

**MAKE YOUR VOTE REALLY COUNT**  
**SEND THE UNIVERSITY BACK TO THE BARGAINING TABLE!**

Let's take a quick look at the "Final Vote summary" **disinformation** that the university sent out to you yesterday.

The university says that a "No" Vote Means that you have chosen not to accept the best the university could offer you." Wrong – it's the **least** they think they can try to **force** you to accept, and the most that they **want** to offer you. They say that the university can "offer no more to avert a potential strike." They could offer lots more – they just don't like sharing. Note that the 2% TMG increases coming in December are only planned for 1 year – count on the amount being higher in subsequent **non-bargaining** years – it even says so in their budget guidelines! They were given no say in new TMG hires not belonging to the Defined Benefit Pension Plan.

Under their "Yes" vote summary they have included such reasoning as "Rates of Pay" and "Other Provisions". These are **NOT** outstanding issues – they have already been agreed to. Incidentally, the rates of pay now being offered are **much** higher and more equitable than those originally offered by the university – **because we bargained for them!** Likewise the enhanced leave provisions for ill family members – **your Union proposed this and bargained for it!** Also the brainchild of your Union was enhancing educational opportunities for our members – who **don't** have PDAs or access to discretionary funds!

As to the issues that actually **are** still outstanding, let's tackle them one by one.

**Pensions**

The only actual promise they can make about the defined benefit pension plan is that the university will meet its commitments **as long as the plan exists**. The law only compels the meeting of obligations – it does **not** compel them to keep the plan, and does **not** prevent them from winding it up.

Their statement that "This is the same pension plan that covers all University managers, faculty, senior leaders and current CAW staff." is true. What they're **not** mentioning is that their managers and senior leaders (whose higher wages make private retirement savings much more feasible) **also** have access to a **Supplementary** Pension plan. At the upper levels of management, there are individually written contracts that provide **ridiculous** levels of retirement compensation. Perhaps if they really need to tweak their spending provisions for the sake of the operating budget, they should first review the outrageous compensation and benefits at the top end – **not** on the backs of our members whose average salary is approximately **half** of the average TMG salary, and a mere **fraction** of those at the top end.

### **Post-Retirement Health Benefits**

Wow – here we go again with “promises” that the university is “committed” to maintaining our benefits. The present administration **cannot** make promises that are binding on any future administrators. Karen Belaire has already left, Peter George is leaving next June...do you think it’s a coincidence that they’ve been so willing to make “promises”? **How** about that “jointly managed” concept “to determine what benefits will be provided, and benefit eligibility based on years of service and **other** factors?” Jointly managed? Who do you guess will have the final say? And what are these “other factors”?

### **Job Evaluation Process**

The university says they merely want to “streamline” the process. **Nonsense, they want to gut it!** The Union Bargaining Team has been trying to come up with acceptable ways to actually streamline the process (which was the intent of the link the university added to their missive) while maintaining as much joint involvement as possible. It has been made very clear that the university does not want joint involvement – we’ve been too successful in achieving fair wages for our members – and that our members do not want to give it up. Who really wants to go back to the Hay system dressed up in a new outfit? The joint system we have in place is the best chance we have of maintaining fair and equitable compensation for our members.

The university is trying to frighten our membership into believing that voting “no” means you will be on strike as of Friday. The Union Bargaining Team has steadfastly maintained the desire and commitment to achieve a fair agreement at the bargaining table.

**VOTE NO & SEND THE UNIVERSITY BACK TO THE TABLE!**