

Re: Motion about investigation report

ME COLLINS [mecollins64@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, August 04, 2016 6:36 PM

To: André Picotte; Nathalie Pothier

Cc: Pamela Scholey; Jacob Porter; Nick Giannakoulis; Emmanuelle Tremblay; Claude Vezina; Isabelle Borré; Alexander Butler; Neil Burron; Chantal DesRochers; Johanna Hove; Ann Kurikshuk-Nemec; Sean Maguire; Stephen Mullen; Simone Powell; Jessica Squires

Oh, okay... but **without having seen them, we will not know what those might be?**

I understand what you mean now, but not how we'd go about addressing it in advance of seeing it?

Did we not discuss redacting 'sensitive' information such as the name of the person who's employment

circumstances were discussed? **I'm not sure what else we can do, without appearing to be selectively with-holding information?**

Original Message

From: André Picotte

Sent: Thursday, August 4, 2016 6:20 PM

To: Maureen Collins; Nathalie Pothier

Cc: Pamela Scholey; Jacob Porter; Nick Giannakoulis; Emmanuelle Tremblay; Claude Vezina; Isabelle Borré; Alexander Butler; Neil Burron; Chantal DesRochers; Johanna Hove; Ann Kurikshuk-Nemec; Sean Maguire; Stephen Mullen; Simone Powell; Jessica Squires

Subject: Motion about investigation report

Parts of the statement of facts and parts of the recommendations could pose a problem in view of the possibility of leaking outside CAPE.

From: ME COLLINS [mecollins64@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, August 04, 2016 6:11 PM

To: André Picotte; Nathalie Pothier

Cc: Pamela Scholey; Jacob Porter; Nick Giannakoulis; Emmanuelle Tremblay; Claude Vezina; Isabelle Borré; Alexander Butler; Neil Burron; Chantal DesRochers; Johanna Hove; Ann Kurikshuk-Nemec; Sean Maguire; Stephen Mullen; Simone Powell; Jessica Squires

Subject: Re: Motion about investigation report

Hi Andre,

I don't think we recommended releasing the entire report? The motion from the June 15th mtg says 'the NEC, once the vote has been held, shall make the findings of fact and the recommendations, with the NEC's vote on those recommendations,....'

So, under the terms of the existing motion, the main body of the report wouldn't be released? Which is the concern?

My apologies for the back and forth, but I'm afraid I am misunderstanding something?

Thanks,

Maureen

Original Message

From: André Picotte

Sent: Thursday, August 4, 2016 6:04 PM

To: Maureen Collins; Nathalie Pothier

Cc: Pamela Scholey; Jacob Porter; Nick Giannakoulis; Emmanuelle Tremblay; Claude Vezina; Isabelle Borré; Alexander Butler; Neil Burron; Chantal DesRochers; Johanna Hove; Ann Kurikshuk-Nemec; Sean Maguire; Stephen Mullen; Simone Powell; Jessica Squires

Subject: Motion about investigation report

Good evening!

The special meeting during which the motion was adopted was held before I received the advice from Peter Engelmänn. **The motion as written provides that the entire report should be disclosed to our members, and that could potentially create some legal problems, especially if the report is leaked outside CAPE.**

Of course, if the NEC members believe that the motion is fine, they could simply hold the special meeting upon receiving the report and the recommendations, as per the motion adopted.

See you!

From: ME COLLINS [mecollins64@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, August 04, 2016 5:45 PM

To: André Picotte; Nathalie Pothier

Cc: Pamela Scholey; Jacob Porter; Nick Giannakoulis; Emmanuelle Tremblay; Claude Vezina; Isabelle Borré; Alexander Butler; Neil Burron; Chantal DesRochers; Johanna Hove; Ann Kurikshuk-Nemec; Sean Maguire; Stephen Mullen; Simone Powell; Jessica Squires

Subject: Re: Motion about investigation report

Hi Andre,

I am not understanding why we would need to 'reconsider' the motion. Doesn't that fact that we've already had a special mtg, discussed this and made a decision respect the legal advice?

Am I misunderstanding something?

Thanks,

Maureen

Original Message

From: André Picotte

Sent: Thursday, August 4, 2016 5:25 PM

To: Nathalie Pothier; Maureen Collins

Cc: Pamela Scholey; Jacob Porter; Nick Giannakoulis; Emmanuelle Tremblay; Claude Vezina; Isabelle Borré; Alexander Butler; Neil Burron; Chantal DesRochers; Johanna Hove; Ann Kurikshuk-Nemec; Sean Maguire; Stephen Mullen; Simone Powell; Jessica Squires

Subject: Motion about investigation report

Good evening!

My request for a special NEC meeting was about determining before the filing of the report what part of the report should be disclosed to our members. My request was based on the advice of Peter Engelmann. The objective of the meeting would be in fact be to reconsider the motion adopted. So, a special meeting of the NEC is still required before the special meeting on the report itself.

See you!

Re: Motion about investigation report

Nick Giannakoulis

Sent: Thursday, August 04, 2016 7:18 PM

To: André Picotte; Nathalie Pothier; Maureen Collins

Cc: Pamela Scholey; Jacob Porter; Emmanuelle Tremblay; Claude Vezina; Isabelle Borré; Alexander Butler; Neil Burron; Chantal DesRochers; Johanna Hove; Ann Kurikshuk-Nemec; Sean Maguire; Stephen Mullen; Simone Powell; Jessica Squires

Thank you for the clarification Andre. I'm not in support of revisiting the motion that we passed in June. I just saw Sean's note requesting a special NEC meeting, and we'll probably have to leave it at that, if there is support for this meeting ahead of the findings and recommendations being tabled to the NEC, most likely not until well into September now.

Take care everyone!

Regards

Nick Giannakoulis

National Vice-President / Vice-président national

Canadian Association of Professional Employees / Association canadienne des employés professionnels

100 rue Queen Street, 4e stage / 4th Floor, Ottawa, ON K1P 1J9

Tel: (613)316-9923

Fax: (613)236-6017

Re: Motion about investigation report

VP Ann Nemec [ann.nemec.cape.acep.503@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, August 04, 2016 11:07 PM

To: Alexander Butler

Cc: Isabelle Borré; Nick Giannakoulis; Jessica Squires; Claude Vezina; Pamela Scholey; Simone Powell; Chantal DesRochers; Emmanuelle Tremblay; Johanna Hove; Stephen Mullen; Sean Maguire; Jacob Porter; Nathalie Pothier; Maureen Collins; Neil Burron; André Picotte

Hi

I too do not support a meeting before the report or when too many NEC members are on vacation.

Also, jumping through hoops to prevent the report going outside of CAPE is not our priority. What is our priority is restoring order and peace at National and hopefully on the NEC. We need only take reasonable care to redact certain names.

I know my colleagues at STC are very anxious to get the investigation results and vote on the Removal ASAP.

Ann Kurikshuk-Nemec
Vice-President
CAPE Local 503 &
National EC Director

On Aug 4, 2016 19:59, "alexanderbutler79" <alexanderbutler79@gmail.com> wrote:

Sean I will be receiving the report momentarily (I hope) so timing is really bad if this needs to be done before. Which I do not understand why and frankly have big issues with having this meeting now. A motion was passed that specifically allows us once we see the report to see what can be disclosed and not to the membership. To have a special NEC meeting now while several people are on vacation to effectively change a motion already made I do not like.

My guess is that Andre s looking to establish some kind of disclosure policy that would be generic beyond the current complaint (and I hope this is the case and just motions specific to the petition complaint). As Maureen has restated and I had said previously how are we to decide what is or is not to be disclosed without seeing content first?

So in short I obviously do not support this special meeting and moreover have serious issues with calling a meeting when many people are on vacation to revisit a motion that was already passed.

Cheers

Sent from my Samsung device