

Table of Contents

The “New” Central: A Rover’s Rant or <i>Requiem</i> For a Vanished Service	1
Our New CUPE Representative	3
James Fyshe – CUPE 932’s Lawyer	4
Union Says NO to Contracting Out Short-term Medical Coverage	4
Scheduling of Hours	5
Retirees	5
Performance Appraisals	5
Problems with Performance Reviews	6
Performance Reviews: Why Bother Then?	7
Our Employer: What Is Their Real Intent?	7
What Can You Do to Protect Yourself?	8
A History of Organized Labour and Health & Safety	8
Rumours.....	9
“Our” Bulletin.....	10
Thinking of you.....	10
Kudos.....	10
2011 General Membership Meetings	10
CUPE 932 Representatives.....	10

The “New” Central: A Rover’s Rant or *Requiem* For a Vanished Service

After 18 months of dust, noise, and lugging book-trucks between floors on account of the frequent breakdown of the book-hoist, Central finally opened its new first floor doors to the public on Thursday, December 9th.

After much anticipation, the first general impressions of the major reconstruction were of awe and amazement...so much light...so much space...and so much white! With an army of staff newly schooled in the art of *Wal-Mart™* style greeting, customers were overwhelmed as they tried to run a veritable gauntlet of eager helpers, who were poised to pounce on each and every possible inquiry. But now, two months have passed, and while staff is still struggling to find their routine, and patrons are literally recuperating from shock from using the self-check stations, we’ve had time to recover from the frantic opening and reflect on where we are, how we got here, and what will be our future.

The new first floor features rows of books displayed not by classification... not by theme... not by genre, but by jacket colour. Of course, on opening day, and in keeping with the season, red and green were the colours of choice. Non-fiction DVDs are now shelved in random order, creating a browse-only collection, which has led to great frustration for both staff and customers



intent on locating a particular item. Many of us are still questioning whether or not HPL intends on abandoning the Dewey system outright – not such a preposterous idea, when we consider how many other facets and foundations of library science have gone the wayside in favour of the misconstrued notion that corporate American commercial practices are wholly applicable in Canadian public libraries.

Individuals with walkers and canes found the space challenging, and in their fatigue searched for seating to rest on. Unfortunately, much of the furniture supplied for the new “landscape” is not accessible to individuals with mobility limitations, and those who finally managed to sit down, found it to be a humiliating struggle to get back up. Whatever happened to the idea of cushioned seating? We can only conclude that the lack of comfort was either an intentional design element aimed at

discouraging patrons from relaxing at the library, or the unanticipated consequence of purchasing seating from the famous design house of *Preparation H™*. Needless to say, many of our regulars, who used to occupy the lobby seating, have moved into the food court, in search of more comfortable surroundings.

Unlike the opening of Turner Park, no new collections were ordered for Central’s grand debut. Instead, staff was asked to locate “newer” books with “fresh” looking covers to put on display -- a task, which given the current purchase policy, was tantamount to looking for the proverbial needle. Notably, the hunt for materials was especially upsetting for staff, given the recent weeding campaign, which resulted in stacks and stacks of books being earmarked for the book sale. While much of the weeded material was indeed dated and worn, staff has seen very little new material arrive to fill the gaping holes in what used to be a sizeable and comprehensive collection.

A “Revitalized?” Central Library...	
Gains	Losses
Computer Commons, DVDs, <i>Playaways™</i> , Video Games	Periodicals and thousands of books
\$150,000 annual maintenance cost for self-check systems	Central subject floor budgets
A new Director Position	4.94 Full-time Equivalent positions
Second Manager for the Digital Technology Department	
More part-time positions	
Punitive work schedules	Staff consultation and direction
Tiny Wall-mounted LCD Monitors	Signage

The Central library was once the reference hub for the entire system. It was a place where anyone could undertake in-depth research without requiring a paid membership to a college or university library. Professionals had access to valuable industry research tools, the do-it-yourselfer could find well-illustrated manuals and project guides, and specialized collections like the Career Resource Centre and the Urban Municipal collection provided one-stop access to materials, which despite all the ballyhoo of our electronic offerings, remain difficult to locate. But

sadly, the new Central has become little more than a popular collections branch. What was once a six-floor research library teaming with highly-trained subject specialists is now a four-floor (soon-to-be less, if rumours are correct) video store and gaming arcade staffed by “Rovers”, who are expected to know everything about anything. Clearly, the current administration would prefer

that we not reminisce about how things were; and that we forget all of our proud memories amassed since 55 York Boulevard opened its doors in 1980 – could this be why the building’s original dedication plaques are absent from the first floor?

In our race to compete with Chapters and Indigo, we have embraced many of corporate America’s ideals...it’s now all about statistics and perceptions; but what about our commitment to literacy, discovery and learning? What happened to our role as heralds for the history and knowledge of our community? Yes, circulation statistics are important, and they have increased since the introduction of current feature films on DVD; however, the provision of entertainment materials and popular fiction cannot be our *raison d’être*. Hamilton, in particular, with its high rates of poverty in the centre core still requires a strong commitment to literacy and education.

Staff is not alone in lamenting the disappearance of our collections. Despite the prominence afforded to the DVDs, *Playaways™*, and computers, a commonly asked question by many Central patrons is “Where are the books?” – a clear sign, that many people feel that Central’s first floor “marketplace of ideas” does not quite fill their basket.

A recent press release issued by HPL stated that, “everything is going high tech.” While that may be true, technology, in and of itself, does not necessarily result in better customer service, especially when the high-tech gadgets are funded by the elimination of service points, personnel, collections and programmes. The reported benefits of self-check is that it will allow staff to “help patrons find information; recommend books, *etc.*,” however, there are fewer books left to find, and many of the databases that, which have been introduced to replace them, offer inferior results and are challenging to navigate even for staff. Perhaps “*la technologie pour la technologie*” is indeed a fitting philosophy for an institution where the words “education” and “learning” are wholly absent from its mission statement and core values.

The frontline staff gets the brunt of everyday complaints. It’s no wonder. They, like the rest of us, are struggling with a computer booking system that presents information in a confusing manner, a needlessly complicated, high tech photocopier/printer, two different copy card systems, random and unorganized displays of material...in other words, total confusion. Instead of rolling our eyes in response to the negative comments – the Pavlovian-type reaction witnessed in some Managers -- we suggest that the public be encouraged to submit comment forms if they have concerns. After all, our Chief Librarian, in a recent interview on local radio, did encourage the public to make their comments known, with the assurance that he would read them.

For the last two years, our management “Team” insisted that there would be no job-loss on account of the increased automation. We were assured that by freeing staff from repetitive and mundane tasks, the

new self-check system would not only allow more time for assisting patrons, but would lead to exciting new responsibilities and great “opportunities” for staff. Clearly, those assurances were nothing but “doublespeak,” as we continue to experience a shrinking staff-complement as a result of redundancy -- it seems that every time a full-time position is vacated; it is replaced by part-time positions.

The operating budget for 2011, which was just recently presented to the Library Board, noted that 4.94 FTEs were cut from the staff complement in 2010 in order to “limit the increase in the operating budget.” Interestingly, that same budget also includes a new Director’s salary, a second Manager position in the Digital Technology department, and an annual maintenance cost for RFID to the tune of \$150,000.

One final note on our “near” future: it’s interesting that there has been no contingency for salary and wage increases in 2011 -- administration must be pretty confident that the city employees will not get any increases. But, what if they do? Will management come to us again with the threat of more job cuts to pay for the negotiated increases? Is this yet another symptom of smugness?

Our New CUPE Representative

Joan Hanton replaces Gerry McDonnell as our local CUPE Representative.

Joan has been a National Representative with the Canadian Union of Public Employees for 10 years. Having moved to the Niagara area in January of 2010, she represented locals in the City of Ottawa as well as Cornwall. Joan has also been the Library Workers' Coordinator for OMECC (Ontario Municipal Employees' Coordinating Committee) for almost 5 years, and accordingly, she is very familiar with the concerns of library workers, and trends in library service.

Joan comes from a strong union background whereby her father was a municipal worker for an eastern Ontario township for 25yrs (CAW), her mother a health care worker in a nursing home for 27yrs (Steelworkers)

and her sister-in-law a representative for the Steelworkers union for almost 20 yrs. One can only imagine the conversations that were had around the dinner table in their family home!

Joan also loves to facilitate workshops for CUPE. Empowering members through education is the key to members being able to fight for their rights as workers in their workplaces!

We are very pleased to have Joan as our new CUPE representative.

James Fyshe – CUPE 932’s Lawyer

Jim is one of 26 lawyers in the province who has been granted certified specialist status in labour law by the Law Society of Upper Canada. In his practice, Jim has had experience with various areas of labour law, both federally and provincially, across the country. He provides services to a number of locally based trade unions in Hamilton and in several other areas of the province of Ontario. Jim has appeared before all labour and human rights tribunals and at all levels of the court, including the Supreme Court of Canada.

Union Says NO to Contracting Out Short-term Medical Coverage

In the June newsletter, we reported that the employer was in the process of designing a “simplified” Medical Certificate form, which would be required for *all* illness- or non-occupational injury-related absences of 10 days or more. To date we have met with them on numerous occasions to discuss the matter. The employer’s final attempt at a solution was to request that the Union agree to a trial, whereby the management of short-term medical coverage would be contracted out to RBC Insurance. After consulting with both our lawyer and CUPE representative, the Union has rejected the employer’s proposal.

At the heart of the issue is the employer’s refusal to abide by the terms of the Collective Agreement, which stipulates both the type and scope of medical

documentation, which an employee must submit, either during, or prior to returning to work, following an illness or non-occupational injury.

The language in the Collective Agreement makes it quite clear that the *Medical Certificate* form is not required until such a time that a staff member on short-term sick leave is ready to return to work. It is the Union’s position that until then, a doctor’s note indicating that the staff member is currently under the care of a physician is sufficient.

Following an unsuccessful attempt at persuading the Union to accept a revised *Medical Certificate* form – our lawyer determined the proposed form was too intrusive and potentially problematic for members -- the employer proposed that the Union agree to contracting-out the management of short-term medical coverage to RBC Insurance on a trial basis. Although, under normal circumstances, the employer can contract-out management activities as they see fit, Union approval was required in this case, since RBC Insurance cannot use the current negotiated *Medical Certificate* form for the submission of claims.

Given that job security remains one of our top concerns, we were immediately suspect of the proposal, since we also do not want to see our non-union friends lose their jobs as a result of out-sourcing. However, if we had any doubts remaining as to the merit of the employer’s proposal, these doubts were put to rest following a joint presentation by the employer and RBC Insurance. After learning about RBC Insurance’s medical forms, staff doctors and field personnel (a.k.a. spies), who are used to verify the legitimacy of staff illnesses, we were extremely hesitant about participating in the proposed trial. Not even the employer’s extolment of the possible benefits of access to private medical services would convince us that this was a good idea. Our apologies, but as proud Canadians we remain fundamentally opposed to a two-tier health care system.

Despite all our forebodings following the presentation, the Union, nonetheless, agreed to prepare a list of questions and concerns for both the employer and RBC

Insurance, and to discuss the matter further. With the exception of a curt response to only one of our questions, we received no replies. What we did manage to intimate from the response to our query was that the use of RBC Insurance would not be limited to illness- or non-occupational injury-related absences of 10 days or more; but, that staff would be required to submit claims to RBC for all illnesses, including those with duration of 4 days or less.

Clearly, the Union was not going to accept these terms, so at the December Joint Labour-Management Committee meeting, we informed the employer that we were rejecting their proposal.

Get ready Brothers and Sisters, because we can guarantee you that the contracting-out of short-term medical coverage will figure prominently in the 2013 negotiations.

Scheduling of Hours

With the reduction of the staff complement and reopening of Central's first floor, schedules for some departments have been radically revised leaving staff with more time alone on desk, working three consecutive weekends, and inconsistent break relief. When management initially proposed the revised schedules, the Executive expressed its concerns that they were, not only, punitive and un-workable but also demoralizing. Management's response has been to sarcastically dismiss our criticisms and to demonstrate blunt indifference to our recommendations. We have filed a grievance, but have placed it in abeyance while we prepare a plan of action...we'll keep you posted.

Retirees

We wish to extend best wishes to our friends and colleagues who have retired since December 2009.

Kathryne McDonald, Joan Fletcher, Phyllis Morris, Catherine Bryden, Debbie Millar, Elizabeth Toohey, Maria Cicero, Caroline Moran, Clara Chan, Allan Wilson, Susan Snow, Patricia Dent, Maureen Gal

Performance Appraisals

During the October 2010 Joint Labour-Management Committee meeting, the Union raised a number of issues related to the annual staff performance appraisals. We were primarily concerned with management's adoption of a five point Likert scale, and questioned its suitability as an objective measurement of staff performance, particularly, in light of the fact, that three out of five appeared to be the *defacto* grade for the vast majority of staff. While management stated that they were quite pleased with how the staff fared, they did agree to revisit the ratings system.

It now appears that management has indeed heeded our recommendation, as they have done away with the five point Likert scale, and have adopted a description-based ratings system instead. While this represents a step in the right direction, we are hopeful that management will also follow our advice and inform themselves of some of the more modern-day approaches to employee performance evaluations in use by other institutions.

Most Human Resources experts agree that the practice of annual performance reviews or performance appraisals is an antiquated one. A product of 1960s management, the annual performance review appealed to employers, whose staff was primarily engaged in piece-meal work and where interaction between managers and staff was extremely limited.

Although the current school of thought regarding annual performance reviews is that they do little to foster productivity and improvement in employees; many employers continue to conduct this type of review primarily as a means of either determining promotion and merit pay increases, or justifying disciplinary action and termination. Given, that the concept of merit pay is non-existent at the Hamilton Public Library, and that one of this management's mandates would seem to be the continued erosion of the staff compliment, one cannot help but consider what might be the 'real' motivation behind the recent

implementation of performance reviews by our employer. However, without engaging in speculation as to what our employer's intent really is, this article will present some of the more common objections against the use of annual performance reviews in the modern working environment. Lastly, this paper will offer some valuable advice as to how employees can protect themselves against unfair and unjustified ratings by employers.

Problems with Performance Reviews

In the modern team-based workplace, annual performance reviews have proven to actually undermine workplace harmony, since employees whose performance is under review often become defensive; and disagreements between employees and managers about contribution and performance ratings can create conflict ridden situations that can fester for long periods of time (Heathfield, 2010).

Apart from the impact on staff morale, another common complaint against the annual performance review is that, too often, the managers conducting these reviews do so improperly, resulting in reviews that do not adequately reflect employees' work. Even in those rare cases where a supervisor makes a conscious effort to suppress personal bias they may have against an employee, there is no question that the lack of objectivity on the part of the reviewer is the primary reason for unrealistic and fallacious reviews.

The Goal Setting and Performance Review form currently in use at the Hamilton Public Library is typical of most performance reviews in that it is based primarily on subjective judgments and opinions instead of true quantitative and qualitative measures. For example, our employer uses the following rating categories (in addition to other components):

Communication – Demonstrated skill in communicating, presenting information, writing, consulting and active listening

Judgment – Analyzes and evaluates situations and issues, recognizes problems, anticipates

consequences and develops and presents appropriate courses of action

Leadership – Effectively relates to and engages others in the achievement of objectives, advocates for the role and mission of the library within the community and demonstrates team leadership, credibility...

The problem with rating a concept such as "skilled communication" is that one manager's idea of what constitutes "skilled communication" can differ dramatically from that of another manager. Moreover, how does one even begin to objectively evaluate intangible concepts like how well an employee "anticipates consequences", "evaluates issues" and "effectively relates to others"?

Another concern with annual performance reviews is that they tend to focus on an employee's most recent performance and ignore the contributions that the individual made throughout the year. Let's face it; most managers have short memories when it comes to remembering an employee's successes, yet these same managers possess elephantine powers of recall when it comes to citing an employee's transgressions. Accordingly, critics of annual performance reviews have coined the term "horns or halo effect" to refer to a manager's classifying an employee's performance for the year by the employee's most recent success - or lack of success (Heathfield, 2010).

Unfortunately, most performance reviews do not make allowances for a manager to seek feedback from other managers and co-workers regarding an employee's performance. Given the proximity and similarity of their jobs, fellow employees have a much more realistic and concrete understanding of one another's productivity, making them far more suited to judge performance than many managers, who on account of all their "meetings" are absent more than they are present in their departments. While collegial feedback can be scary for employees, its collection would unquestionably result in much more objective, fair and accurate information about an employee's performance.

A far more effective form of performance review is an employee's review of their immediate supervisor, since poor employee reviews all coming from one department are much more indicative of the efficacy of the manager than the employees. According to Kevin Burns, a Canadian Corporate Attitude & Culture Strategist, employees are only ever going to perform as well as their managers allow -- lousy managers lead to unhappy, disengaged, poorly performing employees who, ironically, tend to receive a poor review as a byproduct of their bad manager (Burns, 2010). Burns writes,

...people don't leave their jobs. They leave their bad managers. So, it would stand to reason, purely by the numbers, that the department with the highest staff turnover and lowest performing employees would have the worst manager running it. Conversely, the department with the lowest turnover and the highest performing employees would likely be run by the most engaging manager (Burns, 2010).

In one of the pivotal works on the subject of performance reviews, namely, *Get Rid of the Performance Review!: How Companies Can Stop Intimidating, Start Managing--and Focus on What Really Matters*, Samuel A. Culbert is entirely circumspect of the efficacy of annual performance reviews, and views them as one of the most insidious, most damaging, and yet most ubiquitous of corporate activities. So what is Culbert's solution? Managers must quit being lazy and spend the time reviewing and conversing with staff on a continual basis.

Performance Reviews: Why Bother Then?

Given the multitude of problems associated with annual performance reviews, why then do so many employers continue to implement them? For Burns, the answer is a simple one; "organizations do them because it's what they've always done -- which certainly doesn't make it right. It just makes it old" (Burns, 2010). He writes,

Too many managers are lazy in speaking regularly with their employees and they depend on a few sheets of paper once per year to be the one time

that there is any meaningful dialogue between manager and employee. The truth is that an employee's performance review is more indicative a manager's effectiveness at communication and coaching. The only upside to a formal review is that it forces "absent" managers to communicate with their people -- which, on the downside, can create animosity based on a poor review because of poor management (Burns, 2010).

However, for Daniel Lublin, a Toronto-based Employment Lawyer, the principle justification for the continued institution of annual performance reviews is a legal one. Many employers view the annual review as a crucial legal requirement in the event that they wish to divorce themselves of an employee. While poor performance reviews often constitute key evidence supporting an organization's allegations against, and concerns with, an employee, they seldom make for a *prima facie* case for dismissal and must usually be accompanied by a larger paper trail documenting an employee's wrong doings. In other words, one or more poor performance reviews is generally not sufficient grounds for an organization to justify the termination of an employee. There is case law in Ontario, which supports this understanding.

In 2000, The Ontario Court of Appeal affirmed the decision in *Shah v. Xerox*¹ that the company's intolerable treatment of the employee through the use of unsubstantiated and unfair performance evaluations constituted constructive dismissal (Payne & Viric, 2001). In employment law, constructive dismissal occurs when an employee resigns because their employer's behaviour has either become so heinous, or made life so difficult that the employee may consider himself/herself to have been fired. In such instances, the employee can sue for wrongful dismissal.

Our Employer: What Is Their Real Intent?

Clearly, the trend amongst modern and innovative employers is to abandon the traditional annual performance review in favour of an on-going review process; unless as Lublin alludes to, the intent behind

¹ [2000] O.J. No. 849 (C.A.).

the adoption of such an antiquated practice is ultimately disciplinary in action. Obviously, we remain hopeful that the employer's goals are noble, and that they continue to acknowledge that there is room for improvement in how they conduct staff performance reviews. In the meantime, we strongly suggest that staff members take note of some of the advice that follows.

What Can You Do to Protect Yourself?

For employees who have received poor evaluations, we recommend that they build a supportive documentary case, which could be used to challenge a negative or unjust performance appraisal. Then, should legal confrontation ensue, there is an ability to contest any harmful inference drawn by a series of poor appraisals (Lublin, 2008). For employees faced with a negative performance appraisal, Lublin offers the following advice:

- document your response to a challenged appraisal in writing and request that the response be placed alongside the appraisal in your human resource file;
- performance appraisals should be remedial in nature. Point out that the standards expected are not objectively reasonable, are beyond your capability, and were never communicated, or suitable instruction and supervision were never given to assist in meeting those standards;
- remedial, negative performance appraisals usually contemplate corrective discipline, which may eventually support the employer's case for dismissal. Therefore, ask for sufficient time and support to correct any alleged deficiency. State that all of the employer's concerns cannot be addressed without assistance and while you are expected to simultaneously maintain a regular workload;
- express bewilderment if there is any marked inconsistency with previous positive appraisals or accomplishments and point out any historical or recent achievements;
- state that prior to the appraisal, the alleged shortcoming was never verbalized, and, as far as

understood, you were just following the procedures or protocols in place;

- note if there are any perceived inequities in the evaluation process of other less-scrutinized employees;
- where specific actions or events are chastised, state that your version of the events was not solicited before these criticisms were leveled and then document this version regardless if it is sought or not,
- ask for clarification and examples, in writing, regarding any aspects of the appraisal that are misunderstood or that may potentially be challenged. Point out that the explanation first provided was so vague that the underlying concerns can't possibly be addressed;

And finally, if you have any questions or concerns, contact your Union Steward or member of the Executive.

Works Cited:

- Burns, Kevin. 2010. "Performance Reviews: Why Scrapping Them Makes Sense" in *The Corporate Culture Turnaround Blog*. August 15, 2010. Accessed August 16, 2010 from <http://burnsattitude.wordpress.com/2010/08/15/performance-reviews-why-scrapping-them-makes-sense/>
- Heathfield, Susan M. 2010. "Performance Appraisals Don't Work: The Traditional Performance Appraisal Process" in *About.com: Human Resources*. August 7, 2010. Accessed August 16, 2010 from http://humanresources.about.com/od/performanceevals/a/perf_appraisal.htm
- Lublin, Daniel. 2010. "Performance Appraisals can cut both ways" in *Metro*. October 20, 2008. Accessed August 23, 2010 from <http://www.metronews.ca/toronto/comment/article/128415--page0>
- Payne, Janice and Virc, Sonia. 2001. "Constructive Dismissal – Ontario Court of Appeal Finds Managers Unreasonable" in *Executive Employment Newsletter*. Volume VIII, No. 1, 2001. Accessed August 23, 2010 from [http://www.nelligan.ca/e/pdf/Constructive_Dismissal_\(JBP\).pdf](http://www.nelligan.ca/e/pdf/Constructive_Dismissal_(JBP).pdf)

A History of Organized Labour and Health & Safety

The earliest health and safety law was an Act of the British parliament in 1788. It set a minimum age of eight years for chimney sweeps and required a weekly bath. As industry grew throughout the 18th and 19th centuries,

job-related injuries, sickness, and death grew right along with it.

Unions and people of conscience found this unacceptable. Starting in 1802, the parliamentarian, Sir Robert Peel introduced a series of Acts – mainly regulating child labour. These led in 1878 to an expanded Factory and Workshop Act.

Six years later, in 1884, similar legislation came to Canada, in the form of the Ontario Factories Act. This law resulted from the public outcry, led by unions, over the number of workers injured and killed in the workplaces of Ontario's fast-growing manufacturing industry. Its major effect was the removal of women and children from the workplace and some minor regulation of working hours. The Act also set rules for workplace sanitation, machinery guards and fire prevention, and it appointed inspectors to enforce these rules.

The new law was qualified in many places by the words – reasonably practicable – a significant loophole, which helped employers to escape most of the costs that a safer workplace might otherwise require. Not unexpectedly, the law's standards were inconsistent and ill defined. In addition, their enforcement was uncertain, since wide discretion – to enforce, or not to enforce – was given to the inspectors, who were usually drawn from managerial ranks.

Injured workers either relied on the goodwill of the employer for sick pay or other compensation, or they sued for damages. Worker suits appeared to have a fair chance of success, because the courts continued the common law practice of medieval England. Further help came from the law, the Employers' Liability Act, passed in 1886, which placed the burden of proof in such disputes on the employer. However, the courts frequently allowed employers to escape liability.

The early 1970s marked the beginning of a new era in Ontario workplaces. Workers were becoming aware of health and safety problems. Labour made significant progress in its long fight for laws that gave workers power over their own health and safety.

In 1972, the Province of Saskatchewan, headed by a labour friendly NDP government, passed the first Occupational Health Act in Canada. It quickly became a model for the other provinces. The legislation combined all health and safety activities. It required joint committees in all workplaces of 10 or more workers. It established for the first time in Canada, workers' rights to know, to participate and to refuse unsafe work.

With the introduction of Bill 139 in 1976, Ontario took its first small step into the modern era. The Bill became the first Health and Safety Act. It allowed the Minister to form a joint health and safety committee. It gave workers, for the first time, a work refusal right, and protection against reprisals.

In the early 1980s, in response to growing demands for a right to know, a federal/provincial Task Force was formed. It recommended the creation of a national information delivery system for workers. The system was to consist of warning labels on containers, material safety data sheets (MSDS), and a workers education program. Bill C-70 came into force in 1988.

Over the years, union pressure of various kinds, combined with effective political action has brought about most of the improvements to workplace health and safety law.

The Hamilton Public Library has a Joint Health & Safety Committee. Members of the Committee represent both the employees and the employer. If you have any questions about your health or safety at work, please do not hesitate to contact a member of the committee.

Rumours...

We have heard that many members of the "Dream Team" have been seen doing the "thumbs up" and high-fiving each other with self-congratulatory glee each and every time they enforce a new policy. Before you know it, they will be "high-tening," doing the "up high...down low...too slow routine," and possibly several other variations of adolescent bonding rituals. Members! We need your help! Please forward any remedy to contain

their smugness before their contagion spreads. (FYI: antibacterial lotions have proven to be ineffective)

There have been some little peeps that CAM (Technical Services) is coming back home to Central. Can this be true? After all these years of thoughtful utilization of space on the 5th floor as a dumping ground for discarded furnishings and equipment, and thousands spent on couriers and delivery, has Admin finally inhaled a breath of sensibility. Time will tell. Until then members, we won't hold our breath until the smoke from all the powwows clear, and our chiefs are ready to speak.

Staff at Central has been very curious about the presence of strange men walking through the stacks and subject floors with measuring tapes, floor plans and computers. We've heard wild speculation that with all the weeding, staff reduction, dismantling of shelves, and computer removal from the 4th floor, that there is a "master" plan to compress the collections to three floors. We expect vociferous denials but in a year from now don't be surprised to hear "we told you so".

"Our" Bulletin

This is "our" Bulletin...a forum to communicate and share comments and ideas openly and freely. If you would like to submit an article, express an opinion, comment on what you have read or would just like to share, please email our Secretary, Laura Lamb.

Thinking of you

Being part of a union includes offering and receiving support, encouragement and congratulations from one another in both good times and bad, but especially in times of need. So, if you know of a co-worker, who has experienced an illness, the birth of a baby or the passing of a loved one, let us know, so that we may send them a little something that shows we are thinking of them. Please forward this information to Carol Harding, Treasurer.

Kudos

The Executive strongly believes in giving praise where praise is due. As such, we wish to congratulate administration on its current inclination towards hiring long-serving HPL employees for senior management positions, and for reinstating the past practice of promoting Union staff to management. While we are curious as to what prompted this sudden change in *modus operandi*, we remain, nonetheless, quite pleased.

2011 General Membership Meetings

January 31	May 18
February 23	June 22
March 23	September 28
April 27	October 26
November 23	November 23
December 21	

All dates are subject to confirmation.

Remember that the March Membership meeting will take place at Acclamation Bar & Grill in downtown Hamilton. This will be a catered event, so please R.S.V.P with Laura Lamb, Secretary.

CUPE 932 Representatives

Anne Spadoni, President
aspadoni932@gmail.com

Ron Gabor, Vice President
gaborrs@msn.com

Bridie Howell, Vice President – PT
bhowell932@gmail.com

Birute Visockis-Cassidy, Vice President
bvisocki932@gmail.com

Cheryl Smith, Chief Steward
cvsmith932@gmail.com

Carol Harding, Treasurer
charding932@gmail.com

Laura Lamb, Secretary
llamb932@gmail.com