us. I don't know if that's what Rich has been experiencing.

I have a very good relationship with my French teacher. And now that I know my job, I feel like I'm focusing better on the French and I can learn it better. So I do agree with one of my brothers and sisters that said in the first year, you really got to learn your job. And I really think that should be the priority to get a grasp on your new position and then focus on French.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Keinsy?

MR. KEINSY LAINÉ (Montreal): Keinsy Lainé from Montreal Division. I just wanted to point out the

conversation is going towards speaking French, but it also goes to French people going in a role. They have to speak English, so they have to learn the language also. So I just wanted to make that clear to everyone. It's not only for French learning. It's also for English learning from French to English.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have any other questions? Sam?

MR. SAM HAYMOUR (Edmonton): Sam Haymour, Edmonton Branch. Can we make an amendment to that 8.3 where I was thinking the officers of the National Executives should, and need to, enrol in the language training to attempt to become bilingual within 18 months of assuming office?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. I'm just going to read this back, Sam. "The officers of the National Executive must immediately enrol in language training in an attempt to become bilingual in both official languages within 18 months of assuming office." Or is the 'immediate' part 'must enrol'? Okay, let me read it again. "The officers of the National Executive must enrol in language training in an attempt to become bilingual in both official languages within 18 months of assuming office."

Is that correct? Okay.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have a seconder? Andrew. Sushil?

MR. SUSHIL NINAWAT (York): Sushil Ninawat, York. So I just have a question in regards to the level of understanding and proficiency level. Rachel, you mentioned that we had some good results after the National Officer was doing two hours a week, which is 120 hours. So I just wanted to understand in 120 hours what level of proficiency they have achieved and what was the cost of that course, please? Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): I am not comfortable sharing the level of proficiency. I think that belongs to the individual and the person that they are training with. What I can say is that she has been attending class on a regular basis and she's advancing.

So this is not about becoming fully bilingual to Louise's point. It's about putting the effort in to be able to speak to those that call, to those that have questions and answer those questions.

As for the cost of the course, I do not have it offhand. We can definitely share that with you. It's pulled out of Fund A. So that's the $75,000 that's given to us by the company. And the reason it's pulled out of

Fund A and not the training fund, it's because we are piggybacking on the discount that Canada Post gets because they have to train their management team and APOC team to become bilingual since the change in the language of work. So we are getting a rebate, but we can give you that information. It is getting drawn out automatically from our Fund A. Okay. So do we have the new...

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Okay. Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. Unfortunately, the Fairmont internet is playing evil tricks with us today. So we are having a bit of a hard time to get what I was going to hope would be three seamless days of translation for both. And how ironic is it that the amendment that we're putting forward is to have bilingual situations and I can't get the bloody thing in bilingual writing. Bear with us.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): My apologies. It does happen.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): The good thing is that we have Lyn Charron here who can actually read that and do it in real time.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Hello everyone. If you guys want to take a 15-minute break while this is getting resolved, you can grab a coffee,

fresh air. Thank you.

--- Upon recessing at 9:51 a.m. /

Suspension à 9 h 51

--- Upon resuming at 10:14 a.m. /

Reprise à 10 h 14

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Please take your seats. S'il vous plaît, prendre vos places.

Thank you everyone for indulging us with this break. I think we figured out the problem. It's been corrected. Sam, you had your hand up.

MR. SAM HAYMOUR (Edmonton): Sam Haymour, Edmonton. Just want to pull my amendment.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Perfect, thank you Sam. Rick?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. So this puts us back to the resolution that is offered from the Constitution Committee.

I do believe in the amendment that they put forward. I think immediately enroll, we have to realize that immediately enroll means that they have to make sure that they're entered into a course, whether it be something that's formal.

Whether it be something that's a little more

formal down the line, but they have to immediately enroll in it. And then the idea from the national office would be that they would work towards being bilingual within their first term.

We talked a couple of resolutions earlier about unity, and I talked about it when we talked about how I need my team around me. We also need to continue to unify this floor, and the only way we can do that successfully is to make sure that we can communicate successfully with both groups.

We had Luc come up who was a very French-speaking individual, and he did put a lot of effort into becoming English, and him and I worked together. He would speak English to me, and I would respond in French to him because I needed to work on mine too because I come from New Brunswick, which is a very different French.

But here's the ticket, folks. We are going to put the efforts in at the national office to make sure that we learn both of those languages to the best of our ability. We can certainly enforce procedure, which is exactly what we're doing here. We have to procedurally make sure that everybody enrolls. We can't teach effort, but we can certainly influence it, and that's what we're going to do.

So I really do actually believe the more we've

talked about it, the more passion that you see on the floor, and the more divide that it should not create. So let's take the divide away from the floor. Let's pass this resolution because it actually does make sense, and it's important for us to learn both of these languages, and I, for one, will put my booklet up when it's time to vote on this one.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale) : Merci, Rick. Stone.

MR. STONE BLEMANO (York): Stone Blemano, York branch. I think I support what Rick is saying. And in addition, with the modern advent of AI and interpretations, whoever takes the role, I think, will have the tools to do it.

We just have to trust, and they have to believe in themselves that they've been given a role to be able to communicate with both groups. And the attempt will be on them if they want to be successful in their role and to be supported by both groups.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you, Stone. Are we ready for the question? Booklets in hand, those in favor? Thank you. Those against. Thank you.

--- Applause / Applaudissments

Resolution #26 (as amended) – Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Resolution 27.

RESOLUTION #27

M. PIERRE-YVES CARRIER (Québec) : Pierre-Yves Carrier, section Québec.

Résolution nº 27, section régionale du Nouveau-Brunswick, Ouest.

Article 8 - Exécutif national.

Pour appuyer les efforts continus visant à attirer et à retenir de nouveaux talents au sein des divisions, ainsi que pour renforcer la visibilité globale et la mobilisation dans l'ensemble de l'Association, nous proposons que le Bureau national dresse une liste exhaustive des contributeurs potentiels.

Cette liste serait composée de personnes de diverses régions qui ont été recommandées par les membres de la direction de leur section respective.

Attendu que ces personnes auraient exprimé le désir de s'impliquer davantage au sein de l'Association et d'aider à des projets spéciaux ou de faire partie de groupes de travail ou de comités;

En puisant dans un bassin diversifié de membres d'un bout à l'autre du pays, cette initiative permettrait non seulement de repérer les nouveaux leaders, mais aussi

de veiller à ce que les perspectives et l'expertise régionales soient mieux représentées dans les initiatives nationales.

En outre, l'établissement de cette liste officielle créerait un cheminement plus clair pour les membres qui cherchent des occasions de perfectionnement, tout en fournissant à l'Association une liste fiable de personnes motivées qui sont prêtes à contribuer à ses objectifs permanents et à ses priorités stratégiques.

Par conséquent, qu'il soit résolu que l'article 8.4.8.1 indique ce qui suit:

> « 8.4.8.1 Le Bureau national établira une liste exhaustive des personnes qui ont officiellement déclaré souhaiter appuyer des projets spéciaux ou des comités au sein de l'Association et qui s'y sont engagées. La présidence nationale examinera ces manifestations d'intérêt et choisira les candidats en fonction de leurs compétences démontrées et de leur volonté déclarée de participer. La liste sera examinée, confirmée et officiellement promulguée au plus tard soixante jours après le congrès. »

The Constitution Committee is recommending non-concurrence with the resolution as drafted. The Constitution Committee notes that Article 8.4.8 of the Constitution already provides that the National President appoints members to all committees. There are no restrictions as to where these members come from. There is no need for the additional language.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Any questions? Are we ready for the vote? Ballots in hand, all in favor? Thank you. All against? Thank you. The resolution does not pass.

Resolution #27 – Not Passed

RESOLUTION #28

M. PIERRE-YVES CARRIER (Québec) : This is a long one. Pierre-Yves Carrier, section Québec.

Résolution nº 28, Conseil d'administration.

Article 8 - Exécutif national.

La description actuelle des fonctions du vice-président national, finances et administration, ne décrit pas adéquatement les tâches réelles du rôle.

Attendu que, au cours des dix dernières années, les exigences juridiques et le niveau de perfectionnement du poste ont augmenté.

Attendu que, pour que les gens comprennent bien le rôle, la description du poste doit être mise à jour.

Par conséquent, il est résolu que l'article 8.7 indique ce qui suit:

« 8.7 Le vice-président national, finances et administration est responsable de la gestion financière, de la surveillance administrative et de l'intégrité financière de l'Association et doit

8.7.1 Surveiller et administrer toutes les affaires financières de l'Association, notamment la perception, le contrôle, l'investissement et le décaissement de tous les fonds conformément aux présents statuts et à toute politique établie par le conseil d'administration.

8.7.2 Veiller à ce que les dossiers financiers et les systèmes comptables soient complets, exacts et vérifiables, et mettre en œuvre et superviser des contrôles internes appropriés pour protéger les actifs de l'Association.

8.7.3 Préparer et présenter des états financiers, des prévisions et des analyses périodiques à l'exécutif national et au conseil d'administration, et fournir les rapports financiers de cette nature qui peuvent être exigés par le congrès national;

8.7.4 Élaborer, en consultation avec l'exécutif national, le budget proposé pour l'Association et surveiller les écarts, le rendement financier et les risques tout au long de l'exercice et en faire rapport.

8.7.5 Superviser toutes les activités bancaires, de placement et de gestion de la trésorerie de l'Association; notamment, veiller à ce que les fonds soient gérés prudemment et d'une manière conforme à la stabilité financière à long terme de l'Association.

8.7.6 Veiller au respect de toutes les obligations

financières, juridiques, réglementaires et de déclaration applicables, dont celles qui ont trait à la fiscalité, aux normes de vérification et à toute exigence réglementaire régissant l'Association.

8.7.7 Coordonner et faciliter toutes les vérifications internes et externes, notamment la préparation de la documentation financière, la liaison avec les vérificateurs et la mise en œuvre des recommandations découlant de ces vérifications;

8.7.8 Fournir de la formation, un suivi et des conseils aux sections et aux divisions sur les exigences en matière de rapports financiers, dont l'examen des présentations financières ainsi que l'identification et la transmission à un niveau supérieur de toute irrégularité ou non-conformité.

8.7.9 Administrer les politiques et procédures financières de l'Association et recommander des améliorations pour renforcer la gouvernance, la responsabilisation et la transparence.

8.7.10 Superviser les opérations administratives assignées par l'exécutif national, dont le maintien des installations, des systèmes et des processus nécessaires au soutien des fonctions financières et opérationnelles de l'Association.

8.7.11 Conseiller l'exécutif national et le conseil d'administration sur la stratégie financière, la gestion des risques et la viabilité à long terme, et donner un jugement professionnel sur les questions touchant la situation financière de l'Association.

8.7.12 S'acquitter des autres fonctions qui peuvent lui être

confiées par le président national conformément aux responsabilités du poste. »

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the resolution as drafted.

The Constitution Committee supports changing the description of this position from "tasks" to "responsibilities". The role carries a higher level of accountability, and the wording should reflect that. Thanks.

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale) : Merci. Rick?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. This was certainly, I would have to say, a long time coming. Having done this role as long as I had done it before I moved into the 1st, the understanding of that role was so far from what it really is. When you're working from a branch position, or even if you haven't worked in that National Office, you don't realize just exactly how heavy that particular portfolio can be.

When we talk about history, we had six treasurers and of the six, three of them struggled because they didn't realize what they were getting themselves into. It's not a branch treasurer's position and unfortunately,

it kind of felt that way. But when you get in there, you're dealing with the CRA, you're dealing with EHP, you're dealing with salaries, you're talking about the WSIB, you're talking about organizations, budgets, you know, contract negotiation. It is so overwhelming as a workload that anybody who comes in there and doesn't have a full understanding or at least a full description of what's going to go on there is going to be so blindsided.

When I came into that role back in 2015, it was a real eye-opener for me. I brought with me, thankfully, a good knowledge of computer systems and Excel and all of these things. So I was able to find ways to get that job done. And even then, I was finding ways to just get that job done in eight hours, it was a full eight-hour dedicated timelines. And when you have to throw in committees and things like that, it really has to be understood.

And Joseph Blanchard, who was very instrumental in putting this one together because he's got a very firm understanding of what the role entails. And the executive committee all had their buy-in as well. And honestly, I can't overstate just how important it is to know what this role entails. We've all done the disability. We've all done labour relations in some form at our branch level. But I can tell you, nobody has done what that role requires. So this was an important change for us.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Any questions? Are we ready for the – Andrew?

MR. ANDREW WATTS (Halifax): Andrew Watts, Halifax branch. I'd like to echo what Rick had just said, having been on the standing Committee on Finance since 2014, the amount of change we have seen and the amount of recommendations that have come out of those conversations, it is really nice to know what we're getting into when we apply for a job or when we are anywhere else, and I think this is the right way to do it. Thanks.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Anyone else? Are we ready for the question? All in favor, ballots in the air. Thank you. Those against? The resolution is passed.

Resolution #28 - Passed

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale) : Résolution 29.

RESOLUTION #29

M. PIERRE-YVES CARRIER (Québec): Pierre-Yves Carrier, section Québec. Résolution nº 29, Bureau national.

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale): Excuse... Rick?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President, giving the much more extensive wording that we just passed, the national

office withdraws this.

Resolution #29 - Withdrawn

MR. BILL HATESOHL (Kitchener): Bill Hatesohl, Kitchener branch. I echo what Rick said, we'll be withdrawing resolution 30.

Resolution #30 - Withdrawn

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you Bill.

MR. DEAN EVANS (Halifax): Dean Evans, Halifax branch. Halifax branch be withdrawing resolution number 31. Thank you.

Resolution #31 - Withdrawn

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution 32.

RESOLUTION #32

M. PIERRE-YVES CARRIER (Québec): Pierre-Yves Carrier, section Québec, résolution nº 32, Bureau national.

Article 9 - Conseil d'administration.

L'article 9.4.6 stipule:

> « Veille à ce que l'Association transmette à ses membres au moins deux bulletins d'information électroniques par année, affichés sur le site web national, en vue de les tenir au courant des activités de

l'Association. »

Cet article doit être modifié pour refléter les normes de communication d'aujourd'hui.

Attendu que l'article 9.4.6 n'est plus pertinent pour nos communications;

Attendu que les bulletins ne sont plus publiés, mais que l'Association doit tenir ses membres informés de façon régulière.

Par conséquent, qu'il soit résolu de modifier l'article 9.4.6 pour qu'il se lise comme suit :

« 9.4.6 Veiller à ce que l'Association publie et mette à la disposition des membres, par l'entremise du site web national de l'AOPC, toutes les communications destinées à tenir les membres informés des activités et des affaires de l'Association. »

The Constitution Committee proposes an amendment to the resolution, be it resolved:

"9.4.6 ensuring that the Association publishes and makes available to members, through the APOC national website, all communications intended to keep members informed of the activities and affairs of the Association."

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the amended resolution.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have any questions? Are we ready for the question? All in favor? Thank you, those against? The amended resolution has passed.

Resolution #32 (as amended) – Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution 33.

RESOLUTION #33

MR. NEIL MAKSYMIW (North Saskatchewan): Neil Maksymiw, North Saskatchewan. Resolution No. 33, National Office.

Article 9 - Executive Committee.

The proposed amendment is intended to bring greater consistency between budget years and the mandate of the Board of Directors. Whereas current budgets are prepared and presented by calendar year.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Neil, sorry.

MR. NEIL MAKSYMIW (North Saskatchewan): Oh, sorry.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Rick?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President):

Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. We'd like to withdraw No. 33.

Resolution #33 – Withdrawn

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution 35.

MR. NEIL MAKSYMIW (North Saskatchewan): The Constitution Committee would like to park Resolution 35 to speak to Resolution 36 first.

RESOLUTION #36

MR. NEIL MAKSYMIW (North Saskatchewan): Resolution 36, National Office.

Article 11 - Divisional Council.

Divisional Council meetings should have the option to be combined for the purpose of collaboration, sharing of information, etc.

Whereas the article surrounding the taskings of the Divisional Council is ambiguous.

Whereas the Association wishes to promote collaboration among the divisions of the Association. Therefore, be it resolved to add subclause to our Article 11.2 to read:

> "11.2.7. Divisional councils may hold joint meetings with one or more other divisional councils for the purpose of collaboration, sharing of information,

and the exchange of experiences and best practices, provided that such meetings are financially feasible."

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the resolution as drafted. Do we have any questions?

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have any questions? Oui.

M. FÉLICIEN NSAKANDA (Montréal) : Felicien, section de Québec -- Montréal, désolé.

--- Rires / Laughter

M. FÉLICIEN NSAKANDA (Montréal) : Je suis d'accord sur cette résolution, je voulais juste peut-être amener un autre aspect, que dans les cadres de collaboration c'est vraiment une bonne chose entre les sections, mais est-il possible de noter que la collaboration devrait être faite juste entre deux sections, parce que s'il y a plus que deux sections ça risque d'être trop problématique.

Donc, si le conseil divisionnaire doit se tenir, ça devrait être juste entre deux sections, vu l'impact financier qu'il peut y avoir aussi. Ou sinon ça dépend où se trouvent les sections, s'il y a possibilité de les faire à trois, c'est bien aussi. Merci.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President):

Rick?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. The idea of being able to do more than two will really be -- this is why we created the budget the way we created the budget. We've given the DVPs a budget to be able to give them a better control on just exactly how much collaboration they want to do. And it's all as long as they stay within budgetary confinements.

So the costs, honestly, if we did three divisional councils when we costed out the possibility a couple of years ago, it actually saved the Association money, would have saved the divisions' money. Because you save on things like if you're inviting the national officers, you save on national officer travel. If you're using meeting rooms, which are very costly these days, you save on meeting rooms because you're only using one versus three over three days.

And the question came up of, well, if we start adding three and four and five divisions altogether, does that not start to become more of a branch presidents' meeting situation?

The big difference there is that the DVPs are driving the content. The divisions are driving the content. So they're in full control of what's going to be

presented at those divisional councils. And we've seen some of these divisional councils that have really provided some training to be able to provide some guidance, some health and safety life lessons that have been instrumental even in my life.

So I actually do believe that we should allow the DVPs the professional courtesy, and this is not a dig, this is to say that I trust the DVPs to be able to make the best decisions for their divisions and to be able to present these meetings with the best possible outcomes. And collaboration, you can never get enough of that for me. So that was my rationale behind it for this year.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Travis?

MR. TRAVIS SHALLA (Ottawa): Travis Shalla, Ottawa branch. For the colleague who spoke before Rick Williams, the Rideau Division already has three branches in it. So the suggestion that there should only be between two branches is what you said, just so you know, there are divisions that have multiple branches inside them already. So if you were to say, should only be between two divisions, that might be a little bit more specific and a little bit more clear. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Anyone else? J-F?

M. JEAN-FRANÇOIS CHARTRAND (Montréal) : Jean-François Chartrand, section de Montréal. La question aussi, c'est, oui, deux sections, mais c'est sûr qu'il y a une question de proximité, on s'entend dans un grand pays, donc je pense que ce serait important peut-être de bien encadrer ça.

Deux sections, ça peut être deux sections et plus. Ça peut être également vu comme un budget qui peut être alloué et les sections auraient la liberté d'organiser la rencontre entre deux divisions comme elles veulent, puis ce serait plus raisonnable et ça donnerait aussi une flexibilité aux sections, je pense.

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale) : Merci. Je veux juste faire un point de clarification. On parle vraiment de divisionnaires et non de sections. Alors, c'est deux divisions qui pourraient être ensemble. Les sections sont à l'intérieur de la division. Je voulais juste clarifier pour que les gens comprennent. C'est correct? Merci.

Joe?

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Divisional Vice President Atlantic): Joe Blanchard, Divisional Vice President Atlantic. I've done the math. Combining divisions, obviously it depends on what you do during that time period, the savings are shockingly high. There was some

plans put in place and some analysis done on some divisions, and it could be tens of thousands saved.

Having everyone get trained at once, one trainer's trip rather than multiple trips, similar locations. I mean, Rick outlined most of the key saving spots, but I just wanted to articulate that fact that we're talking here, and I don't -- come talk to me sometime and I'll show you the math, but the savings could potentially be shockingly high. And I won't go too deep into that but just know that the money that we can save is big.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Donald.

MR. DONALD MAK (Pacific Coast): Donald Mak, Pacific Coast. So, Joe, I just want to take a little deeper the saving that you mentioned. So now when divisional joined, so the amount of people that travel, even let's say for the Pacific Coast goes to Foothills, with ten people traveling at least a minimum of a flight ticket, that can quickly wipe out the saving of a trainer, a meeting room, and stuff like that. So can you elaborate a little bit more about the savings?

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Divisional Vice President Atlantic): Joe Blanchard, Divisional Vice President Atlantic. I won't get into the heavy math here because, well, we don't have time, I don't have a spreadsheet in

front of me and I don't have more than three minutes to talk.

But if I use the Atlantic division as an example, and Halifax, which is very common for my members to attend, the travel costs, and I'm specifically going to travel itself, for most of my branch presidents and their alternates to go, without flights, four, six hundred dollars per person. Adding a flight to say, Ottawa, for that individual is about 500 bucks more. But then I have all my team in one central location and I have one training session. And it's one and done versus sending a trainer to Halifax for the Nova Scotia branch or Halifax branch and Cape Breton for the Cape Breton branch, sending that trainer to Newfoundland for the Newfoundland branch.

By centralizing training, you're also not sending that trainer into, it's not just one time, right? You're centralizing it for each of those locations each time. And for a trainer, say if I wanted Rick Williams to come down and to do a fireside chat, every time we can subtract one trip for him to do a fireside chat because he went to my divisional, I had all my crew there, and say we brought in the Montreal and the Quebec divisions at the same time, then they're doing it once versus one, two, three.

And if you even split that up beyond not doing

it at divisional councils and just doing it directly to the branches, that's when the savings start getting big. Because sending it to the branches costs more than sending it to divisions.

There's a lot of math, but when you're dealing with the dispersed branches across the country and the larger territorial branches across the country, travel into that central location, it's already there. So your costs and money, you might cost a little bit more, yeah, but you're costing money or you're costing money, and things balance out.

And if you guys have ever had the opportunity to rent a room and rent IT for that room, when I said shocking, yeah, some of those places charge you $3,000 just to have the IT set up for a day.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Rich.

MR. RICH DINON (Divisional Vice President, Huron): Richard on DVP for Huron. I think we're getting hung up on costs and how much more travel or how much more it's going to be. I think what Rick was saying, and we have to kind of remember this, is that moving forward, there will be a budget. So when the National Executive said, here's a budget, and we think this is how much money should be spent on divisionals, that budget now is -- you

stay within that budget now.

You don't have to do divisionals together, but now it's allowing you to do that and the budget that's given is maybe a little bigger, and we think that because we should be spending a little bit more money on the collaboration and stuff. So your divisional might cost more, but that money that's being put in hopefully is being put into the right place to get the benefit of bringing people together, and it now allows us to do that.

But again, by staying within budgetary constraints, we don't just open it up to say, go ahead, go up to the Northwest Territories and send six different divisions up there. It's going to cost a million dollars. It's not because it is constrained within a budget. So I think, you know, the money's there now to be able to do that.

And will the cost go up? Sure. You might do one divisional. It's not as much as the next divisional. But you have that leeway now to enable you to do what we believe is the right thing to collaborate to bring people together. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Rick.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice. Rich said a lot of what I

was going to actually say. If you've spent five minutes around me, you've probably heard me say the term, I'm just trying to figure out whether the juice is worth the squeeze. This is the situation that we have here. When we talk about we've built this budget with the idea that we want to bring this entire country together in some way, shape, or form, and collaboration is the easiest way to do that. So the budget is put in place because the juice is worth the squeeze.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Wes.

MS. WESLEY FUNSTON (London): Wes Funston, London. I just want to kind of piggyback on what Rich said there is, I mean, the collaboration is important and having divisions come together, I've been fortunate enough to experience it, and the unity that it helps provide goes way beyond budgeting and way beyond cost savings or cost extras.

Having that get together and sharing of ideas and feeling that unity and feeling that part of something bigger, same as coming to, you know, the branch presidents' meetings and coming to this event, it helps us all understand that we're not just a little branch off in the middle of nowhere by ourselves. And the more we can build

that, the stronger we will all become. And every effort, in my opinion, should be made to make us stronger and to make us more one solid voice when we're speaking with the corporation and supporting all of us in all of our endeavours when interacting with the corporation or supporting our members. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Mona?

MS. MONA ASSAF (Edmonton): Mona from Edmonton. I don't have anything to say anymore, but I just want to hear my own voice.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Andrzej.

MR. ANDRZEJ KUCIEL (Manitoba): Andrzej Kuciel, Manitoba branch. I would like to remind you that the strength is in unity and the Corporation has a proven record of trying to divide us, as you can see around the room. I think this is a tool to prevent it from happening again because terminations are skyrocketing and you know what, that's the direction the Corporation is taking. So, nothing more than collaboration is going to bring us together.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Are we ready for the question? All in favour, raise your booklets. Thank you. Those against? Thank

you. The resolution has passed.

Resolution #36 – Passed

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Jean-François?

MR. JEAN-FRANÇOIS CHARTRAND (Montreal): Jean-François Chartrand, Montreal branch. We would like to withdraw 35, please.

Resolution #35 – Withdrawn

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale): Merci. Resolution 37. Résolution 37.

RESOLUTION #37

MR. NEIL MAKSYMIW (North Saskatchewan): Neil Maksymiw, North Saskatchewan. Resolution No. 37, Executive Committee.

Article 13 - Discipline of Branches.

Article 13.1 currently reads:

> "Article 13.1, Any branch of the association is guilty of an offense against the Constitution that;"

The article currently does not capture the need for an investigation to occur before a determination that a violation occurred can be rendered.

Whereas any potential breach of the Constitution requires due process before a finding can be

determined.

Therefore, Article 13.1 be amended to read:

"Article 13.1, Any branch of the association following an investigation by the National Executive is guilty of an offense against this Constitution that;"

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the resolution as drafted.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Any questions? Jean-François?

MR. JEAN-FRANÇOIS CHARTRAND (Montreal): Jean-François Chartrand, Montreal branch. I agree with that, and I think investigation has to be done if something happened.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Merci beaucoup. Anyone else? Are we ready for the question? Booklets in hands? All in favour? Thank you. Against? The resolution has passed.

Resolution #37 – Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution 38.

RESOLUTION #38

MR. NEIL MAKSYMIW (North Saskatchewan): Neil Maksymiw, North Saskatchewan. Resolution No. 38, Executive

Committee.

Article 14 - Branch Presidents' Meeting.

Article 14 of the Constitution does not outline the actual purpose of the branch presidents' meeting.

Whereas, clarity regarding the purpose of the branch presidents' meeting would be beneficial for our members.

Whereas, the Constitution is entirely silent to the current purpose of the identified meeting.

Therefore, article 14.1 be amended to read as outlined below. The current article is to be renumbered to follow the new article 14.1.

> "14.1 Purpose. The branch presidents' meeting serves as a coordination and leadership forum for the branch presidents and Executive Committee. The purpose is less likely about day-to-day member issues and more about alignment, strategy, and decision-making across the organization. The main purposes include strategic alignment, ensuring all branches are working toward the same priorities, especially around bargaining, organizing and advocacy.

Information sharing, branch president's report on local issues, workplace trends, and member concerns to identify broader patterns. Coordination of bargaining, aligning tactics and timelines. Policy discussion and decision-making, reviewing and voting on recommendations and dealing with constitutional issues in between conventions. Leadership support and problem-solving, providing a forum to discuss challenges and exchange advice on handling complex situations. Training and updates, provide training and updates to keep the branches current on the latest processes, policies, and practices. Building unity, strengthening relationships among leaders and peers to ensure effective collective action when needed. Overall, the goal is to keep branch leadership informed, coordinated, and unified so the association can act effectively as a single organization."

The Constitution Committee proposes an amendment to the resolution. Be it resolved:

"Article 14.1 Purpose. The branch president's meeting serves as a coordination and leadership forum for the branch presidents and the executive committee. The main purposes include;

14.1.1 Strategic alignment, ensuring all branches are working toward the same priorities, especially regarding bargaining, organizing, and advocacy.

14.1.2 Information sharing, reporting on local issues, workplace trends, and member concerns to identify broader patterns.

14.1.3 Coordination of bargaining, aligning tactics and timelines.

14.1.4 Policy discussion and decision-making, reviewing and voting on recommendations and dealing with constitutional issues in between conventions.

14.1.5 Leadership support and problem-solving, providing a forum to discuss challenges and exchange advice

on handling complex situations.

14.1.6 Training and updates, provide training and updates to keep the branches current on the latest processes, policies, and practices.

14.1.7 Building unity, strengthening relationships among leaders and peers to ensure effective collective action when needed.

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the amended resolution.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have any questions? Daniel?

M. DANIEL LAROUCHE (Vice-président Divisionnaire, Québec): Daniel Larouche, VPD Québec. Juste pour porter à votre attention qu'il y a une erreur dans la numérotation des articles.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Right. Merci, Daniel. Scott?

MR. SCOTT McPHERSON (Pacific Coast): Scott McPherson, Pacific Branch, I notice that you've numbered the articles in the amendment proposal 14.1.2 already exists in our current constitution and it's not reflected in other proposals that I could see moving forward. So what do you plan to do with our current 14.1.2?

MR. NEIL MAKSYMIW (North Saskatchewan): It would be renumbered after the amended resolution passes.

MR. SCOTT McPHERSON (Pacific Coast): A point of order, that hasn't been put to the Executive to vote on.

MR. NEIL MAKSYMIW (North Saskatchewan): Should the amendment pass, the current numbering would be renumbered.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have other questions? Rich?

MR. RICH DINON (London): Just a question, and I know Daniel brought this up, so if we were to vote on this, should an amendment go in to change 14.1.4, the second one to .5, third one to .6, and the fourth one to .7? Does the amendment have to go in prior to doing this, or does that just automatically get done?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. As it's just a grammatical error, we can correct it after the fact to make sure that the numbering is proper, so we don't need to put the new one in. Thanks Rich.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Anyone else? Are you ready for the question? Ballots in the hand. All in favor of the amended proposal. Thank you. Those against? The amended proposal passes.

Resolution #38 (as amended) – Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution 39.

RESOLUTION #39

MR. NEIL MAKSYMIW (North Saskatchewan): Neil Maksymiw, North Saskatchewan. Resolution No. 39, Halifax branch.

Article 14 - Branch Presidents' Meeting.

With many branch presidents and branch executive being parents of school-aged children, the need for work, life balance, and attention to family, we propose a change to the month in which the annual branch president's meeting is held.

Whereas Halifax and District branch met on March 12th, 2026, reviewed and voted the proposed change to article 14.2.

Whereas 14.2, the branch president's meeting will be held in the spring of each year, except in the year of the National Convention, unless an item of an urgent nature arises, then a meeting could be called by the Executive Committee or a simple majority of the branch presidents.

Therefore, be it resolved to amend article 14.2 to read:

> "14.2, the Branch Presidents' Meeting shall be held in the month of July each

year, except in the year of the National Convention, unless an item of urgent nature arises, then a meeting could be called by an Executive Committee or a simple majority of the branch presidents."

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the resolution as drafted.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Scott?

MR. SCOTT McPHERSON (Pacific Coast): Scott McPherson, Pacific Branch. I'm not sure who I'd ask, but the hotel costs in July, as my understanding, would be significantly higher, as would the travel costs in July, as opposed to what we currently do or when we meet in June. Would that not be correct?

Is it really worth it to our association to meet a month later when our costs significantly increase at a time when we keep talking about how we have to monitor our costs and make sure we're being fiscally responsible? And I'll also note, according to the budget that was presented yesterday, that in 2029 we're projecting a loss. So this would increase that. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Travis?

MR. TRAVIS SHALLA (Ottawa): Travis Shalla, Ottawa branch. I love everyone in this room, but I'd rather be on annual leave than in any meeting anywhere for anything. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Do we have any other questions? Andrew?

MR. ANDREW HVARREGAARD (Edmonton): Andrew Hvarregaard, Edmonton branch, I'm just going to piggyback on that a little bit by saying we're already here for 1 July and 3, that's plenty.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you, Andrew. Are we ready for the question? All in favor? Thank you All against? Thank you. The proposed resolution is defeated.

Resolution #39 – Not Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution 40.

RESOLUTION #40

MR. NEIL MAKSYMIW (North Saskatchewan): Neil Maksymiw, North Saskatchewan. Resolution No. 40, National Office.

Article 15 - National Convention.

Organization of the National Convention may become both cumbersome and costly when being established in a remote area without reasonable access to an airport.

Whereas financial considerations and reasonable transportation arrangements to minimize inconvenience to travelling members as well as more efficient organization of conventions is warranted.

Therefore, be it resolved to amend Article 15.4 to read:

> "The National Convention of the Association shall be held in Canada at a place to be determined by a vote of the delegates at the previous National Convention. The city garnering the most votes shall be the next host city. Any proposed host city must have a commercial airport located within a reasonable distance of the convention location not to exceed 40 kilometres."

The Constitution Committee is proposing an amendment to the resolution. Be it resolved.

> "15.4. The National Convention of the Association shall be held in Canada at a place to be determined by a vote of the delegates at the previous National Convention. The city garnering the most votes shall be the next host city. Any proposed host city must have a

commercial airport located within a reasonable distance of the convention location."

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the amended resolution.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Rick?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. The 40 kilometres was what I had come up with. This was after having done some research to see -- I did distances for an airport to all of the major cities to anybody that's actually serviced by an airport. That's when I came up with the 40 because I think the highest was 27. To me, 40 is actually the definition of reasonable here.

If we put the term reasonable into this, then we are now becoming ambiguous again. Somebody's reasonable is another person's unreasonable. I like the idea of the 40 kilometres and the time and the effort has been put in to actually come up to that number. For myself personally, I would ask that we defeat this amendment and then we go to the original one.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you, Rick. Anyone else? Tim?

MR. TIM HORNE (Pacific Coast): Tim Horne,

Pacific Coast. Was there any reasoning for the use of the word commercial? That does hold weight in what a commercial airport is compared to a non-primary or primary. For clarification, a commercial would be considered a primary, which would be, I believe, over 10,000 daily passengers. Non-primary, I think, is like 1,500 daily passengers.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President, to be quite honest, it's a great point. The term commercial was just simply used as a standard definition and it never really occurred to me anything of that nature. We would certainly be talking about, as an example, I don't know what would be deemed for, I think there's an airport in London, and I don't know what the size -- I'm not picking on you, I'm asking. I don't know what it's deemed, I don't know if it's commercial or if it's just an airport because I don't know if it meets that criteria. The idea is that it was to have an airport within reasonable distance. My apologies for that commercial word. You're right, it could have an outcome.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Ed?

MR. ED LA MARCHE (Vancouver Island): Ed La Marche, Vancouver Island Branch. So with the 40

kilometres, I'm just trying to understand, Niagara would have never happened, further than 40 kilometres, and neither would Whistler with this resolution.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Correct. Thank you. Andrew? Yes?

MR. ANDREW HVARREGAARD (Edmonton): Andrew Hvarregaard, Edmonton Branch. Commercial airport is just too vague to fly in this instance. There are over a dozen commercial airports in Nunavut. There are over a dozen commercial airports in the Northwest Territories. There are four in the Yukon that are within 40 kilometres of the communities they serve. Without clarification, this is just not a good resolution.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): We have a definition here. Commercial airport is an airport that handles public flights, operations featuring scheduled passenger services, or cargo transportations for a fee or profit.

MR. ANDREW HVARREGAARD (Edmonton): Andrew Hvarregaard, Edmonton, and the numbers I use reflect that, commercial scheduled service.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Mona?

MS. MONA ASSAF (Edmonton): Mona Assaf, Edmonton. So just to Rick's 40 kilometers in the wording

in the amendment and the original, it says the distance of the convention location. So for me, that wording bothers me, shouldn't it be the distance from the airport to the host city? Because convention location, what if the airport is 27 kilometers away, but the convention hall is on the other side of the city, that's a big city. You know what I mean? It could be more kilometers. What if it hits 50 kilometers? So maybe from the host city, not from the convention itself location.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you, Mona. Okay. Scott.

MR. SCOTT McPHERSON (Pacific Coast): Scott McPherson, Pacific Coast. I just think it's pretty rich to sit here in Whistler and talk about future Executives not being allowed to pick and choose. When a host city puts its bid in, it can take all that kind of stuff into consideration, and it can be put to the rest of us to vote on as to what we think is appropriate or not appropriate.

I think that's our call, and I don't think that's something that should be in the Constitution. I'm definitely going to vote whatever you put in front, so you can stress about the language or what an airport is or isn't. It's not right to sit here in Whistler and tell future APOC Executives that they can't experience the same thing if they don't choose to do so, and they don't think

it's fiscally responsible for them to do that.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. Scott, you talked maybe not more than two Constitutional amendments passed about budgetary confinements and how we have to be fiscally responsible. So when we're talking about sitting here in Whistler and talking about trying to determine whether or not we're going to be able to save money, because the transportation from Vancouver to get here is actually a very big cost, not to mention the fact that because we had to transfer people from here to Vancouver, Vancouver the other way, we had to add extra days of travel.

So that's exactly why we're having this conversation, because we're sitting here in Whistler and we're trying to determine whether or not we're going to be able to be fiscally responsible in the future. So this is one of the main constraints of trying to set up this convention. It is very difficult to get people to these locations. Niagara is yet another situation where it was very difficult to get people there and it's very costly. So yes, it's very appropriate to be sitting in Whistler and

talking about this right now.

MR. SCOTT McPHERSON (Pacific Coast): Scott McPherson, Pacific Coast, you've addressed me so I'm going to respond. I voted against this. I wasn't in favour of this. I might be from Pacific Coast, but I wasn't in favour of this. But that vote in Niagara wasn't even close, the other city didn't even present. As soon as the words Whistler came out, that's what the committee decided. I don't have to agree with it, but they had the option to look at the cities that were proposed and they chose Whistler.

And that is something that should be entrusted to everybody. Now you've mentioned the cost. We've had two conventions in a row that have been very expensive. So I think we've all had a wake-up call as to what these things can cost.

And we always talk about trust and responsibility. Well, part of that is when we vote tomorrow on the next convention, is that we've been put in a place of trust and responsibility and it's up to us to make sure that we vote on that. It's not up to the National Office to now restrict us to conventions at an airport. I'm not interested in that, and I don't think a lot of other people are, but there must be a balance between Whistler and Niagara Falls and conventions at an

airport. And I think that's up to us to decide, and I think that's up to the cities that are presenting themselves as potential hosts to make that part of their equation.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Liz.

MS. LIZ JONES (Pacific Coast): Liz Jones, Pacific. I would like to propose an amendment to the resolution, or to the amendment, the last sentence to read: "Any proposed host city must have an airport not exceeding 40 kilometres from the convention location."

--- Pause

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st Vice President. Can I have the amended proposal read back to me just one more time so that we know that we captured it correctly?

MS. LIZ JONES (Pacific Coast): Liz Jones, Pacific. The last sentence of the amendment to read: "any proposed host city must have an airport not exceeding 40 kilometres from the convention location."

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Do we have a seconder for the amendment? Roy?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): So, just to make sure I'm going to read it back.

"15.4 The National Convention of the

Association shall be held in Canada at a place to be determined by a vote of the delegates at the previous National Convention. The city garnering the most votes shall be the next host city. Any proposed host city must have an airport not exceeding 40 kilometres from the convention location."

Is that correct? Perfect.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): While we translate that and put it up on the screen, I will go to Rich Dinon.

MR. RICH DINON (Huron Divisional Vice President): Rich Dinon, Divisional Vice President for Huron. So I just wanted to go back to what we're trying to address here. I think we're getting caught up on words and language.

The whole purpose of this is to say -- and I think we learned from Niagara, and we learned from Whistler. So it's not that, you know, well, we did it now, and the future shouldn't be doing it. I think we have a responsibility. And listen, we're not going to be around forever, there will be people down the road that will say, well, why can't we go to so-and-so? Let's take that out of the Constitution. And that's for that convention floor to

make the decision.

So I just think we need to make sure that we understand what we're voting for and understand why we're voting for it. We learned from Niagara, and we learned from Whistler. And it's not anything against Niagara, because I thought that was a fantastic convention. I think this one is a fantastic convention. Would I come back to Whistler? 100%. But I think we have to be... And listen, we've talked about this. I've heard this from many people on the convention floor, about being fiscally responsible.

We just heard it on the last resolution to say we can't have a meeting in July, because that would not be fiscally responsible. So if we truly believe that we should be fiscally responsible, we need to look at how we do our business, and we have to ensure that our Constitution reflects that. It's not about Whistler. It's not about this or that. It's about learning from what we see, and then deciding, can we do something that maybe is more fiscally responsible for the Association at this time?

And it doesn't matter the language. I know we're hung up on commercial now, but the intent of this is to say, how do we control it so that in the future, because we don't have control right now, if somebody wants to say, I want to do a convention there, and they put it forward, and nobody else comes forward, there's no vote for that.

Therefore, we don't have any control to that. And now we're in a situation of paying a price that we think may not be fiscally responsible.

So that's the intent of what this proposal is for. It has nothing to do with who or what people are getting or not. I think we all decided we need to be fiscally responsible. I heard it a lot on the convention floor this week. And this is an opportunity to fix the issue of being more fiscally responsible of what we've learned from the past two conventions. Nothing against the conventions, fantastic. I would do it again.

I would travel the whole world if we could. But we have a responsibility in this room to make that decision. And hey, listen, it's all of us together. So we decide or we don't decide. It's for us to decide where we move forward from there.

I just want everybody to understand this is the problem. So if it's about the words or what it is, it's just something to ensure that we are moving forward fiscally responsibly. Does that make sense? Anyways, I hope I just made a new word up. Good.

So I mean, I just wanted to say that how we move forward and what we do, I think we need to keep that in our minds. And if it's changing words or whatever that is, let's do that. Let's make it so that we are moving

forward and we are doing it in the right way. Thank you.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Ikezu?

MR. IKEZU ONYEKWUCHA (York): Ikezu Onyekwucha, York branch. I no longer wish to speak on this. My issue has been addressed. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you.

Mario? Okay.

Louise?

Mme LOUISE LEROUX (Montréal) : Louise Leroux, section Montréal. Je regarde 40 km, et pour Montréal, c'est très peu, parce que Montréal, c'est grand. Moi, ce que je proposerais, c'est plus ou moins 40 km, parce que ça pourrait être 45, comme ça pourrait être un peu moins, mais 40, c'est comme très...

C'est un carcan. Donc, en disant peut-être plus ou moins 40, si c'est à 50, on pourrait peut-être l'accepter aussi. Parce qu'il y a des villes où ça ne se fait pas. Donc, pour Montréal, ce serait comme difficile. Je veux dire ça.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Merci. Rick?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President):

Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. You are correct, and that was my mistake. The intent was supposed to be that it was 40 kilometres from within the, we'll say the city limits. So if you're traveling into, and I'll give the example of Halifax this time, the airport is about 17 kilometres outside of the city limits.

And it was my intention that it would be 40 kilometres from the city at the most. So when I said the location, I misspoke. So I do believe that I'll actually propose an amendment to it to be able to clarify that portion. And I'm just going to drag it back with me so I can see it here.

So the amendment that I would propose is, and I'll just say the last sentence because the rest remains consistent, any proposed host city must have an airport not exceeding 40 kilometres from the city limit.

From the host city limit. Let's put it that way. So, from the host city limit. We'll put that up on the screen. I think that'll resolve that issue because you're right, and I thought about Toronto as well. Toronto is crazy large, so 40 kilometres doesn't even get you to Markham. So, I'll throw that up there and we'll put the correction in.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Nesha?

MS. NESHA IRVING (York): Nesha Irving, York branch, we're talking about all this financial stuff. Have you guys noticed even if you come to Toronto and do it 40 kilometres within city limits, the most expensive hotels, right? Because Toronto is Toronto, cheapest hotel right now is 300 bucks a night, and that's for a slum.

And whether we want to admit it or not, a lot of us use this convention as a vacation with our families, we bring our families with us. As Scott said, it's up to us when we vote. If we don't have a host city, I don't even know where we'll end up. As far as I'm concerned, it could be Barbados.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. NESHA IRVING (York): But all I'm saying is when we limit ourselves, we have to look at the full picture. We're talking about all of this financial stuff, but the budget went up and up to now I can't figure it out.

So let's be sure that when we do this, we do this for the right reasons, if we do this. But honestly, for York, and probably should not be speaking for York, but if we hold it in Toronto, we're still screwed.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Okay, so we have a new proposal on the screen from Pacific Coast. Are we ready for the question? Oh, okay. Can we get a second? Are we ready for the question?

Those in favour of the new proposal? Thank you. Those against?

We need a count. Nominations committee, please. Quiet, please. Excuse me. Thank you. All those in favour of the proposal on the screen, please raise your hands with your booklets in them and keep your hands raised.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Those against, please raise your hands with your booklets in them and keep your hands raised.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. It does not pass.

Resolution #40 (as amended) - Not Passed

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Okay. Now we go back to the Pacific Coast amendment that is on the screen. Do we have it up on screen? Okay. Are we ready for the vote? All in favour? Raise your booklets. All against? The amendment resolution does not pass.

Resolution #40 (as amended) - Not Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): We are now going back to the Constitution Committee's

amendment. Do we have it up on the screen? Okay. Are we ready for the question? Those in favour? Raise your ballots in the air. Thank you. Those against? We're going to have a count. Nominations committee, please. Quiet, please. Louise?

Mme LOUISE LEROUX (Montréal): Louise Leroux, section Montréal. Est-ce que c'est possible de demander un vote secret?

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale) : Oui, absolument. Deux tiers du plancher va falloir être d'accord pour un vote secret. Oui. We need a seconder for the secret ballot vote.

My apologies again. Excuse me. We need a vote for the secret ballot vote. Those in favour? Please raise your hands for the secret ballot. It doesn't pass? Thank you. Those against? Thank you. It doesn't pass.

Yep. All those in favour of the resolution on the screen, which was proposed by our Constitution Committee, please raise your ballots and keep your hands in the air.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Those against, please raise your ballot books. Leave your hands in the air.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. The amended resolution does not pass.

Resolution #40 (as amended) - Not Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Now we go back to the original.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. National Office withdraws resolution No. 40.

Resolution #40 – Withdrawn

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): We have 15 minutes. I'll go to the next. Thank you. We're going to resolution 41.

RESOLUTION #41

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Quiet in the room, please.

MS. TANYA MACDONALD (Greater Niagara): Tanya Macdonald, Greater Niagara Branch. Resolution 41, York Branch.

Article 15 - National Convention.

If there are no branches that raise their hand to host the next convention, there's no language or process in our Constitution on how the next host city will be determined. Whereas there is no language in our Constitution to decide who will host the next convention if no branch puts their city forward.

Whereas we need a clear defined process so that this is not decided arbitrarily. Therefore, be it resolved to add a new Article 15.4.1 to read:

> "15.4.1. In the event there is no branch that expresses interest in being the host city of the next convention, the National Executive Committee Council shall meet to determine where it will be held. If there are more than one host city identified, the city garnering the most votes of the Executive Council shall be the next host city."

The Constitution Committee proposes an amendment to the resolution. Be it resolved.

> "15.4.1. In the event there is no branch that expresses interest in being the host city of the next convention, the Executive Committee shall meet to determine where it will be held."

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the amended resolution.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Do we have any questions regarding this? Marie-Josée?

Mme MARIE-JOSÉE TOUPIN (Montréal) : Je voudrais savoir, quand vous dites le Conseil d'administration se réunira, est-ce que c'est l'administration présent au Congrès ou ça sera une réunion beaucoup plus tard?

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale) : Ça serait la réunion avant le Congrès si on n'a personne qui se présente.

Mme MARIE-JOSÉE TOUPIN (Montréal) : Merci.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Rick?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. So what we've done in the past is actually not entrenched in the Constitution, it's been a practice. However, the practice is based on Article 9.4.8.1 of our National Constitution, which states: "Notwithstanding 9.4.8." Oh, sorry, I'm reading the wrong one, my apologies, 9.4.7, says:

> "Considering and preparing business to be brought to the National Convention and all arrangements in connection with the National Convention, including the submission of a budget to the Convention for the current three-year period, and a recommendation respecting the date and location of the following

National Convention."

So the selection of the potential candidates has always fallen upon, by Constitutional regulation, it's always fallen upon the Executive Committee in order to come up with these locations. The branches have often approached, or they've always approached their DVP to say we want to put our name forward, and therefore the DVP, in association with that branch, brings it forward.

The problem now becomes is that we've fallen away from what true process should have been, which is if a branch expresses interest and brings it to the DVP, the DVP should be bringing it forward to the EC so that we can have it available to the floor. And in the event that no branch expresses interest, it still falls already today on the EC to choose the location of the next National Convention, or to be able to even select multiple locations to be presented in front of the Convention to be voted upon.

So, long story short, 9.4.7 already captures that responsibility, and therefore I don't think that this resolution is necessary.

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale) : Louise, est-ce que tu as la main levée? Non.

Okay. Are we ready for the question? All in favor of the proposed resolution, please raise your ballots. Thank you. All against? Thank you.

Resolution #41 (as amended) - Not Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Now we are going back to the resolution put forward by York Branch. Are we ready for the question? All in favor of the resolution 41? Thank you. All against? The resolution does not pass.

Resolution #41 – Not Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution 42.

RESOLUTION #42

MS. MARIE TANYA MACDONALD (Greater Niagara): Tanya Macdonald, Greater Niagara Branch. Resolution No. 42, National Office.

Article 15 - National Convention.

15.11 says:

> "Copies of the agenda shall be forwarded to each branch secretary and to each delegate one month prior to any convention."

The article does not reflect current process accurately.

Whereas ensuring only participants receive copies of the agenda.

Whereas branch secretary may not be delegate or alternate to the convention. Therefore, be it resolved to

amend Article 15.11 to read:

"15.11 Copies of the agenda shall be forwarded to each delegate and each alternate one month prior to any convention."

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the resolution as drafted.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have questions? Are we ready for the question? All those in favor, booklets in the air. Thank you. All those against? The resolution passes.

Resolution #42 – Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution 45. My apologies, 43.

RESOLUTION #43

MS. MARIE TANYA MACDONALD (Greater Niagara): Tanya Macdonald, Greater Niagara Branch. Resolution No. 43, Executive Committee.

Article 15 - National Convention.

The article currently states:

"15.15.2 deal with all resolutions and matters submitted to it by the branches and by the Executive Committee."

The article is not accurate in identifying all submission types to be dealt with by the convention,

missing National Executive and Divisional Council.

Whereas accuracy on the business to be conducted at convention is required.

Whereas the article is missing key groups that have the right to submit proposals. Therefore, Article 15.15.2 be amended to read:

"Article 15.15.2 deal with all resolutions and matters submitted to it in accordance with Article 2.3.1."

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the resolution as drafted.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have questions? Are we ready for the question? All those in favor, raise your ballots. Thank you. All those against? The resolution passes.

Resolution #43 – Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): We will break for lunch and start back at one o'clock with Resolution 45.

Thank you. I just want to mention that the nominations will be closed in five minutes.

Thank you.

--- Upon recessing at 11:55 a.m. /

Suspension à 11 h 55

--- Upon resuming at 1:01 p.m. /

Reprise à 13 h 01

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Hello everyone. Please take your seats. Merci de prendre vos places. Gail?

MS. GAIL BRIFFETT (Newfoundland & Labrador): Yes, hi. Gail Briffett, Newfoundland and Labrador Branch. I have an urgent personal matter to attend to at 2:30 p.m. this afternoon, so I will be relinquishing my delegate duties and passing it over to my alternate, Bernard Diamond, at that time.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you very much. Do we have that noted, the handing over?

Okay, thank you. Back to business. Resolution No. 45.

RESOLUTION #45

MS. MARIE TANYA MACDONALD (Greater Niagara): Tanya MacDonald, Greater Niagara Branch. Resolution No. 45, York Branch.

Article 15 - National Convention.

The Association needs to protect their property and assets to ensure the continuity of our business and the ability to properly document and represent our members now and in the future. There is no language in our Constitution to give weight to this expectation should

someone choose to violate this requirement upon their departure from office.

Whereas, to protect our members so that we can properly represent them in having historical data and the return of all property. Therefore, be it resolved to add new Article 15.18.1 to read:

> "15.18.1. Any Officer found to be in violation of 15.18 by failing to return the belongings or intellectual property of the Association shall be deemed a member not in good standing and shall be ineligible to run for any position within the Association until they have fully remedied the violation and rectified the breach."

The Constitution Committee is recommending non-concurrence with the resolution as drafted. As set out in Article 6, appropriate measures are already in place to address any violation of the provisions of this Constitution.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have any questions? Are we ready? Oh, Joe?

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Divisional Vice President, Atlantic): Joe Blanchard, Divisional Vice President Atlantic. The term officer, does that purely

point out to the National Executive, the EC, or does that term go deeper into our organization to essentially anyone who holds an Association position?

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Can someone from the York branch respond to that?

MS. DAWN-MARIE GAYLE (York): Dawn-Marie Gayle, York Branch. I'm not sure why the word officer was chosen, but it's just anyone in a position within the Association, an Executive Member would be defined, so it could be anyone found to be in violation.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have any other questions? Stone?

MR. STONE BLEMANO (York): There is reference to --

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Your name please and your branch?

MR. STONE BLEMANO (York): Stone Blemano, York Branch. There is reference to Article 6. Can the Committee please reference which part of Article 6 resolves the issue that we raise in here?

MS. MARIE TANYA MACDONALD (Greater Niagara): Tanya MacDonald, Greater Niagara Branch. Article 6 refers to the Ethics Committee and any investigation that would take place and/or discipline.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President):

Anyone else? Tim.

MR. TIM HORNE (Pacific Coast): Tim Horne, Pacific Coast. Just to reiterate what Stone is saying, there is nothing that I can see in Article 6 that outlines this specific issue that was recently experienced. Nothing in here states if you're not returning APOC files or intellectual property. I think that's what this resolution would actually address. And maybe it should be under Article 6 instead of 15.8, because there is nothing in Article 6 that actually states that unless you guys can interpret one of the points in there.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Dawn.

MS. DAWN-MARIE GAYLE (York): Dawn-Marie Gayle, York Branch. I think the intention of this was if you put it under Article 6, then someone has to put a complaint forward for it to be investigated, where with this, it would be basically an automatic. We did have a situation that did transpire, and unfortunately, nothing was brought under Article 6. So because of that, there was no repercussions for that individual with harming the Association.

MR. MARIO MANGO (York): Mario Mango, York Branch. I don't understand why we're leaving anything into interpretation. This makes it very clear, and this should

go forward. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): André.

M. ANDRÉ BEAUDET (Montréal) : André Beaudet, section de Montréal. Justement, je ne comprends pas pourquoi le comité a recommandé le rejet, alors qu'on devrait au contraire l'approuver. On a vécu une situation récemment que, justement, là ce n'a pas réglé le problème, donc il faudrait mettre quelque chose en place.

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale) : Merci. Anyone else?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. I can say that having been at the National Office through a number of different coming and going, that there is situations where things leave the office that should not have left the office. And to try to cookie cutter it into like a misappropriation of funds would probably be exactly that, it would be a little bit gray.

I actually do think that this is a good situation because the penalty is not we're trying to take money out of your pockets specifically. We're asking back what you may have either inadvertently or purposefully taken out of the office. And if not, then the repercussion is pretty standard by the Association means in that you're

a member not in good standing. So it's reasonable, but it still holds a little weight. So I actually do think this is a good proposal.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Andrew?

MR. ANDREW HVARREGAARD (Edmonton): Andrew Hvarregaard, Edmonton Branch. I would suggest that each of the National Officers is responsible for safeguarding the assets of the Association. And each of them would have the ability to ask for them to be returned. And 6.1.7, anyone who wrongfully interferes with any officer in the discharge of their duties would have brought Article 6 into consideration for this most recent encounter. The fact that nothing was brought forward is something for internal review because it was there.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Joe?

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Divisional Vice President, Atlantic): Joe Blanchard, Divisional Vice President Atlantic. I'm not going to speak for or against this one. I know of events where this would have been a strength, to be honest. But I will speak to the Constitution Committee's review of this. They are correct. 17.13, the Oath of Office, states that you will return anything after your use. So to point out Article 6.6.1.1

says you've violated any provision of this Constitution. The oath is a part of the Constitution.

So for pure clarity of the issue, yes, Article 6 absolutely gives us the authority to use that process to address this issue. Does that mean that this shouldn't pass? I'm not going to say yay or nay, but just to give everybody a full, clear picture of the issue. Article 6 does cover this.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Did we have anyone else? Yep, Stone?

MR. STONE BLEMANO (York): Stone Blemano, York Branch. I think a couple of people have spoken, and it is clear that this will carry some weight. Article 6 talks about it, but this one adds a little bit more to it to strengthen for people in Ottawa to be able to deal with the situations as it applies. So I think it's a good one to vote for. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Any last questions before I ask the question? All in favour? Raise your ballots. Thank you. All against? Thank you. The resolution is passed.

Resolution #45 - Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution 46.

RESOLUTION #46

MS. MARIE TANYA MACDONALD (Greater Niagara): Tanya Macdonald, Greater Niagara Branch. Resolution No. 46, York Branch.

Article 15 - National Convention.

APOC needs to protect their property and assets to ensure the continuity of our business and the ability to properly document and represent our members now and in the future. There is no language in our Constitution to give weight to this expectation should someone choose to violate this requirement upon their departure from office. If their actions cost the association financially, we are suggesting that the cost of this must be paid back before they can become a member in good standing.

Whereas, to cover the costs of any financial impact to the Association. Therefore, be it resolved to add new Article 15.18.2 to read:

> "15.18.2 If any of their actions cost the association money to rectify remedy, these costs shall be recovered by the Association before their status can be changed back to being in good standing."

The Constitution Committee is recommending non-concurrence with the resolution as drafted. The Constitution Committee believes that the addition to

Article 15.18 is not necessary.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Any questions on the floor? Rick.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. I was completely in favor of the first one, I think this one almost feels a bit redundant. I think that all of the provisions that we need are already buried in 15.18.1, and I think that this one becomes unnecessary because the rectifying the problem is already buried in there. So for me, this one, it's just a rehashing of what we already now just voted in.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Tim?

MR. TIM HORNE (Pacific Coast): Tim Horne, Pacific Coast. Just to kind of reiterate what Rick said there, we just voted on the previous one that says you're no longer a member in good standing. This would say unless you give us money. So it would be kind of like you can pay your way back into being a member of good standing, which doesn't necessarily sit right. So I don't support it at all. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Anyone else? Joe?

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Divisional Vice

President, Atlantic): Joe Blanchard, Atlantic DVP. Could I ask from the York Branch, are these two like in tandem? Is that the intent? Because to the point that everyone's been making, it seems like the first one covers what needs to be covered. And then the second piece -- could someone from the branch elaborate?

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): No? Rick?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. I think when I read the 15.18.1, I think the intent might have been that the interpretation was that they would just be -- they would not be able to return to running for any position until the remedy was put in. But when you read it as a whole, it still captures the essence of remedy.

So it says shall be deemed a member in not good standing and shall be ineligible run for any position within the association until. So both of those situations can be rectified or can be resolved by remedying the breach, as it says at the end, rectifying the breach at the end.

So it is captured in there, but I think when they put it in, they just intended to this one fixed the running for office and that one was going to fix being not in good standing. But I believe it's captured in both.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Jennifer?

MS. JENNIFER DIMEO (York): Jennifer Dimeo, York Branch. We would like to withdraw. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you.

Resolution #46 - Withdrawn

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Just waiting for the English to pop up on screen. Resolution No. 47.

RESOLUTION #47

MS. MARIE TANYA MACDONALD (Greater Niagara): Tanya Macdonald, Greater Niagara branch. Resolution No. 47, National Office.

Article 15 – National Convention.

Article 15 reads:

> "15.22 Unless otherwise specified, any decisions taken by the Convention shall take effect immediately upon adjournment of the National Convention. This does not apply to constitutional changes, which are covered under Article 2.4."

The Article references an invalid Article, 2.4 when it should be 2.3.

Whereas, the Article references the wrong previous article, likely due to past renumbering.

Therefore, be it resolved to amend Article 15.22 to read:

"15.22. Unless otherwise specified, any decisions taken by the Convention shall take effect immediately upon adjournment of the National Convention. This does not apply to constitutional changes, which are covered under Article 2.3."

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the resolution as drafted.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Any questions? Are you ready for the vote? Or are you ready for the question? All in favour, raise your ballots. Thank you. Those opposed? Thank you. The resolution has passed.

Resolution #47 - Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution 48.

RESOLUTION #48

MS. MARIE TANYA MACDONALD (Greater Niagara): Tanya Macdonald, Greater Niagara branch. Resolution No. 48, Montreal Branch.

Article 16 – Convention Rules of Order.

Decorum demands, whereas the order of procedures is important. Therefore, be it resolved to amend Article 16.8 to read:

"16.8 If a delegate is called to order, they shall close their mic and stop talking until the chairperson has decided the question of order."

Instead of:

"16.8 If a delegate is called to order, they shall take their seat until the chair person has decided the question of order."

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the resolution as drafted. As the process for speaking has changed, it would stand to reason that this Article be updated.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): J-F?

M. JEAN-FRANÇOIS CHARTRAND (Montréal) : J-F Chartrand, section de Montréal. I don't have much things to say about this, it's just that things change and now we have our monthly meetings, they are by teams. This is why we recommend this.

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale) : Merci. Do we have any other questions on the floor? Are

you ready for the question? All in favour, raise your ballots. Thank you. All opposed, raise your ballots. Thank you. The resolution has passed.

Resolution #48 - Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): We will be going to 50 as we've already done 49. Resolution 50.

RESOLUTION #50

MR. DUNCAN GILLIS (N.B. East Regional): Duncan Gillis, N.B. East Regional Branch. Resolution 50, Executive Committee.

Article 17 - Elections at Convention.

During elections for Divisional Vice-President, we realize that the involvement of the entire convention floor is not a necessity, as only delegates of the Division can vote for their respective candidates.

Whereas the involvement of the entire floor regarding elections of DVPs and alternate DVPs is not necessary. Therefore, the following article be added.

> "Article 17.7.5.1, New. The election of the Divisional Vice-President shall not be conducted on the Convention floor. Each division conducting an election shall leave the Convention floor, conduct their election with the

assistance of the Election Committee, and return with the name of the successful nominee.

Article 17.7.6.1, New. The election of the alternate Divisional Vice-Presidents shall not be conducted on the Convention floor. Each division conducting an election shall leave the Convention floor, conduct their election with the assistance of the Election Committee, and return with the name of the successful nominee."

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the resolution as drafted.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Rick?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice-President. A couple of points of clarity. When we say that you have to leave the Convention floor, that just means the process itself will be conducting -- you can conduct off to the side here at the booths, things like that. That is still considered as off the Convention floor because it's the procedure that we're actually being taken out.

If we look back, for those of us that have been

around a few Conventions, there was a time where we actually did that. There was a time where we would leave the floor. St. John's is probably the most recent that I can remember where the entirety of the DVPs that were conducting elections would step off into a side room, would step off into a corner, and they would conduct their elections amongst their people simply so that they would be able to speak to the people who are truly doing the electing versus speaking to a grander crowd.

And I think going back to that is fair to the DVPs because they should really be speaking at a more intimate level with their group versus an entire Convention floor that has no impact on the outcome. So that's the purpose of this one.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Garret?

MR. GARRET ANDERSON (Calgary): Garret Anderson, Calgary Branch 10. Does this have any effect at all on exactly who can vote for the DVP vote? Does this open it up to or does this open it up to people other than who the delegates are?

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): This would not have an impact. Any other questions? Mario?

MR. MARIO MANGO (York): Mario, York Branch.

This would not affect this year's Convention, correct? It will be starting next year?

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): It will go into place this year if we vote to support it. Any other questions before I ask the question? Are we ready for the question? All in favour, raise your ballots. Thank you. All against, please raise your ballots. The resolution has passed.

Resolution #50 - Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution 51.

RESOLUTION #51

MR. DUNCAN GILLIS (N.B. East Regional): Duncan Gillis, N.B. East Regional Branch. Resolution 51, Executive Committee.

Article 17 - Elections at Convention.

In the event that the changes proposed for Articles 17.7.5.1 and 17.7.5.2 are adopted, additional procedural is required.

Whereas proposed language to 17.7.5.1 and 17.7.5.2 are adopted by the Convention floor.

Whereas the newly adopted language needs additional procedural clarity. Therefore, new Article 17.8.1 to read.

"Article 17.8.1, new. Notwithstanding

Article 17.8, elections for positions referred to Articles 17.7.5 and 17.7.6, the nominee and the nominator or seconder of each nominee may speak to the delegates from their division for no more than three minutes on behalf of their nominee."

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the resolution as drafted.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have any questions? Donald?

MR. DONALD MAK (Pacific Coast): Donald from Pacific Coast. The newly adopted is 17.6.1, no? Is there -- there's no 17.5.2. It's 17.6.1 is the last one we passed. I think it's a clerical update.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you, Donald. Go ahead, that's correct. Do we have any other questions? Are we ready for the question? All in favor, raise your ballots. Thank you. All against, raise your ballots. The resolution has passed.

Resolution #51 - Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution 52.

RESOLUTION #52

MR. DUNCAN GILLIS (N.B. East Regional): Duncan

Gillis, N.B. East Regional Branch. Resolution 52, Executive Committee.

Article 17 - Elections at Convention.

The article currently reads:

> "17.11, In Case of a Tie Vote.
>
> 17.11.1, The Chairperson shall immediately take a second ballot without recess or adjournment. If this results in a second tie vote, the Chairperson shall cast a short recess before taking the third ballot.
>
> 17.11.2, In the event of a tie vote under Article 17.7.4 or Article 17.7.5 and following three votes having been cast, the National President, the 1st National Vice President, and the Second National Vice President shall be included in the vote to break the tie."

This creates an issue with the ability to break a tie that may persist beyond a third ballot for the National Executive positions.

Whereas the elections process must deliver a clear winner.

Whereas the current process is incomplete and problematic. Therefore, Article 17.11 be amended to read:

"Article 17.11, In Case of a Tie Vote. 17.11.1, The Chairperson shall immediately take a second ballot without recess or adjournment. If this results in a second tie vote, the Chairperson shall call a short recess before taking the third ballot. Should the tie persist, the Chairperson shall immediately take another ballot without recess and adjournment and should continue to do so until a successful nominee is determined.

Article 17.11.2, In the event of a tied vote under 17.7.5 or 17.7.6 and following three votes having been cast, the National President and the 1st National Vice President and the Second National Vice President shall be included in the vote to break the tie."

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the resolution as drafted. As the resolution states, the first amendment would enable the voting process to determine a winner.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Rick?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. Just going to point out what Donald had caught on the last one. This is the same thing. So we will fix the article reference that it's 17.7.5.1 or 17.7.6.1. So the amendment is to include those past ones from the earlier proposal and we'll fix that as we go.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Any questions? Are you ready for the vote? All in favor, raise your ballots. Thank you. And it was the question, not the vote. All against, please raise your ballots. The resolution has passed.

Resolution #52 - Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution No. 53.

RESOLUTION #53

MR. DUNCAN GILLIS (N.B. East Regional): Duncan Gillis, N.B. East Regional Branch. Resolution 53, York Branch.

Article 17 - Elections at Convention.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Jennifer?

MS. JENNIFER DIMEO (York): Jennifer Dimeo, York branch. We'd like to withdraw.

Resolution #53 - Withdrawn

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution 54.

RESOLUTION #54

MR. DUNCAN GILLIS (N.B. East Regional): Duncan Gillis, N.B. East Regional Branch. Resolution No. 54, National Office.

Article 17 – Elections at Convention.

This article is redundant and should be withdrawn.

Whereas Article 17.14 is identical to Article 15.17. We propose to delete Article 15.17.

The Constitution Committee proposes an amendment to the resolution. Be it resolved. Move current 15.17 to 17.14 and delete current 17.14.

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence to the amended resolution.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have any questions? Are you ready for the question? All in favor, raise your ballots. Thank you. All against, raise your ballots. The proposed amended resolution has passed.

Resolution #54 (as amended) - Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Resolution No. 55

RESOLUTION #55

MR. DUNCAN GILLIS (N.B. East Regional): Duncan Gillis, N.B. East Regional Branch. Resolution 55, Northern Saskatchewan.

Article 18 - Collective Bargaining.

To increase the representation of the West Provinces on the committee, as 50% of the geographical country west has only one representative on the committee. We would like it to be two individuals representing the geographical region of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, BC, Yukon, Northwest Territories, and Nunavut.

Whereas to increase the number of representatives from the Western Provinces from one to two members on the committee.

Therefore, be it resolved to amend Article 18.1 to read:

> "The Negotiating Committee shall be comprised of National President, one other member of the National Executive to be offered in the following order; 1st National Vice President, Second National Vice President, and then to the National Vice-President Finance & Administration. And if no one accepts, the 1st National Vice President shall be appointed. One representative from the

Atlantic, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, PEI, Newfoundland. One representative from Quebec, one representative from Ontario, and two representatives from Western Canada, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, BC, Yukon, Northwest Territories, Nunavut. The committee must be formed at least 18 months before the expiry date of the collective agreement. In effect, or immediately after the convention, preceding the expiry date, whichever occurs later."

The Constitution Committee is recommending non-concurrence with the resolution as drafted. The current Collective Bargaining Committee has operated effectively without identified concerns. As a result, there is no need to change either the number of representatives or the regions they represent.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Rick.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. The Executive Committee as a whole would like to propose an amendment. The amendment to read as follows:

"18.1, Negotiating Committee shall be comprised of A, National President, B, one other member of the National Executive to be offered in the following order; one, 1st National Vice President, two, Second National Vice President, three, National Vice President Finance & Administration. If no one accepts, the 1st National Vice President shall be appointed. C, one representative from the Atlantic, NB, NS, PE, NL, D, one representative from Quebec, E, one representative from Ontario, F, one representative from Western Canada, MB, SK, AB, BC, YK, NT, and NU, and G, one additional delegate who may be elected by the executive committee where in its judgment, the negotiating committee would benefit from particular workplace experience, operational knowledge, or exposure to specific work functions, classifications, environments, or issues relevant to the bargaining unit. The selection shall be based on the

particular needs of the Negotiating Committee and shall not be restricted by region or position. This committee must be formed at least 18 months before the expiry date of the collective agreement in effect or immediately after the convention preceding that expiry date, whichever occurs later."

So just to speak to this really quick, we do believe that we've seen, even just over the last collective bargaining this time around, and I'm not going to get into specifics, but I will say that we see the handiness of having somebody that is a subject matter expert in what we're trying to work with to be able to bring somebody forward and to be able to speak on behalf, whether it be the job evaluation or whether it be sales or whether it be maintenance, all of the different facets of Canada Post. So we believe that this will certainly benefit our members greatly.

And just to add to it, and this is not part of the resolution, but part of the commitment, and I actually get to say that officially now, the Executive Committee will be embarking over the next three years on doing a full analysis on the makeup of the negotiating team and how it

best serves our membership, whether it should be region-based or whether it should be skill set-based, whether it should be portfolio-based or a combination thereof.

And that's not to say we would get away from the region or we would. What I'm saying is that we are going to commit ourselves to looking at this in-depth so that when we come to next convention, which unfortunately won't impact the next collective agreement, but it will still give us an opportunity to put our best long-term and analyzed proposal forward for the negotiating team.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have any questions? Stone?

MR. STONE BLEMANO (York): Stone Blemano, York Branch. I think I like the whole idea of Rick targeting to the group, but we're still really exempting noticeably the very areas that have eight plants that predominantly face all the issues that affect the Collective Agreement. So somehow I think I would like to have that language in the last portion to include areas that have eight plants.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you, Stone. Kirk.

MR. KIRK VON WISTINGHAUSEN (Cape Breton): Kirk, Cape Breton. I'm just wondering how you choose one delegate that is smarter than the rest of you. Because if

you're looking for somebody who could do all of that, how do you choose one, or do you swap them in and out?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): So the question is, how do we choose the subject matter experts?

MR. KIRK VON WISTINGHAUSEN (Cape Breton): Kirk, Cape Breton. You're going to add one additional delegate, and you're saying that someone who may have experience in a certain area, but how does one person have experience in all areas?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): No, that's not what I'm saying. What I'm saying is that we would add an additional one to contribute to the needs of the negotiating team. We can't make a -- certainly it wouldn't be just a catch-all individual. But as an example, one of the examples that I gave, because we knew that we were going to be dealing with job evaluation from the previous Collective Agreement, what carried forward, it was easily identifiable that a subject matter expert in job evaluation would have greatly benefited our progress in that situation.

So we have to look at the needs of what we're going after, because a mandate is also brought forward by our membership as well as the Executive Committee. So we have to analyze what our needs are in order to be able to

determine who that best candidate is.

To complement what we will also have that has held true for the better part of 50 years as an Association. So it's not to say that the people that are already on the team are not also subject matter experts, but it's also a great idea to be able to have that pivot position to be able to complement what you may need that may be outside. And I'll give you the perfect example. Our committee did not include a salesperson, that could be the pivot. So it's nice to be able to have that position in hand to be able to complement the rest of the team.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Do we have any other questions? J-F?

M. JEAN-FRANÇOIS CHARTRAND (Montréal) : Jean-François Chartrand, section de Montréal. Au niveau du texte proposé par Rick, s'il y avait possibilité du délégué additionnel qu'on en utilise des différents selon leur expertise sur leur spécialité. Exemple, comme tu viens de mentionner, Rick, vous êtes dans une période de négociation, là vous êtes dans les ventes. Bon, dans nos membres, chercher quelqu'un qui est connaissant, qui est fort en vente. On arrive après ça dans la livraison, même chose. Donc cette personne-là additionnelle, ça serait une personne qui aurait une expertise de connaissances qui pourrait être utilisées par vous.

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale) : Je veux juste clarifier, Jean-François, on fait déjà ça, on l'a fait cette fois-ci au niveau des négo. Quand on avait besoin d'expertise, par exemple, pour les évaluations d'emploi, quand on avait besoin d'expertise en ventes, d'expertise au niveau de la maintenance, on a demandé à des gens qui avaient déjà été déterminés par leurs pairs comme nos contacts.

Alors quand on avait des questions, puis on était prêt à se préparer pour aller avec la société, on amenait ces gens-là à la table. C'est déjà en vigueur, c'est juste que ces gens-là, ils viennent pour le sujet, ils quittent après le sujet, ils ne sont pas là pour le complet des négo.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Are you ready for the question? All in favor? Oh, my apologies, we need a seconder.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Point of order. So this was actually brought forward by the entirety of the Executive Committee, which are 13 individuals. Do we still have to identify a seconder? Okay.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): A seconder? Are we ready for the question? All in favor, raise your ballots. Thank you. Those against, raise your

ballots. Thank you. The resolution has passed.

Resolution #55 (as amended) - Passed

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Angela?

MS. ANGELA BURNETT (Pacific Coast): Angela Burnett, Pacific Coast. Due to the vote of the last resolution, Pacific Coast wishes to withdraw Resolution 56.

Resolution #56 - Withdrawn

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you, Angela. Jennifer?

MS. JENNIFER DIMEO (York): Jennifer Dimeo, York Branch, we would also like to withdraw Resolution 57.

Resolution #57 - Withdrawn

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you, Jennifer. Resolution No. 58. Jennifer?

MS. JENNIFER DIMEO (York): Jennifer Dimeo, York Branch, we would also like to withdraw No. 58.

Resolution #58 - Withdrawn

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you, Jennifer. La résolution 59. Claude-Éric?

M. CLAUDE-ERIC HÉBERT (Québec) : Claude-Éric Hébert, section Québec, on désire retirer la...

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): La résolution?

M. CLAUDE-ERIC HÉBERT (Québec) : La résolution

59.

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale) : 59? Merci, Claude-Éric.

Resolution #59 - Withdrawn

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): J-F?

MR. JEAN-FRANÇOIS CHARTRAND (Montréal): Jean-François Chartrand, Montreal Branch. We would like please to withdraw 60, 61, and 62.

Resolution #60 - Withdrawn

Resolution #61 - Withdrawn

Resolution #62 - Withdrawn

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale) : Merci J-F.

--- Rires / Laughter

UNKNOWN: Hey guys, you don't want me to do my job, eh?

MR. JEAN-FRANÇOIS CHARTRAND (Montréal): Enjoy your time.

--- Laughter / Rires

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): We will proceed with a break for 15 minutes. 15, 16. Please be back in the room by ten after.

--- Upon recessing at 1:53 p.m. /

Suspension à 13 h 53

--- Upon resuming at 2:13 p.m. /

Reprise à 14 h 13

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Please take your seats. Can we close the back door please? We don't even have Rick -- oh he's there, over there. Thank you everyone. Can you take your seats? Veuillez prendre vos places. Alors, nous sommes à la résolution 63. Resolution 63.

RESOLUTION #63

M. PIERRE-YVES CARRIER (Québec): Pierre-Yves Carrier, section Québec. résolution nº 63, Bureau national.

Article 19 - Finances.

Le libellé de l'article 19.10 est le suivant:

> « 19.10 Le conseil d'administration peut investir les fonds non nécessaires au fonctionnement courant de l'Association dans des valeurs mobilières. Seules les obligations garanties du gouvernement ou les certificats de placement garantis émis par les banques à charte constituent des placements acceptables. »

Afin de faire de l'Association une organisation plus saine et indépendante sur le plan financier, nous

devons mettre à jour notre stratégie et notre politique d'investissement financier.

Attendu que l'article 19.10 actuel limite nos possibilités d'investissement.

Attendu que l'Association doit continuer d'aller de l'avant en assurant une bonne gestion financière.

Par conséquent, il est résolu que l'article 19.10 indique ce qui suit:

> « 19.10 L'Association peut établir et maintenir un portefeuille de placements pour la gestion prudente de ses ressources financières. Ces placements peuvent comprendre une combinaison d'actions et de titres à revenu fixe, y compris des certificats de placement garantis. Le portefeuille de placements sera structuré avec une allocation cible d'environ 40 % en actions et 60 % en titres à revenu fixe, notamment les certificats de placement garantis, sous réserve d'un examen périodique et de rajustements par le conseil d'administration conformément à de saines pratiques

financières. »

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the resolution as drafted.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Any questions? Rick.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. This is a proposal that we put forward after having a proposal put to us from our finance gentleman at Beaudry-Deschatelets, or Assante. Assante did a review of what we've had in the past, a review of how we've gained in the past, and then they gave us an updated proposal that was a balance of 40% equities and 60% in fixed income.

This is going to allow the Association to continue to grow its surplus in order to move towards a more both financially sustainable situation as well as an independent situation because we do know that we still rely on the Corporation for certain things. And the more that we can disconnect ourselves from that tie with the Corporation, the more that we can make sound decisions in the field.

And also, more importantly, we can show the membership that we are an entity onto ourselves and not relying on the Corporation or, as you may hear, things like we're in bed with the Corporation or we're allied with the

Corporation. We are certainly in a partnership with the corporation in order to try to move this business forward, but it doesn't mean that they pull our strings, so to speak.

So we currently have about 3.5 to 3.7% over the lifetime of investments in the GICs. That's our return is about 3.7% over the lifetime. Over the lifetime of the medium risk equities, we are probably somewhere between 6.5 to 7.5%. So the yield is significant. And if we can move ourselves in that direction, we're making our best financial decisions as possible. I think that's the best for all of us.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Okay, we have a few. Joe?

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Atlantic Divisional Vice President): Joe Blanchard, Divisional Vice President, Atlantic. I want to add a little more colour to what Rick said because it's a little bit misleading. Within those GIC 3% lifetime he's talking about, because the life of our investments, the majority of them are not 25 years old, they're in the last 10 or so, most of that investment rate, we had the balloon of the fixed interest rates.

So where we have, yes, that is the actual number 3 and change, but we had about five years where we were getting 4, 5, and 6% interest on GICs that artificially

inflated that 3%. If those COVID time periods where the inflation didn't go up, that number would likely be sub two, not in the threes.

And we are very unlikely in the anytime near future to see those super high rates on GICs anytime soon. Fours, fives, sixes based on those on the Bank of Canada rates. That's nearly unheard of since the 80s. So keep in mind that number is accurate, but it is misleading. We will not be achieving 3% on those GICs, 4% on those GICs going forward. So they are guaranteed, which is why the interest rates are incredibly low, because there's no chance of losing the money. So I just wanted to clarify that.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Bernard?

M. BERNARD CÔTÉ (Montréal) : Oui, Bernard, Montréal. J'ai juste une question. Il semble qu'on fait affaire avec Assante, qui est une boîte de placement, en fait, qui est courtier. Si on parle de 40 % d'actions, c'est eux qui vont gérer ça. Puis on sait que ces gens-là font leur argent, en principe. Plus ils ont de transactions, plus ils font d'argent. C'est comme ça qu'ils se payent. Qui va gérer ça? Qui va regarder ça?

On va se fier sur Assante, qui vont investir en actions directement en bourse ou en FNB, ou whatever, ou

ETF en anglais. Sauf que je suis un peu inquiet parce que je me dis que ces gens-là, on a beau faire affaire, en fait, on fait affaire déjà avec eux, il semble. Je n'étais pas au courant.

Je me dis, ils font quoi pour nous, ces gens-là? Ces gens-là, c'est des gens qui sont payés à la commission. Qui va surveiller comment ces gens-là font nos transactions? Est-ce qu'on a un spécialiste au niveau de l'exécutif qui va pouvoir contrebalancer ce qu'Assante va leur dire ou le courtier, malgré toute la vertu que ce gars-là a? Dans le fond, lui, il fait son argent avec les transactions.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice. Historically, the overseer of any of the investments from the national office has always been the National Secretary Treasurer of the National Finance, VP of Finance Administration, and the President. They actually have been our experts, and you're right, they do make a commission off of what we do, so they have a vested interest, but I think their vested interest should come in making us money.

But any of the decisions that are made in terms of investments are always made by the VP of Finance Administration and the President. It's never made by Assante. They come to us, they say, look, here's the

investment possibilities, here's what we think you should do. They'll come, the same with the GICs and say, here's what the rates are right now, here's your terms, and it's always been the National Office that makes the decision.

But do we have a secondary professional that oversees investments with Assante? That we don't. We haven't historically anyways.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Marie-Josée?

Mme MARIE-JOSÉE TOUPIN (Montréal) : Marie-Josée Toupin, Montréal. Je vois ces taux de placement et tout. Moi, on nous a toujours dit qu'on était à but non lucratif pour les impôts, surtout dans les petites sections. Donc, est-ce qu'on ne va pas à l'encontre de ça?

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Joe?

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Atlantic Divisional Vice President): So to answer both questions from the floor. Sorry, Joe Blanchard, Divisional Vice President, Atlantic. We also have the -- so the President, the National Vice President of Finance Administration keep an eye on things. You know, if they are starting to charge us massive fees, yeah, you're going to have conversations with them. But to Rick's point, any investment organization worth their salt, their goal is to make you money. And if they start nickel

and diming you for fees and stealing your money, essentially, they will not exist long.

The other question around the not-for-profit. We are an association, we are a bargaining agent and we are a not-for-profit. But there is no -- we are allowed to make a reasonable return on our funds that we have. We could buy all kinds of things. We could buy buildings or we could start businesses as long as they fed into -- and no one individual profits from that. That is what CRA looks at with these things.

So there is zero risk of us losing our not-for-profit status. It would have to be a very, very extreme example of profiting for that. But one of the key pieces of that conversation is where do the quote-unquote profits go? And if we look at our financial statements, when we do have surpluses, because we don't call them profits, they're surpluses or deficits, they go back into the organization. There's no one individual profiting.

So no worries there. No fears on that front. We are very much allowed to earn a reasonable return on the money that we have. There's no concerns there.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): André?

M. ANDRÉ BEAUDET (Montréal) : André Beaudet, section de Montréal. La façon qu'on veut utiliser notre

portefeuille 60 % / 40 %, avec ce qui se passe dans le monde avec notre ami au sud de la frontière. S'il arrivait une catastrophe et qu'on perdait 40 % de notre argent, comment pourrions-nous expliquer ça à nos membres? Qu'on investit de l'argent qui ne nous appartient pas, à risque, et on l'a perdu.

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale) : Merci. Donald.

MR. DONALD MAK (Pacific Coast): Donald Mak, Pacific Coast. So right now there's a lot of financial institutes that offer similar service, right? I know we have always been using that same provider. Have we ever ventured out to shop around? Because what Rick has said, they give us a proposal of 40/60 and how we could gain a little bit more money.

We just took the advice from them without going around, because even as GIC, you can get it from different bank at different rate. So if we always go to the same guy it doesn't mean we get the best value of our money. Second part is if we do go ahead and transit into this 40% equity and 60% risk, I mean a 60% fixed income. To bear that risk, that puts a lot of responsibility to the President and the VP of Finance Administrator to make that decision.

And that, too, that make that decision will have to now answer to our 4,000 plus member that in case

there's a downturn on the investment. Lastly, so we saw the forecast of finance yesterday. So we didn't incur any loss until 2029. And then the year before that, we have 18,000 surplus and the year before that, we have half of that. So now, what is the plan that, if we do venture down this road for increased return in our investment, is there a plan how we're going to use that money? If we are financially stable, why are we making the changes? Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Rick.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): So just to respond to those comments before we go to Scott.

When we talk about the 40/60 proposal, this wasn't a push from Assante. This was something that we approached Assante to ask them to put together for us. That's the reason why we didn't shop around because, again, we have been in business with Assante, but it wasn't something where they came to us and say, hey, you know what you really should do? You really should be doing a 40/60. No, we asked for it because we wanted to be able to move towards, again, that idea of financial independence, if you will.

When we talk about the lot of responsibility on the president and on the VP of Finance Administration,

there's certainly a lot of pressure on making the best decision for any immediate investment. But the proposal also talks about the subject of periodic review and adjustment by the Executive Committee in accordance with sound financial practices.

So the Executive Committee has oversight on any of the financial investments that we are doing on a regular basis. So there's also the clarity there, and there's also that checks and balance that's in place as well. As far as -- I'm trying to think, there was a third part that you had mentioned, Donald, and it's eluding me at the moment.

MR. DONALD MAK (Pacific Coast): Donald Mak, Pacific Coast. Third one is what are we going to do with the gained money from the return?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Okay, so you've seen the plan, and of course it's just a plan, it's a budget. We would certainly love to be able to see more returns or better surplus out of that budget. We'll see how the years progress. As far as whenever we have a return on our investments, typically we recycle that return into our investments to in turn get more gains on it as a security for us. We've gone since 2015 until today, in the last 10 years, we've grown our portfolio from about $1.7 million to $5.4 million. So it's been a significant increase over the years based on what we believe were good,

sound financial decisions, not just by the President and the VP of Finance, but also by the EC as a whole. So that's what we typically do with those.

Just to give you a quick look under the hood as to what would be a financially sustainable or independent association, if we were sitting with an investment portfolio of $15 million, we could really have some financial independence where this Association could start to become, I guess, far more trusted by our membership. Not to say that we're not now, but as we continue to move in that direction and detach ourselves from any kind of a link with the Corporation, it creates a trust in our membership that we need to continue to rebuild as we're going along. But those are the answers, I think I hit all the points that you had, Donald. Scott?

MR. SCOTT McPHERSON (Pacific Coast): Scott McPherson, APOC Pacific. I just wanted to get some clarity for my own self here. 19.10 currently states that funds not required for current operation may be invested. The proposed amendment would remove the funds not required part. So you could conceivably increase the amount of money invested beyond that quote unquote funds not required. And there's nothing to govern that or no way for us to claw that back or to manage that once we've said yes to this until the next convention.

And I guess a question I would have is if something were to happen and we need those funds, I'm sure there must be some sort of penalty that you're going to pay to be able to get access or are you even able to access that money? Are they not sent into terms or whatnot? And then what would be the plan to help us navigate that?

Because we can certainly all understand that increasing investments would give us additional money, but there's also a risk. There's no such thing as a guarantee. So I'm just curious about that. Thank you.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. Just to address part one, the 19.1, where it says funds not required for current operation, even though 19.1 would change in the way that it's written, we also have the security cap that the Association has to abide by, which means that we can't go below 3 million in assets without making sure that it's directly for operational requirements and operational requirements only.

As far as the second part of your question... Wow, it's starting to elude me. Give me the second part of your question again, Scott.

MR. SCOTT McPHERSON (Pacific Coast): Scott, Pacific. Sure, no problem. If we had to access the money that we've invested because we need the capital, what kind

of penalties will we be facing and will we even be able to access that money or will we have to wait?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): The penalties, typically, I don't think it's really penalties that you would pay, but if you have to break a GIC, you're not going to get the return that you want on a GIC. If you're having to cash in anything on the equities, there's actually no penalty at all. The opportunity is to be able to just flush that back into the account as required.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Bernard?

M. BERNARD CÔTÉ (Montréal) : Sans doute que je me trompe, Bernard, Montréal. On doit absolument réinvestir ce qu'on gagne en gains au niveau des fonds. C'est ce que la loi nous dit. Maintenant, si on veut retirer ces fonds-là, on s'expose à une imposition. Je ne sais pas, je ne suis pas un expert, mais je suis ça un peu. On ne peut pas, mettons qu'on a besoin de ce placement-là pour investir en, je ne sais pas, payer des salaires.

Automatiquement, là on s'expose à être imposé. Le gouvernement peut dire vos profits, vous avez une exposition à l'imposition. Parce que si on ne réinvestit pas notre gain, automatiquement on s'expose. Je me trompe peut-être, mais c'est un peu ça qui se passe dans la vraie

vie.

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Atlantic Divisional Vice President): We don't pay taxes. Joe Blanchard, Divisional Vice President Atlantic Region. Due to our non-profit status, we don't have to pay taxes. So when we earn money from our GICs, or income, we can just reinvest it right back in. We don't have to pay taxes. We pay taxes for income, for all of you when you work, and we do pay certain taxes, but we don't pay that kind of tax.

And keep in mind, folks, tax is paid on the bottom line number we showed on the screen. So yeah, even if we took money and then earned something and then reinvested that, you don't pay tax on that. You pay tax on the bottom line of this year projection, $832. But we are a non-profit, so we don't pay no taxes.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Tim?

MR. TIM HORNE (Pacific Coast): Tim Horne, Pacific Coast. Maybe some clarification is required. I did hear a comment there, somebody was worried about losing all the money, which would have to be probably one of the greatest catastrophic events in the history of the stock market for an ETF to lose 100% of its funds. So maybe not everyone is aware what ETFs are, and what they're made up of, and how they actually are a fairly risk-divided

investment, if you guys want to clarify that.

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Atlantic Divisional Vice President): So the concept that we have is right now we have investments in GICs and a little bit in equity that doesn't come directly from the dues. The idea here is to allow us to expand the money in a little bit higher risk. We are not going to be investing in startup companies. We're investing in medium risk, I don't want to go down saying what we're actually investing in, but a Microsoft or a Bell, these companies that are very stable, long-term. Yeah, there's a little bit of risk of a downturn, I mean, markets are markets, but our investment strategy is what we have on the table right now is 60% of our investments will be locked in. Pay $1,000 now, get $1,050 on this date. No questions, it's done, it's over.

The other 40% will go into other forms of investment. I think we have it defined here as medium risk, yeah, medium risk; long established companies, stable dividends, things like that where each year you see a bit of growth. You're not gonna hit, you know, it's not gonna be investing in SpaceX, but you're gonna hit some reasonable numbers, see some nice 5, 6, 7% returns on our funds, especially next year, compounding, compounding, compounding. And then someday, you know, the dream would be we're sitting here with a trust that funds a nice chunk

of the operations of the Associations.

So we can tell the company, go away, we're gonna do this and we don't care and we don't need your help and it's the right thing for our members, so go away. That's the dream.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Vidya?

MS. VIDYA ALVARES (York): Vidya Alvares, York branch. I just wanted some clarification on the equity investment. So are you all investing everything into the US market or it's a combination of US, Canadian and international equities?

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Go ahead, Rick.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President, the second one. So it's much more diverse than American stocks because Lord knows we don't want to invest in Donny right now.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Andrew?

MR. ANDREW WATTS (Halifax): Andrew Watts, Halifax branch. Just to put some clarity to a lot of what Rick and Joe has been explaining, based on our last report by the Standing Committee on Finance, as of December 31st, 2025, we've got about $800,000 in a medium-risk mutual fund

that primarily consists of bonds. We've got about $2.65 in GICs with varying maturity rates. So basically, that's basically, I think that was Scott's question about losing money if we took money out. So there's money accessible to us at different times. And we've got about $2.1 in a Fidelity fund, which is heavily weighed in bonds. So basically, it's a very, very balanced portfolio from what I understand as well. Thanks.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Rick, did you want to go back and speak? Okay. Are we ready for the question? All in favour for the resolution, please raise your ballots. Thank you. Those opposed, please raise your ballots. Thank you. The resolution has passed.

Resolution #63 - Passed

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): We will take a very short break. Ten minutes, please.

--- Upon recessing at 2:43 p.m. /

Suspension à 14 h 43

--- Upon resuming at 2:56 p.m. /

Reprise à 14 h 56

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you very much for indulging me in another break. We're at Resolution 64.

M. PIERRE-YVES CARRIER (Québec): Pierre-Yves Carrier, section Québec. The Constitution Committee would like to park Resolution 64 to speak to Resolution 65, please.

RESOLUTION #65

M. PIERRE-YVES CARRIER (Québec): Résolution 65, Bureau national.

Article 19 - Finances.

L'article 19.12 stipule:

> « Les chèques doivent être signés par deux dirigeants, parmi ceux figurant sur la liste suivante: »

Les banques offrent des moyens alternatifs aux chèques pour le paiement, ou le remboursement de dépenses ou pour payer des factures. Nous devons nous adapter aux nouvelles technologies.

Attendu que les chèques sont de moins en moins utilisés par les entreprises ou les particuliers.

Attendu que les banques offrent des options alternatives aux chèques comme les dépôts directs ou les transferts électroniques.

Attendu que nous devons nous adapter aux nouvelles technologies.

Par conséquent, qu'il soit résolu que l'article 19.12 indique ce qui suit:

« 19.12 Les chèques, dépôts directs ou transferts électroniques doivent être signés ou approuvés par deux dirigeants parmi ceux figurant sur la liste suivante :

19.12.1 Le vice-président national, finances et administration.

19.12.2 Le président national.

19.12.3 Le 1e vice-président national.

19.12.4 Le 2e vice-président national.

19.12.5 Un vice-président divisionnaire advenant l'absence ou l'inaptitude de trois des quatre dirigeants mentionnés ci-haut. »

The Constitution Committee is recommending concurrence with the resolution as drafted.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Québec): Do we have any questions from the floor? Donald?

--- Laughter / Rires

MR. DONALD MAK (Pacific Coast): Sorry, it's me again, Donald Mak from Pacific. Can I propose an amendment

to change 19.12 into "payment shall be signed by two of the following officers." Instead of adding e-transfer, like the terminology might change over time, so if it is just instead of a cheque, it's a payment, we could just simplify it as a payment and whatever name the bank uses will not affect down the road as terminology might change.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): In the meantime, I believe we had another hand up. Dawn?

MS. DAWN-MARIE GAYLE (York): Dawn-Marie Gayle, York Branch. I just have a question in regards to how the sequence of names are presented here. And if based on the language, would this mean or could this mean that a payment could happen by two other officers without any oversight or overview of the finance position?

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): George has confirmed that yes, the way it's drafted. Joe?

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Divisional Vice President, Atlantic): Joe Blanchard, Divisional Vice President, Atlantic. Yes, like George just said, yes, that is the thing. But this isn't a clause to prevent collusion. This is a clause that is the internal control of the association for issuing funds. So it is written as it is and has been written as it is for the entire length of time I've been with the Association, because this is how

you should write it. Because there are times when the finance individuals aren't available. They need to get vacation too. And when they're gone, does that mean we should stop payments? No.

But to that same point, we have other internal controls, other policies, other procedures. And the last piece of the puzzle is the financial records, the accounting systems, the banks. As long as that individual in the finance role is doing their job and present, it is virtually impossible for a payment to come out of there without them knowing it. Because as I've done for the past few months, helping out with National Office, you see the numbers, you see the bank accounts, you see the transactions.

So could it potentially happen? Yeah. Well, if that person wasn't present for some reason, but as soon as they get back and they open up their book, the accounting system will start doing work and take a look into the transactions, you're going to see it. So the internal controls are present to reduce the risk of collusion or misappropriation of funds. But like I said, this is an internal control for who can sign, not particularly to stop those kinds of things.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Merci. Dawn?

MS. DAWN-MARIE GAYLE (York): Dawn-Marie Gayle, York Branch. Then I would suggest that based on the fact that it's possible that language should be added just like to 19.12.5, where it says in the absence of or incapacity to all of the other ones, to ensure that it follows the proper sequence in not bypassing that position.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Rick, did you want to put the new language on?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. Firstly, I have to clarify with Donald. So you were saying that in 19.12, I believe it was, that cheques, direct deposits, or E-transfers should just be changed to payments. Would that be correct?

MR. DONALD MAK (Pacific Coast): Yes.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): And then Dawn, it sounded like you had an additional amendment to it as well. So I'm going to put up Donald's first and then I will include yours in a second, let me work on that one.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Chris?

MR. CHRISTOPHER ALAIN (Ottawa): Hi everyone, Chris Alain, Vice President Finance, Ottawa Branch. I'd like to just add an amendment as well, in the spirit of

what Dawn is saying. As an oversight, I do think, from what I've seen from Dawn, I think the Vice President Finance was the one making the majority of the payments, so the way I would word this question is payments, because I did like that initially, should be signed or approved by the National Vice President Finance & Administration – or sorry, in the following order, and then the VP Finance Administration, in the absence of the Vice President Finance Administration, two other officers may sign.

MR. Rich Dinon (Divisional Vice President, Huron): Rich Dinon, Divisional Vice President, Huron. Just a point of order, we have a bunch of amendments on the floor right now, so if I'm not mistaken, the first amendment needs to be seconded. From that, once it is seconded then the next one can go in, and is seconded. Then the third amendment can go in. I think we're jumping ahead here, so I think we should slow down, do the first amendment first and then go through the next one. And if I'm incorrect on that process please let me know.

MR. DONALD MAK (Pacific Coast): Donald Mak, Pacific Coast. I agree with Chris, so I withdraw my amendment. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President):

Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. In no world was I capturing that at the time you were saying it. I was still working on the last one.

MR. CHRISTOPHER ALAIN (Ottawa): Can I say it again? Is it -- sorry.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Yeah, I don't want to... So before you do, Chris, I'm going to catch Dawn's and then I'll get to yours, okay?

MS. DAWN-MARIE GAYLE (York): And I withdraw mine for Chris's.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you, Dawn.

--- Laughter / Rires

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Thank you. Rumour has it you have an amendment, Chris.

--- Laughter / Rires

MR. CHRISTOPHER ALAIN (Ottawa): Chris Alain, Vice President of Finance for the Ottawa Branch. So the amendment that I would propose would be payments shall be signed or approved by the National Vice-President -- sorry, let me stop and redo that. Payments shall be signed or approved in the following order: National Vice-President Finance & Administration...

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President):

Rick Williams, 1st National Vice. Just for a point of clarity, are you stating to eliminate any two of the following?

MR. CHRISTOPHER ALAIN (Ottawa): No I am not.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Okay, perfect. So I've got payments shall be signed or approved by...

MR. CHRISTOPHER ALAIN (Ottawa): In the following order.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Shall be approved in the following order.

MR. CHRISTOPHER ALAIN (Ottawa): By any two of the following officers.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Okay, continue.

MR. CHRISTOPHER ALAIN (Ottawa): National Vice President Finance Administration. In the absence of the National Vice President Finance Administration two of the other officers may sign.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): So right now we have it as 19.12.1 National Vice-President Finance & Administration. So are you proposing this next piece of language as 19.12.2?

MR. CHRISTOPHER ALAIN (Ottawa): Yes, I would be.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Okay. So 19.12.2, please reiterate again.

MR. CHRISTOPHER ALAIN (Ottawa): In the absence of the Vice President Finance Administration, any two of the following officers may sign off.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Any two of the following officers and what was the last piece?

MR. CHRISTOPHER ALAIN (Ottawa): May sign off on payment.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): So then would I assume that 19.12.3 would be the National President? 19.12.4 would be the First National. 19.12.5 would be the Second National. And 19.12.6, are you remaining it, having it remain as Divisional Vice President in the absence or incapacity of the three or the four officers mentioned above?

MR. CHRISTOPHER ALAIN (Ottawa): Yes.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Okay, I shall work on that.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): There's Ed? No? Sam?

MR. SAM HAYMOUR (Edmonton): Sam Haymour, Edmonton. I just have a question, like, doesn't the Finance Committee go like every three months and look at

the books?

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): It's not done every three months.

MR. SAM HAYMOUR (Edmonton): It should.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice-President): Rick Williams, 1st National Vice-President. This is not a proposed amendment. This is more of a clarification that I'd like to point towards. I'll say Chris because it's his amendment on the floor. Chris, 19.12, any payment method, would you be acceptable to that, shall be signed or approved, it's a better clarity to that?

MR. CHRISTOPHER ALAIN (Ottawa): Chris Alain, Vice President Finance Administration Ottawa Branch, yes I would be.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice-President): Thank you.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Very good. We have the amendment on the board. Do we have any questions before I ask the question? Do we have a seconder for the proposal? Are we ready for the question? Oh, do you have a question? Please go ahead.

MR. NATHAN LAABS (Ottawa): Nathan Laabs, Ottawa Branch. I'm just curious, right now at the top of this, it doesn't specify that the VP Finance and Admin has

to be one of those two signatures. It still says any two at the end of that sentence. So it says in that order, but it still only says any two of the following officers. So I know people are trying to move forward on this, and if it works, and maybe I look to some more experience on the dais there, but would it need to be broken down to say, part one is it needs to be signed off by the VP Finance and Admin and one other of these officers and maintain that whole list, and then have a secondary portion that says in the absence of the VP Finance Admin, and then any other two officers can be done, and then list those folks again, or reference that list.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Is this clear? Chris?

MR. CHRISTOPHER ALAIN (Ottawa): Chris Alain, Vice-President, Finance Administration, Ottawa Branch. I like exactly what Nathan said because that's the spirit of what I was trying to capture as well.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): The gentleman at the back.

MR. HAARIS GILANI (York): Haaris Gilani, York. I think that the previous commenter made the same point that I was going to make. There's, I think it's a logical inconsistency that would be, it's not on the screen anymore, but I believe it would be resolved by removing

from 19.12 the wording after the word by. So by removing any two of the following officers, it would resolve the inconsistency and like Chris said, it better reflects his intention.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. So Nathan, can you repeat what you're suggesting?

MR. NATHAN LAABS (Ottawa): Nathan Laabs Ottawa Branch. I'm working on the fly here, so, I mean, it makes it quite a bit wordier, and Rick, I'll rely on you to write this out and maybe tweak it as we go here, but to maintain the -- for the first part it would be that any payment method shall be signed off and approved by the VP Finance and Admin, and as well as one of the following officers.

Obviously, we would strike 19.12.1, and then the remaining list would be renumbered, up to and including the Divisional Vice President in the absence of the...

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice-President): Riick Williams, 1st National Vice. So I know exactly what you're trying to get at. If you'll indulge me and give me some, if you trust me, I'll pull it back and I'll capture the spirit of exactly what you're saying. You okay with that?

MR. NATHAN LAABS (Ottawa): Yeah, I'm very much okay with that.

--- Laughter / Rires

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Joe?

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Divisional Vice President, Atlantic): Joe Blanchard, Divisional Vice President Atlantic. I'm just going to throw this out here. This amendment was put on the floor today to allow for everyone across the country to be able to not have to use cheques. That was the purpose. So we're now fixing a problem that doesn't exist. So we can continue to amend the language that we don't have an issue with, that has functioned for years, that we already have existing internal controls, policies, procedures, and regulations that prevent these things.

Where the purpose of the amendment was to allow everyone to use e-transfers and not have to use cheques.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Ed.

MR. ED LA MARCHE (Vancouver Island): Ed La Marche, Vancouver Island. I just wanted a point of clarification on 19.1 to cheques, direct deposits, or e-transfers shall be signed or approved by any two. How does one get two signatures on an e-transfer? Thanks.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice-President):

Rick Williams, 1st National Vice-President. We actually did a test with that, so you need two approvals. You can set up e-transfers so that in order to be able to send the e-transfer, you have to have two officers that approve the e-transfer. Although it's not a signature, it says any payment method shall be signed or approved as part of the amendment, so that's where that would fit in.

Therefore, be it resolved to amend 19.12 to read, and I'll put it on the screen here in a moment, I just need it in front of me to read it.

"19.12 Any payment method shall be signed or approved in the following order by any two of the following officers.

19.12.1, National Vice-President Finance & Administration, and one of the following officers.

19.12.2 National President

19.12.3 1st National Vice President

19.12.4 2nd National Vice President

19.12.5 in the absence of the National Vice-President Finance & Administration, any two of the officers identified in Articles 19.12.2 through 19.12.4 may sign off on payment.

19.12.6, Divisional Vice President in the absence or incapacity of three of the four officers mentioned above."

And I'll actually edit that line so that it makes a little more sense now.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Okay, thank you. We have it up on the board again. Chris, can I have you just have a look at it? Does this -- Oh, Nathan, Chris? Okay. Can we have a seconder? Do we have any questions? Joe.

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Divisional Vice President, Atlantic): As I read this, does this not -- if I'm reading this right, and George, tell me if I'm wrong, Joe Blanchard, Divisional Vice President, Atlantic, as it would practically happen, the National Vice-President Finance Administration is present it is them and one other, that's great. And in their absence, there will be three signatures?

That's how I read that.

So the top section says two of the following, dot, dot, dot, so one's missing. And then the bottom one says in their absence, any two can replace them, so that makes it three.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President):

No. Where do you see that?

MR. GEORGE RONTIRIS (Parliamentarian): George Rontiris, your Parliamentarian. I don't read it that way, Joe, I think it's clear.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Are we ready for the question? All in favour, raise your booklets. Thank you. All against? The resolution -- the amended resolution has passed.

Resolution #65 (as amended) – Passed

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Wait for it. Rick Williams, 1st National Vice President. The National Office would like to withdraw Resolution 66.

Resolution #66 – Withdrawn

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): We have to go back to 64. Jean-François?

MR. JEAN-FRANÇOIS CHARTRAND (Montréal): Can we have 30 minutes to think about it?

--- Laughter / Rires

--- Applause / Applaudissements

M. JEAN-FRANÇOIS CHARTRAND (Montréal): Jean-François Chartrand, section Montréal. On retire la résolution 64.

Resolution #64 – Withdrawn

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale) :

Merci.

--- Applaudissements / Applause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Well thank you very much for a very productive day. It's going to be a nice short one tomorrow. But before I let you go, I wanted to make sure that you all remember that you need this ticket. You need to bring it to the registration table, which will be right outside here between 5:15 to 6:00 – 5 to 6. Then there's the procession walk to the event with a full buffet for an hour and a half. The buffet is going to be open, and then you can stroll around the museum because the museum has been bought out for our event.

I would also like to take a moment to thank all of you that have placed your names on the boards. For those of you that will have elections, I wish you all good luck.

I will close out by thanking the Constitution Committee for their diligent work --

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): -- and guiding us through all these resolutions. So thank you. Have a great evening.

Oh, we have a hand up here.

MR. NATHAN LAABS (Ottawa): Nathan Laabs,

Ottawa Branch. I'm sorry. I was just hoping we might have some insight on what tomorrow might actually look like since all of our resolutions have been resolved, with the limitations on when the elections can actually take place. Do you have an idea of what tomorrow will actually look like? Are we going to be able to start this stuff earlier than anticipated, or is the morning all quiet?

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): No, no. We're going to open the session and hold the elections like we would. Then we're going to have the announcing of the next convention, presentation of that branch. We'll collect the ballots tomorrow. Then we'll have our lunch because we have a beautiful lunch planned back upstairs on the terrace. Then you'll be free to go if we get through all the elections before lunch. Sounds good?

UNKNOWN: And an update on the collective agreement?

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Pardon me?

UNKNOWN: And an update on the collective agreement?

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): We can surely give you some details.

Thank you.

Have a good evening.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

--- Whereupon the Convention adjourned at 3:33 p.m., to resume on Thursday, July 23, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. / Le coongrès est ajournée à 15 h 33 pour reprendre le jeudi 23 juillet 2026 à 9 h 00

Whistler, BC / Whistler (C.-B.)

--- Upon commencing on Thursday, July 23, 2026
at 9:02 a.m. / l'audience débute le jeudi
23 juillet 2026 à 9 h 02

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Good morning, everyone. Hope you had a good evening last night. Nice to see your smiling faces. Yesterday, or the past two days, to me has been very, very productive. I think we've implemented resolutions that will shape the future of the Association. So thank you for your participation, for being respectful, and for hanging in there for the past two days. Thank you.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Today is a big day. It's election day. So we're going to start this morning with the elections. But before we do, I will ask that you please place your cell phones on vibrate or silence. I'm just going to do that because it would be bad if mine rang. Again, your ballot books will be very important today. So hopefully you all brought them in. You have them ready to utilize.

During the votes, we will close the doors, so if anybody steps out during a vote, you can't come in until the vote has been finished. So hopefully you took the time this morning to use the facilities and take a breath of

fresh air before coming in.

Okay, so I think we're ready for roll call. Mr. Williams, roll call.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, First National Vice President.

ROLL CALL

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): I do want to say thank you folks for your patience and if I got any of your names wrong, I do apologize. I did my very best.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Keith Cross, I apologize. Keith Cross. There he is. Thank you.

ELECTIONS

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Okay. Our next step, we're going to go through the elections of each office. Each office shall be called and completed before the next office is called. And let's start with the National President. A round of applause for Rick Williams. Acclaimed.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Next, First National Vice President, Rich Dinon. Acclaimed.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Second National Vice President, Dana Le Blanc. Acclaimed.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): The next position is the National Vice President, Finance and Administration. We have two names up on the board. We have Christopher Alain and Andrew Watts. The candidates have three minutes to speak. If they would like to.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams, President-elect.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): So a couple of things about the elections we have to make sure that everybody is aware of. First of all, if you leave the room, you don't come back in. So please stay in your seats. Make sure that you use the ballot that is going to be called out. That is very important.

The candidates will have three minutes to speak or they can also elect to have their nominator or seconder speak on their behalf.

So, again, those are two very important rules, though. Do not leave the room because if we see you coming back in, your vote will not count. We'll be monitoring the doors.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Joe?

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (Divisional Vice President, Atlantic): Joe Blanchard, Divisional Vice President, Atlantic. When are the doors locked? Is it during the vote only or is it from now on?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Rick Williams -- I'm not even sure how to announce myself now.

--- Laughter / Rires

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): The doors will not be locked, first of all. That's a safety hazard, but they will be monitored and they will be from the point of when the election is called. So you will be able to come and go when the vote is over. However, if you're not in the room when the vote begins, you don't get to come back into the room. Clear? Okay. Travis?

MR. TRAVIS SHALLA (Ottawa): Travis Shalla, Ottawa branch. What if, hypothetically, you were an idiot and left your ballot upstairs in your room? Could you go get it right now in a theoretical scenario like that?

--- Laughter / Rires

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Yeah, you should probably hurry.

MR. TRAVIS SHALLA (Ottawa): Thank you.

--- Laughter / Rires

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Oh, my God.

MS. DANA LE BLANC (2nd National Vice President): We outed some people.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Can you look to your right and your left. Are we missing anyone in the room?

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Did you hear the bell? They asked me to ring my bell. I was going to sing and then I said, oh, no, everybody's going to leave. Okay, so let's get started. Chris Alain, would you like to speak? Yes? Perfect. You have three minutes. You can speak from your seat.

MR. CHRISTOPHER ALAIN (Ottawa): Hello everybody, thank you very much.

Bonjour chers membres. Hello fellow members. My name is Christopher Alain. Wow, what a beautiful place! Thank you to the Pacific Division for hosting us at such a spectacular location. I also want to say thank you to everyone at National APOC office for all the hard work that went into making this event possible.

I'm here today to discuss my candidacy for the position of Vice President, Finance and Administration at the National APOC office. To begin with, my qualifications. Currently, I'm the Vice President, Finance and Administration at the Ottawa branch. I'm on the Standing Committee of Finance and have conducted three national audits. This has given me an inside look at the job and I'm confident that I can fulfill my obligations in this role. And recently, they've been outlined in the 12 points from the job description that we voted on yesterday, and I feel comfortable with that.

I have a Bachelor in Business Administration. I also have a Master's in Business Administration, an MBA. I'm currently elected to the Pension Advisory Council, and I represent all 45,000 active members of the Canada Post Pension Plan. I have a strong financial and investment background, having previously worked as a high-value financial advisor for CIBC Bank. I have significant sales and service experience, and I can type at 45 words a minute.

--- Laughter / Rires

Beyond my experience, something that I believe is very important is to be able to represent all members of our association in whatever language that they choose. To this effect, je vais continuer en français.

J'ai récemment représenté le groupe des ventes dans le cadre d'un grief et j'ai apprécié cette expérience de défense des intérêts des membres. Des changements importants s'annoncent pour Postes Canada et je souhaite continuer à soutenir tous les membres.

Si je suis élu, je veux participer au conseil de vente et au conseil de service. Dans un premier temps, je veux me familiariser avec les processus en place, puis j'ai l'intention de chercher des moyens à les améliorer. Je veux potentiellement utiliser des logiciels de comptabilité et de gestion de dépenses pour accomplir ces améliorations.

Finalement, je veux avoir une gestion rigoureuse de nos finances en toute responsabilité envers vous, les membres. Merci et j'espère pouvoir compter sur votre soutien aujourd'hui.

So switching back to English, I recently represented the sales community in a grievance and I enjoyed the experience of standing up for members and I want to continue to do so. If elected, I intend to participate in both the sales council and the service council. Now we all know that significant changes are coming to Canada Post and I want to be a part of the group that supports and protects all members.

If elected, my first order of business will be

to fully learn the system and understand the processes currently in place and then it's my intention to look for process improvements. I'd like to potentially leverage new accounting software and expense processing software that can facilitate my duties.

Finally, I plan to have a firm hand on the distribution of our finances who is accountable to you, the members. Thank you and I would appreciate your support today.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Merci Chris. Andrew Watts, are you interested? Joseph? Joe. I never call him Joseph.

MR. JOSEPH BLANCHARD (N.B. West Regional): Good morning, everyone. It's my pleasure today to nominate Andrew Watts, the Vice President, Finance and Administration.

I've had the privilege of working with Andrew for fifteen years. During that time, we've had lots of good times and a lot of challenging ones, and I've come to know the quality of the person that is Andrew. If I had to describe him in one word, it'd be integrity. But integrity isn't something you can put on a resume. It's not something you see when you hold up a piece of paper. It's what people don't see. It's what people see in the

decisions you make when no one's looking. It's about being honest when the answer isn't popular. It's about being fair. It's about treating people fairly. It's about following through on your commitments. Over the past fifteen years, this is exactly what I've seen Andrew do.

But this job isn't just about character. It's about choosing someone with the experience to protect APOC's finances and provide us all with the accurate, timely information so that we, all of us in this room, can maintain the members' finances and manage them responsibly. For 13 years, Andrew has sat on the Finance Committee. He wasn't simply a member, however. He was integral in the change in that committee from what it once was to what it is today. He was one of the people that rolled up their sleeves and helped design the financial controls to help protect our finances right now. These controls didn't happen by accident. They were built by people who understood the importance of accountability, transparency, and responsible stewardship of our members' funds.

Andrew was integral in this work. The strong internal controls that we have today to keep our members' funds safe are part of his legacy. Whether win or lose today, that will always remain. This experience matters to the Vice President, Finance and Administration because Andrew wouldn't be starting from scratch. A successful

candidate needs to understand how our financial systems work, why those controls exist, how they are put in place and continue to strengthen them. And Andrew's already been doing this for more than a decade.

I know there are good candidates out there, but I believe this role requires someone with the judgment the Delegates can trust, the experience we've already seen, and whose integrity is beyond question. After knowing Andrew for 15 years, I can say without hesitation, he's exactly the person I want in that role. He's earned my trust. I hope he can earn yours too.

But these aren't just words. I have every confidence, every confidence, he will continue to serve our organization with honesty and integrity, and I hope all of you feel the same. If you are interested and believe that, please give Andrew your vote. Thank you.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you, Joe. Joe is a seconder speaking on Andrew's behalf.

Get your ballot books out. Here is how we're going to do it. Right down the middle here, we'll go to the boxes, the booths over here. At each of the booths, I would ask that a member of the nomination committee be there to receive the ballots. Do we have the boxes for the

nomination committee? Perfect. And from this side you will go to the booths over there. You go behind the booth, write the candidate of your choice, fold, hand it over to the nomination committee member who will put it in the box. Then there will be a count.

Now I get to tell you what ballot. Number one. Le numéro un.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Okay. We'll wait for Kelly to get back, and then once Kelly is at his booth, we'll invite you to line up and cast your vote. Please go ahead.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Can everybody take their seats once you've voted, please? S'il vous plaît prendre vos places une fois que vous avez voté. On a deux personnes qui ont quitté la salle.

MR. GEORGE RONTIRIS (Parliamentarian): Ladies and gentlemen, with respect, this is an election. With respect, we have rules. The doors get shut. This isn't a merry-go-round. On, off, on, off. No, you're here to stay until the elections are over or we take a break. We're not asking for too much. Just sit down, try to be quiet, let us do the count, we'll tell you who the winner is, and please don't leave. We've already had two people just walk

out. My apologies for being so stern, but…

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you, everyone. Here is the tally of the votes. Chris Alain 75, Andrew Watts 41. Your next VP, Finance & Administration, Christopher Alain.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MR. GEORGE RONTIRIS (Parliamentarian): Just as an aside, this is not a party. For those of you that have left the room, had something other than a clear count been determined and there was a tie, you would not have been able to vote for the second time. So please, respect the rules. The doors are closed. As of now, the doors are closed. Nobody can leave until we're done. Thank you.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Now we move to divisional vice presidents. Pour Atlantic, Joe Blanchard, by acclamation.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente Nationale): Pour Québec, Daniel Larouche par acclamation.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente Nationale): Pour Montréal, Keinsy Lainé par acclamation.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President):

For Rideau, Laura Dorey by acclamation.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): For Huron, Bill Hatesohl, by acclamation.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): For York, Dawn-Marie Gayle by acclamation.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): DVP Midwest, we have two candidates. Gord Ell and Suzanne Schmidt. We will take this election in a separate room, as per the changes we made over the past two days. All delegates, please follow George and myself to the Montebello room. Thank you.

In the meantime, for the people that are in the room, please stay in the room, so when we do come back we won't have to try to bring you all back in. Thank you.

--- Pause

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): The DVP vote for Midwest has been completed. I will wait for the president to announce the results. However, we would like now the Foothills group to follow me out the back and I'll take you to the room and we will run the votes.

It's the president's job to announce the

winner, so I'll wait for the winner to come in. I am the President-elect, not the president in this ceremony.

--- Pause

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Ladies and gentlemen, after second consideration, because our newly elected first vice-president did inform me that we do run it from the Atlantic to the Pacific, the new DVP elected for Midwest is Gord Ell.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Hello? Can everyone take their seats, please? We have everyone in the room. We had three candidates for DVP Foothills. Andrew Hvarregaard withdrew his name from the board. We had Sam Haymour, five votes, and Karen Taylor, six votes. Your Foothills DVP is Karen Taylor.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): The next office is Pacific, Ronda Ludwig, acclaimed.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Now I heard some people wanted to go to the washroom, so we're going to take a 15 minute break.

--- Upon recessing at 10:22 a.m. /

Suspension à 10 h 22

--- Upon resuming at 10:43 a.m. /
Reprise à 10 h 43

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): May I ask everyone to take their seats, please.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you, everyone, now we will move to the alternate DVPs. Alternate for Atlantic, Gail Briffett. Congratulations.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente Nationale): La suppléante pour Québec, Nadine Naud, acclamée.

--- Applaudissements / Applause

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente Nationale): Le suppléant pour Montréal, Jean-François Chartrand, acclamé.

--- Applaudissements / Applause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): The alternate for DVP Rideau, Don Forsythe. Acclaimed.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Alternate DVP for Huron, Susan Barnes. Acclaimed.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Alternate DVP York, Jennifer Dimeo. Acclaimed.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Alternate DVP for Midwest. We will have to leave the room. We have Vikas Joshi and Sheryl Dewey.

Once again, I will ask all other delegates and alternates to stay in the room while we do the vote.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Can everyone take their seats please? Thank you everyone. The alternate DVP Midwest. Cheryl Dewey had three votes and Vikas Joshi had five votes. The next alternate DVP for Midwest is Vikas Joshi.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): The next office is alternate DVP for Foothills. We'll need an election, as we have two members, Garret Anderson and Sam Haymour. Let's leave the room and go to the Montebello for a vote. In the meantime I ask the other delegates and alternates in the room to stay seated. Stay here.

Thank you.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Can everyone take their seats please? Tenez vos places, s'il te plaît.

The election was held for the alternate DVP,

Foothills. Garret Anderson, four, Sam Haymour, seven. The new alternate DVP for Foothills is Sam.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Next office up for election is Alternate DVP, Pacific. We have two candidates, Angela Burnett and Sebastien Bernier. Please, we'll have to leave the room and go to the Montebello office for the vote.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): May I ask everyone to take their seats, please? The vote for the alternate DVP, Pacific has taken place. Angela Burnett, 6 votes. Sébastien Bernier, 13 votes. The new Alternate DVP, Sébastien Bernier.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Now we are going to vote for the three members of the Standing Committee on Finance. Followed by three alternates, and all at the same time, I'm told. We have Kristina -- I'm not going to say the last names because I'm going to offend you guys. We have Andrew -- Rick, do you want to pronounce the next one for me, please? I'm sorry.

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Ikezu - have I been saying it wrong?

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): My

apologies, Ikezu. Keith, Nadine, and Abraham. Kristina, would you like to speak or will you have someone speak on your behalf?

MS. LISA PETERS-SCHMIDT (Calgary): I've just prepared a quick note here. So hello, bonjour. My name is Lisa Peters-Schmidt of the Calgary Southern Alberta Branch. I have nominated my friend and colleague, Kristina Jursenaite, our Branch Treasurer, for the Finance Committee. Kristina has been our local treasurer for the last seven years.

She has an eye for detail, outstanding financial literacy, and the skills for open and honest dialogue with all of our colleagues, including the last year she's been working on French. I've watched her practise daily, so she's had her notes here in the room, and she'd be excited to speak with any of our French colleagues throughout the rest of the day, so please stop by and say hi.

She will ask and answer the hard questions. I've seen this firsthand. She's not afraid to speak up and say something when something needs to be said, and respectfully. I would like us all to benefit from Kristina's skills and knowledge, and I would like her to have the opportunity to expand her experience within the Association as a member of the Finance Committee. Again, I

think we would all win.

Please consider voting for Kristina Jursenaite for the Finance Committee. Thank you for your time.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Andrew, will you speak on your behalf?

MR. ANDREW WATTS (Halifax): Good morning folks. I'm Andrew Watts, Halifax and Districts Branch. I'm running again for the Finance Committee. I ask you for your support. Based on my 12 years with the committee, I have done a number of changes within our processes. I'm not afraid to hold conversations with regards to deviations. And I have been consistent with my asks or my work done on the Finance Committee. As Joe had mentioned and spoke earlier on my behalf, my integrity speaks volumes. And I ask you to take that into consideration and support me through this. Thank you.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Ikezu?

MR. IKEZU ONYEKWUCHA (York): Good morning. Bonjour. Sorry, that's the only French I know how to speak but I will learn. Colleagues, friends and fellow members, thank you for granting me the opportunity to present myself for election to the role of Finance Committee member. APOC

is an association built on trust, trust that the dues we contribute are managed responsibly, transparently, and in the best interest of all members. That trust must be earned through strong oversight and sound financial governance. That is why I am seeking your votes for election as a member of the Finance Committee.

I bring 28 years of experience as a chartered accountant. I qualified in 1998. I'm a fellow of the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Nigeria. My first degree is in Business Administration and Management. My MBA is in Marketing. I hold a postgraduate diploma from George Brown College, Toronto, Canada. I am a certified Business Analyst. I joined Canada Post as a supervisor in 2018.

My experience includes international exposure to financial auditing, hands-on operational experience managing trade marketing budgets and execution, and maintaining balance sheets and producing income and expense reports. Throughout my international career, I've been accountable not just for budgets, but for calculated and guaranteed results, ensuring that financial decisions translate into real value.

I am pleased to share that I currently serve as a member of the York Branch Audit Committee, where I review financial practices and help ensure accountability at the

local level. I currently hold and have been in this position for the last five years. I bring professional and practical experience to the table, which gives me understanding of how financial decisions impact day-to-day execution. This combination -- audit, finance and operations -- allows me to look at issues not just from a compliance perspective, but from a real-world results-driven lens.

If elected, I'll focus on three priorities. First, transparency that informs. Second, strong independent oversight. Third, disciplined stewardship. I'm seeking your support to safeguard national APOC financial integrity, advance transparent reporting, and uphold the trust of our members across Canada. I bring experience, independence, and a proven track record of accountability, and I'll put that to work for you.

If I'm elected, I will collaborate with other elected members of the National Executive Finance Committee and the executive and ensure that all our members can remain proud of and bequeath a legacy to those who will come after us. I respectfully ask for your votes. Thank you.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you. Keith?

MR. KEITH CROSS (Greater Niagara): Good morning, everybody. My name's Keith Cross, Greater Niagara Branch. I thank my colleagues for nominating me to put me in this position. I've been with the corporation for 30 years, and people say, why did it take so long to get to APOC? Well, there's family and there's other responsibilities that I had before I could come and put all my energy in APOC stuff.

So with that being said, I'm a TCO. During COVID, we were very busy, a lot of payments going on. They gave me the responsibility to check the checkers before we paid our contractors. So there was a lot of checking numbers and STRs and a lot of other things.

With that being said, outside of Canada Post, I have my own portfolio. I have my own real estate that I deal with, and I check the checker there. And I think that working with Chris and the other members that get voted in, we're just there to help support and make sure the integrity and the respect and teamwork is put in. And that's everything. Thank you so much.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Nadine?

Mme NADINE NAUD (Québec): Hi everybody. Bonjour tout le monde. I will speak in French because it's going to be too long in English for you. Mon nom est Nadine Naud. Je suis technicienne en administration en position de finance. J'ai eu mon entreprise pendant 7 ans en restauration. Je suis chez Postes Canada depuis 22 ans. Je m'occupe des finances de ma section depuis plus de 10 ans.

J'ai été sur le dernier comité des finances, le comité permanent, le dernier mandat de trois ans. Puis je pense que j'ai apporté beaucoup au comité. Je vous demande un dernier mandat pour trois ans parce que par la suite, ça va être la retraite. Je suis quelqu'un d'intègre, avec beaucoup de rigueur, puis je trouve que la stabilité au sein du comité, c'est important aussi, parce qu'il y a beaucoup de choses nouvelles quand tu arrives à apprendre.

Je vous demande votre appui s'il vous plaît. Merci.

Mme RACHEL LAFONTAINE (Présidente nationale) : Merci.

--- Applaudissements / Applause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Abraham?

MR. SAM HAYMOUR (Edmonton): Sam Haymour, Edmonton Branch.

I nominated Abraham for a reason. Abraham has -- he's an accountant. He's been an accountant for over 20 years. He has a degree in accounting from Grant MacEwan University in Edmonton. He is all about financials and accounting integrity; that's what he has. And he promises to do the job under the general acceptance of accounting principles. And he is willing to contribute, share his knowledge, and learn as he goes day to day. So I hope you vote for Abraham.

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Perfect. We will utilize ballot seven, purple, and we will ask that you indicate three candidates on your ballot.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): We'll divide the floor in two like we did the last time. Please go line up in front of a booth. Thank you.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you everyone. Please take your seats. I'm ready to announce the votes. The three top delegates, or nominees, for the Standing Committee on Finance are Ikezu, 81 votes, Andrew, 72, Kristina, 71.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Your alternates, Nadine Naud, 70, Keith, 33, and Abraham, 23.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Congratulations to the Standing Committee on Finance.

We need a motion to destroy the ballots. And a seconder? All those in favour? Thank you. All those against? Thank you very much.

So we're thinking that we'll just keep going. We don't have that much longer to go through lunch, and then we'll break once we close convention. So before I do move on to the next agenda item and swearing in of our newly elected people, I would like to congratulate the members who have been elected to serve.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): And on behalf of everyone in the room, I wish you every success and -- as this is a huge responsibility of leading our association over the next three years. I would also like to thank the candidates who allowed their name to stand for election. Putting your name forward is an act of service to our membership. It's also your willingness to lead and contribute deserves our respect and appreciation.

Thank you.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

VENUE SELECTION FOR 2029 CONVENTION

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Now Matt, if you can put up the presentation for the 2029 convention. The video, please.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MR. JEFF MacINTYRE (Prince Edward Island): Good afternoon, everyone. Jeff MacIntyre from the PEI branch. We have a little video to show everyone, and I hope that you enjoy it.

--- Video presentation / Présentation vidéo

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. GAIL BRIFFETT (Newfoundland & Labrador): Good afternoon, Gail Briffett, Newfoundland & Labrador branch. We wanted to play a little trick on everyone here today just because some people can't keep their mouth very quiet.

--- Laughter / Rires

MS. GAIL BRIFFETT (Newfoundland & Labrador): So first off I'll probably apologize to the interpreters because they may not be able to keep up – or go with the twang. But it is what it is. We'd be more than welcome to -- we're very excited to have the chance to host 2029 convention in St. John's, of course.

We're a very proud province -- I mean, everybody else is here, I know that -- but Newfoundland is very unique. We got our own way of life. We have our own way of thinking. Well, we're known as the friendly province, right? We want everyone to come and have a time, have an experience.

It's a beautiful province. We've got lots of ideas of different things that we can do. We have some family type things that we have in mind. We've already approached a couple of hotels there. We don't have a whole bunch of hotels that could probably fit us all, but it is what it is.

But we're very excited. We have a lot in mind. My colleagues from the Atlantic Division have been certainly giving me a great hand, getting some ideas on paper. We're very excited to have the chance to let the National office know what we have in mind and see what we can do going forward.

But, you know, come on down Newfoundland. You know this is going to be a time and we're going to have a lot of fun. So hopefully we have your support for hosting 2029.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you very much, Gail.

Is everybody excited?

SWEARING IN

So we'll move into the swearing of the new elected officials. Please, national officers, DVPs, alternates, Standing Committee on Finance, come to the front for the swearing in.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

--- Officers sworn in / Assermentation des dirigeants

--- Applause / Applaudissements

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Thank you everyone, let's take our seats. So just before closing off the session, I'd like to do a few housekeeping.

The gala. We have the cocktail -- well, the gala will be held in this room. We'll have the cocktail just on the outside at 6 p.m. Registration will be before 6 p.m., let's say between 5 and 6 o'clock. After that, we will move into the room at 7:00, and we will have our dinner, and then dance, and we celebrate.

Babysitters. Babysitters will be here, Lyn? Did you want to explain it for me? 5 p.m., just out here, so please come down with your children. They will take them to one of our rooms -- which is the room we held the elections in -- and they will have an evening with their babysitters; crafts, and fun stuff for the kids.

Tomorrow, departure day. Please follow the instructions that were sent to you regarding the transportation and the schedule. Please be in the lobby at least 15 minutes before your departure with all your things. Buses will leave on time. Don't forget to go to the washroom before you leave. And a reminder, it's a three-hour ride.

So I wish you all safe travels as you return back home and all the success to you in the next three years. We do have a request from Pacific Coast Branch -- the DVP will be speaking to one of our members that was an executive of the Pacific Coast that has recently passed.

TRIBUTE TO STEVE GUSTARD

MS. RONDA LUDWIG (Divisional Vice President, Pacific): Ronda Ludwig, Pacific Coast DVP. Please bear with me. I have written some notes, so I'm going to try and stick to them as best as I can.

So, myself and the Branch would like to honour the memory of a fallen member, Steve Gustard. Steve was President of the Pacific Coast Branch for 12 out of the 15 years he served APOC. At times, as some of us knew, he could rule with an iron fist. But those of us who knew him knew he was soft in the heart. Steve left us last December, and it was way too soon for his family, his friends, and all of us at the Pacific Coast and in the

Pacific region.

He will never be forgotten as he holds a special place in all of our hearts. So I'm going to ask you to have a moment of silence for Steve.

--- Moment of silence / Moment de silence

Thank you all. If you knew Steve, he would have been here and him and his wife would have been one of the volunteers here today because that was the first person we thought of when it came down to volunteers; his name was already on the list. So… we will all miss him and we all loved him. Thank you.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

CLOSING REMARKS FROM THE NATIONAL PRESIDENT

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): So, before we close off the session, I have a few closing words.

Over the past three days, we've had debated resolutions, we adopted a budget, we elected leaders, and made decisions that will shape the future of APOC.

While we have not always shared the same views, we have demonstrated what makes this association strong. A commitment to democratic debate, respect for one another, and shared dedication for the members that we represent.

Before we adjourn the 21st Triannual Convention, I would like to recognize those that this is their final

convention. Can I have you guys stand up, please? Is anyone here in the room... This is their last convention.

Your years of service, your leadership, mentorship, and commitment have helped build this association. We know that today. On behalf of all of us, thank you for everything that you've done and contributed to APOC. We wish you good health, happiness, and every success in the next chapter. Thank you.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): For me today is especially meaningful. This convention marks my last days with you as National President. Thank you.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): It has been one of the greatest honours of my career to serve the Association and its members. I have had the privilege to work alongside exceptional National Executive members, DVPs, volunteers, National office staff, and my Canada Post colleagues. Together we have faced challenges, celebrated successes, and always worked towards what we believed was the best interests of our members.

I leave this role with confidence in the future of APOC. Our association is strong because of the people in this room. Together, and now the newly elected National

Executive Committee will continue to build on that strength.

Thank you for your trust you placed in me, for your support over the eight years that I was at National office, and for the friendships I've always treasured.

Serving you as the first female National President has been a privilege --

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): -- has been a privilege that I will carry with me for the rest of my life. I look forward to watching APOC continue to grow and succeed in the years ahead. Before I declare the 21st Triannual adjournment, I want to say thank you to each and every one of you that have come up to me in the last couple of days and said all those kind words. I appreciate you. I wish you success and all the best. Thank you.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT UPDATE

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Now, does anyone want to hear about negotiations? Do you want to go ahead?

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): We can't give you the details of the negotiations.

--- Boos / Huées

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President):

See, this is how I start my presidency.

--- Laughter / Rires

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): Here's the things that we can tell you. We can tell you that there's going to be a communication coming out no later than Tuesday that is going to give you the full details on everything that's happened. What we can also tell you is that these are some of the best material gains that we've had in the better part of 20 to 30 years. So it's something to look forward to.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): We can tell you that we are confident that you will be satisfied not only with the material gains but with the salary increases that of course we bargained in as well. We had the benefit of being able to bargain after the CUPW signing. So it gave us a really good opportunity to be able to work with the company to strive towards reinforcing the Association and the gap between ourselves and CUPW. It's important. We heard it from you loud and clear and we acted.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MR. RICK WILLIAMS (1st National Vice President): What I can tell you as well is once that communication comes out, you will also receive follow-up communications

shortly thereafter. One will be the communication that gives you the details on how we're going to be conducting the vote, the ratification vote, thank you. And we'll also have a communication that comes out that gives you the details on the virtual tour that we will be doing to truly give you the very minute details of everything that we've had in gains.

We've tried to capture some of the best and biggest gains in our communication, but honestly, I can tell you that with everything that's included in this round of bargaining, that it's best to be heard from us because there's a lot. So we're really confident that you're going to be satisfied, and we are. We are certainly happy to have come out of it with what we did.

So stay tuned for the details, they're going to be coming shortly. I wish we could give you something more right now, but in the tradition of making sure that that information goes out accurately to all members at the same time, we ask your patience just a little bit longer. And we also have to give the grace of the company to let them know that we're going to be releasing that information as well.

So that's where we are. Stay tuned with the APOC website because all of that's going to be going on there, and we look forward to hearing from you in the tour.

Thank you, folks.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Okay. One last request. We would like to meet with the new executive committee after lunch for a quick discussion in the Montebello room. It shouldn't be long; we just would like to meet with you if that's possible.

--- Pause

MS. RACHEL LAFONTAINE (National President): Ballot books can be destroyed.

With that, I adjourn the 21st National Convention.

--- Applause / Applaudissements

--- Whereupon the conference concluded at 12:45 p.m. /

Le congrès se termine à 12 h 45