

OPSEU GRIEVANCE FORM PRINTED FROM WEB SITE

OPSEU#

(ASSIGNED AT ARBITRATION)

LAST NAME		FIRST NAME		MEMBERSHIP #	
ADDRESS/ STREET			OPSELL		
OWN/		POSTAL CODE	REGIONAL OFFICE FILE	#	
HOME EL: ()		DLIC		EXT	
CLASSIFICATION/ CLASSTITLE					
OSITIONTITLE		SECTIONOR			
MPLOYEDBY IINISTRY/COLLEGE/BPS					
ORKLOCATION					
OWN/		POSTAL CODE			
ETTLEMENT DESIRED					
IGNATURE F GRIEVOR			DATE		
AME /SIGNATURE OF TEWARD			TEL: ()	
AME /SIGNATURE OF OCAL PRESIDENT			TEL: ()	
IANAGEMENT/ FFICIAL		TEL: ()	_FAX: ()	
OO LESMILL ROAD ORONTO, ONT M3B 3P8	TELEPHONE (416) 443-8888	TOLL FREE 1-800-268-7376	TDI or	O 1-800-663-1070 (416) 443-9898	

STATEMENT of GRIEVANCE – Continued

I further grieve that I have been forced into a career decision that I should not have had to make. The unilateral changes to Retiree Benefits made by the employer have put me in a position where I am forced to choose between continuing to work beyond November 30, 2016 and therefore incurring an additional cost of benefit coverage that I should not have to incur, and retiring before December 1, 2016 and forgoing any future full income in order to avoid the cost of benefits as well as any yearly increases. I believe that the employer does not have the right to make this change to the retiree benefits in a unilateral fashion.

The employer is not treating me equally among all other OPSEU members of the last thirty plus years and they have broken the covenant for OPS retirees which all have explicitly understood is a legitimate expectation upon retirement and therefore a major factor in continuing any career in the OPS. Pension and retiree benefits were promoted as good reasons to join and stay with the OPS and for decades, personally and in the OPS as a whole, we watched that promise be fulfilled. The tens of thousands, of current retirees who are not responsible for paying for the benefits that their OPS career has earned for them, are proof that the covenant exists and has properly been honoured.

The changes are the highest form of Bad Faith actions that an employer can make knowing that many long-serving and loyal employees have worked, planned and made major life decisions knowing that the retiree benefits were being provided at no cost and therefore they were able to choose a time to retire which suited their own preferences and needs as well as putting themselves in the best possible position for a fair and hopefully stress free and comfortable retirement. This change has shown that employee loyalty is definitely not rewarded with loyalty on the behalf of the employer.

The failure of the employer to work with all affected parties to determine the scope of the concerns that led to the change as well as the lack of effort to negotiate any course of action that respects those who have several decades of their lives invested in the service of the OPS further exemplifies the extent of the Bad Faith actions they have chosen to take.

I further grieve that the employer, by enacting this unfair and bad faith (as well as potentially illegal) decision has willingly and knowingly put undue stress and hardship on me as I struggle to come to terms on a decision about my retirement. I have been forced to make changes in my life, finances and the lives of my family in order to make a determination on what I would choose to do going forward. I should not have been forced into this position.

"OPSEU members who began working in the Ontario Public Service, the LCBO, and other agencies of the government did so with the understanding that retiree benefits were a part of their overall compensation."

SETTLEMENT DESIRED – Continued

I further wish to be compensated for loss of quality of life (mainly due to increased stress which impacted me at work and at home) and for the affront to my dignity which was precipitated by the actions taken in such a cold and callous fashion.

And any other award that an Arbitrator deems suitable. To be made whole.

"The parties should be aware that, even though the collective agreement is silent about a legal right or obligation, that right or obligation is not eliminated. Indeed, the right or obligation may form part of the collective agreement even in the absence of language. For example, arbitrators have the lawful right to assume that the prohibition against discrimination in Human Rights Codes is poured into a collective agreement even if the agreement does not contain language to that extent. The same principle holds true for other employment legislation, such as Employment Standards and Health and Safety."