
FACULTY TIMES

A Newsletter of UWOFA

Vol. IX, No. 4

May 2005

Inside...

Notes from Senate, <i>Michael Carroll</i>	3
Nearly 10 Months as V-P, <i>M.J. Toswell</i>	4
Horowitz's Campus Jihad, <i>Bill Berkowitz</i>	5
This Newsletter is Your Newsletter, <i>David Heap</i>	6
The Truth About Copyright Revision, <i>Samuel Trosow</i>	7
Why Part-time Staff Don't Receive Prorated Benefits, <i>Tom Wayman</i>	8

David Heap, *Editor*
djheap@uwo.ca

Faculty Times is an official publication of the University of Western Ontario Faculty Association, published for UWOFA by the Publication & Communication Committee. Signed articles do not necessarily reflect the views of UWOFA.

ISSN# 1206-2529

I'd Like to Look Ahead, But the Rear View Mirror is in the Way.

By Allan Gedalof, UWOFA President

Recently, members of UWOFA received an issue of *Your Collective Agreement* in which I described a number of initiatives underway or about to get underway, all to do with consultations between UWOFA and our administration. In general, I had hoped that those consultations (on benefits, on the new status and governance of Women's Studies, and on the abolition of

mandatory retirement), were all signs of progress in the maturing of our relationship with the administration, indications that we were moving toward a model of co-governance and cooperation. While what comes out of those consultations may yet prove that we're gaining some traction and making some progress, there are equally clear signs that in other areas, we're just spinning our wheels. Here are some quite troubling examples.

Last year, at around this time, Albert Katz was sitting at this same computer, doing what I'm doing now: writing his last *FacultyTimes* column as President of UWOFA. Some of you may even recall that column, titled *L'Affaire de la Note de Service*, archived on the UWOFA website at <http://www.uwo.ca/uwofa/ft/8.3/index.html>. In it, Albert responded to a memo sent to Deans by Vice-Provost Alan Weedon instructing Deans not to offer summer teaching to full-time faculty who had a significant research component in their normal workload, presumably for fear that their research productivity would be compromised. This was done despite the fact that the Collective Agreement is very clear in stating that "A Full-Time Member may hold (a) Limited-Duties Appointment(s) to a maximum of one full-course equivalent across the University in any twelve-month Fiscal Year, subject to the approval of the Member's Dean." Appointments 14 adds: "Such approval shall be withheld if the Dean determines that (an) additional Limited-Duties Appointment(s) would interfere with the Member's ability to fulfil his or her Academic responsibilities as a Full-Time Member."

The Weedon memo went on to suggest that such courses should go instead to non-members of the bargaining unit: graduate students, people from the

community with appropriate expertise, and so on. When we met last year to discuss this problem, we were told that we were taking the memo out of context, and that there had been other exchanges with the deans that made it clear that the Collective Agreement had to be honoured first, before courses might be offered to non-members. Despite that, and despite provisions in the CA that say that teaching should be done primarily by Members, and by the best qualified Members at that (for instance, those with a Ph.D. rather than those without, those with extensive experience rather than those with less), a version of that same memo went out *again* this year. Among the many troubling things about this is the administration's assumption that time taken to do teaching above the normal workload for a department steals time from research, rather than some other part of one's life, and the paternalistic idea that we need someone to make for us the difficult choices of how we will manage our time lest we manage it inappropriately. It's also troubling that such decisions are made pre-emptively, before there is any evidence that taking on such teaching has harmed our research productivity, and that it's assumed that our role as teachers is always secondary to our role as researchers. Further, we suspect that this policy is being inequitably applied across campus. *If you are a full-time faculty member who applied for such teaching and were turned down, please let us know.*

Here's a second example of spinning wheels. For many years now, members have had the right to retire up to ten years before their normal retirement date. The Collective Agreement and the current booklet on the pension plan for members of the academic staff are absolutely clear in setting that out as a right rather than as a privilege that requires anyone's approval. We must give notice in writing to our Deans at the earliest possible opportunity, but not later than April 15th, and even that can be waived. This right, one might reasonably expect, also applies to those who choose to retire one day before their normal retirement date, as we are advised to do by our pension board so that we can unlock a portion of pension funds accrued before 1987. Imagine then the surprise of at least one of our members when he gave such notification, and received a response from Human Resources telling him that he needed the approval of his Dean and the Provost. This would be less troubling, perhaps, might be seen as a simple error, if the same thing hadn't happened in 2001. When that demand was challenged in 2001, the administration responded very quickly with an apology: someone had confused early retirement, which requires no approval, with retirement under the Early Retirement Compensation Plan for Faculty, which does require approval (currently denied in every case), and a retraction was issued. Given that none of the conditions governing the right to retire up to ten years early have changed since October 10, 2000,

why is this mistake still being made? For how long has this mistake been made? Is everyone who informs their Dean that they are retiring early receiving the same inappropriate demand? We have now asked these questions of the administration and await their answers, but once again, *if this has affected you, it would be very useful if you could please let us know.*

My last example concerns our continuing efforts to get for our members the proceeds to which they are entitled from the demutualization of insurance companies in the late 1990s. Without going into painful detail, everyone who was a member of the plan as of January 27, 1998, is entitled to a payment from Sun Life based on premiums paid between 1996 and 1998. Because there were some affected institutions in Canada where the employer was claiming that the payments should be coming to them rather than to the employees on whose behalf or by whom the premiums were paid, no payments were being made while the employers' cases made their way through the courts. Last summer, the Supreme Court refused to hear an appeal by the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology, who had already lost lower court cases in which they were claiming the money rather than allowing it to go to their employees, and the way was cleared for the distribution of the funds. At that point, we, along with other affected employee groups at Western, asked our administration to finally distribute the funds. Through the Unity Group of UWO employee associations, a team of four (David Empey, UWOSA, Bill Lamage, CUPE 2361, Dawn Munday, PMA, and Allan Gedalof, UWOFA) was selected to negotiate that distribution.

At our first meeting with the administration, we were told that the estimated cost of distribution would be \$40 per cheque issued. While that would have eaten up a significant portion of the approximately \$200 due to UWOFA members who were covered as of January 27, 1998 (with more gone because this distribution will be taxable), it would have had a more dire effect on other employee groups where the anticipated share was only about \$55.00 per member. In that scenario, members of UWOSA or CUPE of the PMA might have ended up owing the university money. Happily, at our second meeting, after our protests over this estimate, the administration cost is now estimated to be a little under \$12.00 per person, and we are making our best efforts to reduce that further. This won't enable you to move up the date of your retirement, but we're doing all we can to ensure that as much of this distribution as possible ends up in your hands.

On a happier note, I'm not counting the days to the end of my term yet, although I understand that some former Presidents of UWOFA had already started marking off calendar days by this point. I do, however, now clearly understand why one could say of one's term as president, as Samuel Johnson said of Milton's

Paradise Lost, that no-one wished it any longer. Nevertheless, the signs of change, like those of spring, are strongly evident. This year's UWOFA elections are now behind us, and once again we are all fortunate to have such a strong and committed group of individuals willing to serve their colleagues and the university through their work on UWOFA's Board of Directors and Executive. My congratulations and gratitude go to Kim Clark, who as of July 1st of this year will begin her three-year cycle through Vice-President, President and Past-President, to Bernd Frohmann and Ann Bigelow, who begin their two-years terms as our first elected Secretary and Treasurer respectively, and to the continuing, re-elected and newly elected members of our Board. I am sure that incoming President Jane Toswell has a busy year planned for all of us on the Board, including preparations for and (we hope) a speedy and successful outcome to the collective bargaining that will occur as we near the end of our current contract.

My own term has been marked by good fortune in the terrific support I've received from an outstanding staff, Board of Directors and Executive who have always risen to the challenges that faced us this year. Jane Toswell, who doesn't like me using fulsome and merited adjectives when I describe what she has done for all of us, has been invaluable in many roles, and Albert Katz has been a constant source of sage and sane advice and an outstanding Chair of our very busy Rights and Grievance Committee. Every president in recent times has also had many reasons to be thankful that, whether they are serving in elected positions or not, we have been able to count on Mike Dawes and Al Heinicke to do the many things they do so well on behalf of UWOFA and its members. And no President could come to the end of his or her term without being aware of how much our Administrative Officer, Jane Laforge, and our Professional Officer, Lauren Tremblay, do for UWOFA and its members, of how extraordinarily well they serve us, and of how much we rely on them for this association to function at all. Both cheerfully shoulder heavy loads and put up with the antics of often-idiosyncratic members, and I am deeply grateful to them for making my job possible. We've also been fortunate this year to be able to hire two new and very welcome part-time staff members, Administrative Assistant, Micki Izzard, who started in February and whose wide range of talents and experience we are still coming to learn and appreciate, and Researcher Andrienne (Andria) D'Zura, who will begin to tackle a long list of projects when she starts work at the beginning of May. With their arrivals, UWOFA will finally have staff support more commensurate with what is common in other faculty associations of our size.

Notes from Senate

By Michael Carroll

In February President Davenport added to his remarks on the collaboration between UWO and General Dynamics Canada by suggesting that if "one attempts to sort companies by whether they are good or bad, or those who trade with a country that is on a list of countries that oppress human rights, then faculty members would be forbidden to collaborate with many of the major companies in Canada." In other words, or so it seems to me: since collaborating with the corporate sector is a given, we shouldn't sweat the small stuff, like whether a company is manufacturing weaponry that is being sold to governments with a history of human rights violations.

On the same topic: The *Alumni Gazette* is a glossy publication whose apparent purpose is to make people feel good about Western – which would explain why six different feature stories in the most recent issue have the same theme: how UWO researchers are working to ease pain and suffering by developing new approaches to cancer, cancer treatment, etc. The obvious implication: easing pain and suffering is something that a university should be doing. Fair enough, but the flip side of that, I would have thought, is that we would want to insure that UWO research does not *contribute* to pain and suffering – and doing that, it seems to me, would require us to do something we don't currently do: develop ethical protocols for evaluating military research.

For several years now, a "Survey of Student Engagement" has been administered to students at U.S. universities. Last year UWO and several other Canadian universities also participated. The results, presented at Senate, were striking: UWO ranked below the U.S. and Canadian averages on most measures (which probably means the story won't make the *Alumni Gazette*!). I asked if the President had any explanation for our poor performance. He did: it's all because U.S. schools are better funded. I pointed out that this didn't quite explain our poor performance relative to other Ontario universities and also asked for a more detailed breakdown of the data. Among other things, that breakdown suggests that UWO students spend about the same number of hours per week preparing for classes as other students, spend fewer hours working for pay and more hours socializing. One way to interpret this might be to suggest that Western really is a bit of a party school, but it doesn't affect time spent studying because most students have sufficient access to financial resources to cover a large portion of their educational costs.

Senate also considered the Budget. As usual, it's a fairly opaque document. Partly this is due to the proliferation of various special-purpose funding programs variously identified as UPIF, RISF, WIF, ECF, etc. Since the precise criteria for making all these special allocations has never been made clear (in the 3 years I have been on Senate), I suspect that the programs function mainly to give the Admin the authority to shift money around. In any event, because these programs are reported separately, it also means that it's hard to get a feel for the big picture. Some things are clear: Women's Studies is finally getting some tenure track positions, new Canada Research Chairs are being funded, and the VP-External is spending nearly half a million to create mini-me's (technically called "Faculty specific development/communications officers"). Faculty salaries as a percentage of the operating budget has (apparently) remained constant over the last few years - though in response to a question the Provost indicated that faculty salaries as a percentage of total expenditures has likely declined.

More than one person has asked me if there was a debate at Senate concerning the decision to give Dr. Henry Morgentaler an honorary degree. The short answer: no. The decision was reported "for information only." One senator expressed disapproval, which prompted statements of approval from two senators.

Nearly Ten Months as VP

By M.J. Toswell

The Board for next year now having been elected (congratulations to all), I am working with colleagues and staff to organize a number of new processes which will allow the new Board to get right to work in July. A secure Board website, a workshop for future and continuing Board members in May to talk about committee structures and the work we have to do for next year, and some alterations to our SOP (standard operating procedures) are in train. Most of the committee chairs for next year have been settled, which is particularly important in a negotiating year, since those individuals will have heavy responsibilities. The Secretary-elect, Bernd Frohmann, has agreed to work with our new staff member, Micki Izzard, to develop an electronic filing system and to attempt to teach those of us at 1393 Western Road the social discipline to use it. The Treasurer-elect, Ann Bigelow, is working with Tom Murphy from the Board to streamline the UWOFA Scholarships so that all the funds for them are in the same place, preferably UWOFA. (As most of you know, we are unique among Canadian universities in funding a set of undergraduate scholarships every year; we honour the best students in each faculty.) Kim Clark, the Vice-President-elect, and I are

meeting with relative frequency as well. Officers and offices are also shifting at UWOFA House, as we prepare for the arrival of our new part-time researcher, Andria D'Zura on May 2, and perhaps a Grievance Officer thereafter. The list of things to research and organize is long and getting longer.

Over the past months, I've been attending some of the Contract Committee meetings for the Librarians and Archivists, who have made great progress in determining negotiating goals and proposals to implement those goals. They have turned the administration's intransigence with respect to their bargaining unit into a positive, and have developed positions specific to their circumstances. They have also taught those of us faculty members who have been privileged to work with them (Mike Dawes, Aniko Varpalotai, Bernd Frohmann, Ernie Redekop) about a number of flaws in our own Collective Agreement. Bev Brereton, who is an archivist, has firm views about the confidentiality provisions in our Official File article and elsewhere; Elizabeth Bruton (the Contract Committee Chair) has put her finger unerringly on the poor structure of a number of articles; Ruth Wallace has cut to the heart of issue after issue with clear questions; Linda Dunn has quietly and carefully reworked clause after clause, finding problems with the wording and getting to the solutions; Jim Ford brings good sense and reserves of knowledge to each meeting. Peggy Ellis, Fran Gray, Adrienne Wass, Nancy Warren, Denise Horoky, Christena McKillop, Deb Grey, John Sadler, John Fracasso and many others have worked on individual positions, sets of related issues, communications matters, consultation with other groups (non-Western libraries, directors, unit heads), and the structure of UWOFA-LA. The Committee is now working on the last five or so sets of goals and negotiating positions before the monetary ones which will be done later, so the Chief Negotiator (Mike Dawes) and his team will soon be heading into negotiations of a first Collective Agreement.

Next weekend, Allan Gedalof, the Professional Officer, Lauren Tremblay, and I will head to Ottawa for the 58th CAUT Council Meeting. Policies on the agenda for our consideration include Canadianization, Privacy and Health-related Information, Defamation Actions Arising out of Academic Activities, and Early Review of an Academic Administrator's Performance. As part of the Learned's, CAUT is sponsoring a one-day conference on 1 June concerning Contract Academic Staff. Anne Skoczylas is our representative to this CAUT Committee, and she is heavily involved in the organization of that event. Also on the horizon as a public event is a symposium and celebration of UWOFA's fiftieth anniversary, tentatively scheduled for Friday 23 September. Volunteers to speak at the symposium, or to organize part or all of the event, would be very welcome.

Horowitz's Campus Jihad

By Bill Berkowitz. Originally Published in WorkingForChange.org October 2004. Reproduced by permission.

With liberal professors in his crosshairs, David Horowitz is engaging in some good old-fashioned campus cleansing. At Ball State University in Muncie, Indiana, "WANTED" posters with a headshot of Professor Abel Alves appeared on campus; a political-science professor at Metropolitan State College of Denver in Colorado has been the target of death threats and hate e-mail in the wake of the recent debate in the state over an Academic Bill of Rights. Revenge of the Nerds? Twenty-first century Gipper brigades? No, it's the Horowistas -- a small, hearty and growing band of followers of right-wing provocateur David Horowitz and his Students for Academic Freedom.

David Horowitz and the Independent Women's Forum are scanning the nation's college campuses in the name of homeland security. Horowitz, the head of the Los Angeles-based Center for the Study of Popular Culture, and the conservative women at the Washington, DC-based IWF are focusing their spying on liberal academics. They have been placing advertisements in student newspapers across the U.S. encouraging conservative students to scan their campuses for so-called anti-American academics.

According to Pacifica Radio's *Democracy Now!*, the advertisements running in student newspapers charge universities with being dominated by liberal or left-wing professors. The ads "are paid for by well-funded groups like Students for Academic Freedom -- a Horowitz group -- and the Independent Women's Forum," *Democracy Now!* reported.

Two of the campaign's first victims are Ball State's Professor Alves and David Gibbs, an Associate professor of History and Sociology at the University of Arizona, who last spring taught a course entitled "What is Politics?" On the Ball State University campus, posters "announcing that history professor Abel Alves was 'WANTED'" were put up by Amanda Carpenter, a senior, who said she wanted to attract attention to her website, the Muncie, Indiana *Star Press* reported. The professor's "alleged offenses include indoctrinating freshmen with liberal books, such as *Fast Food Nation*, and guest lectures by the Humane Society." Another professor, George Wolfe, who teaches peace and conflict resolution, was recently the target of a profile in Horowitz's online publication, *FrontPage Magazine*, which accused Wolfe of giving students extra credit for going to Washington to protest the war in Iraq and lowering the grade of a student who argued in favor of a military response to the Sept. 11 attacks. The university denied that any credit had been given for merely attending a demonstration.

Last September, David Gibbs told Amy Goodman, the host of *Democracy Now!* that his largely freshmen class "focuses on propaganda and deception," and he "emphasize[s] incidents of the government lying." When he taught the class last spring, "the Independent Women's Forum... put into the local student newspaper, an advertisement that basically argued that there's a kind of left-wing domination of the universities and students should fight that with the strong implication they should monitor their professors and report them, at least that's how I read it." When Gibbs received student evaluations, "a student who said I'm anti-American communist who hates America and is trying to brainwash young people into thinking that America sucks," said that "I should be investigated by the FBI, and the FBI has been contacted."

Although Gibbs said that he wasn't sure or worried about whether the FBI was contacted, he acknowledged that he thought it was "indicative of a larger national trend, which is conservative activist groups with lots of money and connections to the Republican Party trying to encourage and even to some extent orchestrate students and local conservative groups like those at the University of Arizona to go and basically harass faculty if they don't like their politics."

Horowitz's Mission

Refresher: David Horowitz and his writing partner Peter Collier were well-known lefties in the 60s. Horowitz was a Black Panther supporter and editor of Ramparts magazine, the premier left-wing publication of the period. He and Collier, a co-founder of the Los Angeles-based Center for the Study of Popular Culture, came out as Reagan Republicans in a highly controversial 1985 Washington Post article called "Lefties for Reagan." Since then, Horowitz has blended Dr. Laura-like pomposity with an extraordinary ability to fund raise and self-promote.

In the immediate aftermath of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, he lambasted California Congresswoman Barbara Lee for having the temerity to be the only congressperson to vote against giving President Bush a blank check for his war against terrorism. In a column called "The Enemy Within," Horowitz branded Lee an "anti-American communist who supports America's enemies and has actively collaborated with them in their war against America."

In late October 2001, Horowitz spent three hours on the radio program of Dr. Laura Schlessinger -- America's erstwhile pop psychologist before Dr. Phil took the reins -- denouncing the "so-called Peace Movement." As part of the "National Call to SUPPORT the WAR," Horowitz told Dr. Laura's audience that "campus leftists hate America more than the terrorists." In 2002 he launched the National Campaign to Take Back Our Campuses, and in a booklet titled "Political Bias in America's Universities," Horowitz described "what's wrong in academics today," and the "steps you and I can take to restore sanity to our colleges and universities."

Horowitz's campus jihads could not take place without well-stuffed coffers. His first post-conversion project, which he co-directed with Peter Collier, was called "Second Thoughts." Between January 1986 and January 1990, this project raised \$950,000. As President of the Center for the Study of Popular Culture, he has profited even more handsomely: According to mediatransparency.org, between 1989 and 2002, Horowitz's outfits received 115 grants accounting for more than \$12,700,000. His right-wing 'philanthropic' partners include the Allegheny Foundation, Castle Rock Foundation (the Coors Family), the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, the Scaife Family Foundation, the Sarah Scaife Foundation and the Olin Foundation.

Independent Women?

Founded in 1992, as a direct response to the Clarence Thomas hearings, the Independent Women's Forum Mission Statement aims "to affirm women's participation in and contributions to a free, self-governing society." In a May 2002 piece for the Chicago Tribune, Chris Black wrote: "The conservative women at the Independent Women's Forum are cheering the return of the guy. From their standpoint, the terrorist attacks on the United States turned the feminist tide and brought back traditional values, a retreat to home and hearth, and an appreciation for the manly man." Between 1994 and 2002, the Independent Women's Forum received more than 70 grants worth more than \$5 million dollars from Randolph, Castle Rock, JM, Sarah Scaife, the John M. Olin Foundation and others, according to mediatransparency.org.

David Horowitz told the Muncie *Star Press* that he "completely deplore[d]" the 'WANTED' poster, and that he doesn't "demonize these professors. I want them (professors) to do the right thing. I've never called for the firing of a professor and wouldn't." And in a bit of Rumsfeld-speak, Horowitz added that "When you deal with students, you're dealing with students."

This Newsletter is Your Newsletter

Editorial by David Heap

As editor of *Faculty Times* for the last two years, it has been gratifying to be able to re-print articles from other publications which different Members recommended to us as potentially interesting for our readership. Whether it is the opinion piece on how academics need to stop apologizing to politicians for what we do "Make 'Em Cry" by Stanley Fish, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 5, 2004, or the report on the intellectual cleansing campaigns currently underway on some U.S. campuses (in this issue), these suggestions enrich our publication with different perspectives and different issues.

While issues such as the targeting of U.S. academics for their 'subversive' anti-American views may at first glance appear "external" to our Union's primary area of concern, in fact all these matters concern us. Our world is small and getting smaller, and thus attacks on academic freedom south of the border inevitably affect us as well.

The poem by Tom Wayman (in this issue, page 8) is particularly timely, as we prepare for another round of collective bargaining. Part-time faculty, and especially pro rata benefits and pensions, have been the topic of much work at CAUT recently, including draft model clauses which will help our discussion at Western.

The union label on this publication, indicating that it is printed in a union shop and our recent observer status at the London District Labour Council, are both indications of our increasing ties with other unions in the local community.

As we face our next round of negotiations, we all know that UWO still has a long way to go in recognizing the role of faculty at this institution. To this end, a *Faculty Times* which reflects our Members' concerns, and also what our struggles have in common with others (be it in our community or at other institutions) should serve us well in affirming our collective rights.

The Truth About Copyright Revision

By Samuel Trosow

In May 2004, a parliamentary committee recommended changes to Canadian copyright law modeled in part on controversial features of an American law known as the Digital Millennium Copyright Act. The committee characterized these changes as “responsive to the needs of all Canadians.”

The Truth

The truth is that these proposed changes would drain millions of dollars from Canada’s provincial education systems, threaten national security research and personal privacy, harm Canadian culture by enlarging the billion dollar Canadian culture deficit, and put Canadian business at a competitive disadvantage. The committee spent little time debating the issues, and ignored concerns voiced by public interest advocates. Facing growing pressure from predominantly U.S. interests, Parliament is moving rapidly to embrace dangerous new rules. If enacted, these rules will have a devastating impact on:

1. Education – Canadian schools currently spend millions of dollars each year on copyright licenses to provide students with access to educational materials. The Supreme Court of Canada recently ruled that teachers, students and schools do not have to pay for certain uses of these materials (including research, private study, and certain classroom instruction). Contrary to the Court’s ruling and despite the millions of dollars schools already pay for copyright materials, the committee would require schools to divert millions of dollars more from education budgets – from students, schools and taxpayers - to pay for publicly available material on the Internet.
2. Privacy – Canadians value their personal privacy. The committee’s proposals would undermine Canadians’ privacy protections. In recent months, the Canadian recording industry has sought to identify Canadian Internet users based solely on deficient evidence of alleged file sharing. The proposed changes would outlaw disabling spyware that monitored how you listened to a song, read an e-book or watched a DVD. It would make it illegal to break locks on this content, even if your actual use of the content was perfectly legal. This would leave us no room to enjoy copyright works in private, free from the prying eyes of copyright owners. As Justice LeBel of the Supreme Court of Canada has noted, the *Copyright Act* should be interpreted to respect Canadians’ privacy interests in their Internet-related activities within the home.
3. Freedom of Speech – Our Internet Service Providers should not be censors and the unwilling copyright police of the Internet. The committee is calling for a “notice and termination” system where, on the basis of untested claims and potentially without judicial oversight, copyright holders will be able to use computer generated notices to pressure ISPs to cancel internet access for potentially thousands of Canadians, thereby blocking access to health and financial websites as well as email. Incredibly, Canada offers far more protection to child pornographers than to victims of false copyright infringement claims. While law officials need a judicial order to take down child pornography, the committee merely requires unproven allegation to allow the termination of allegedly infringing material. A similar system in the U.S. has proven both ineffective and dangerous, chilling speech and generating huge costs to ISPs and Canadians.
4. Consumer Rights – Canadians spend billions of dollars each year on books, music, and movies. If Parliament adopts the proposed changes, large multinational corporations will be entitled to use technology to block small amounts of copying that copyright law traditionally permits, and your efforts to get around that technology to exercise your rights will be illegal. Our culture depends upon the ability to use and re-use creative work. Canadians should not be denied the right to fairly use materials for which they have paid. In the United States, legislation similar to that proposed by the parliamentary committee has outlawed attempts to access technologically controlled work. Canada must not establish rules that create similar restrictions.
5. The Culture Deficit – Statistics Canada reports that our copyright royalty deficit – the amount of royalties generated by Canadians abroad compared with royalties earned by foreign performers in Canada – has grown dramatically in recent years. For every \$1 earned by Canadian performers outside the country, \$5 flows out of the country. The parliamentary committee has recommended the ratification of international treaties that would increase foreign royalty payments leading to hundreds of millions of dollars flowing from Canadians to predominantly American interests.
6. Innovation – To compete in a global marketplace and to create new jobs and opportunities for all Canadians, business depends on laws that foster innovation. The U.S. copyright experience demonstrates that business rivals will inappropriately use these laws to create artificial monopolies and stifle competition. Should Parliament enact these proposals, small and medium sized businesses – the engines of our economy – will face the threat of

copyright lawsuits as they seek to bring products to market.

7. Security Research – In recent years, U.S. authorities have jailed software programmers for presenting computer security research alleged to have violated copyright law. As a result, increasing numbers of computer scientists and academics live in fear of conducting security research. They now choose different career paths and global experts avoid entering the U.S. Former U.S. cybersecurity czar Richard Clarke has noted that few people realized that U.S. copyright law would have this “chilling effect on vulnerability research.” In this age of global terrorism, our national security depends upon state of the art security research. Canada will never be secure if its top researchers cannot test information systems for security flaws.

Our Call

1. Do No Harm – Changes to Canada’s copyright laws must be guided by the principle of “do no harm”. Canada must not enact changes that threaten education, freedom of expression, privacy and security. It must not establish laws that harm small business and stifle innovation, or that cost Canadians millions of dollars.
2. *Considered* Copyright - The Canadian government must immediately stop proposed copyright changes until Parliament has heard from experts on education, security, privacy, small business, and consumer groups.
3. Canadian Laws Must Serve Canadians – Where changes to copyright laws are needed, Canada must adopt laws that serve Canadian interests first. Pressure from U.S. interests and proposals that primarily benefit foreign companies should be rejected.

a poem by Tom Wayman

WHY PART-TIME STAFF DON'T RECEIVE PRORATED BENEFITS

for Jack Finnbogason

We don't require people. Instead, we identify specific functions to be performed. Consider a sessional: employed, say, to teach geography. We can use her throat where the vocal cords are, but not her teeth. Why should we pay part of a dental plan? If I purchase a chalkboard from a dealer I don't also have to buy a desk they're offering for sale. You argue that because someone has a clerical job with us six hours a day we should contribute six-eighths of his or her medical premiums. But these employees have complete use of their bodies for the eighteen hours a day we have absolutely no control over what they do. Rather than extend coverage to part-time help our immediate goal in negotiations is to reduce payment of full-time employees' benefits to a fairer level: from one hundred per cent to eight twenty-fourths.

You can see how reasonable this is.

Whatever damage the staff cause to their health during their hours off work should be their responsibility.

I hope you'll agree, too, this is merely a first step toward establishing a more equitable arrangement.

Next we intend to calculate how many days each month an employee isn't present --- sick time, weekends and holidays, for instance--- and take these into account in determining our share of coverage.

That is what we should be discussing when we talk about prorated benefits.

Such a change makes better use of the institution's financial and human resources. Don't we both want this? To minimize expenses while spending the dollars we have most efficiently? Which is why our plan for the long term is to hire the majority of non-managerial personnel only for certain targeted skills. This policy allows for more flexibility in meeting the demands of the market.

We must realize the era of the full-time employee ---except for executives---has passed.

And if the part-timers object to the thrust of our current operational strategy they should remember: individuals like them have just a casual involvement here. Believe me, those of us with a total commitment to this place understand best what it needs.

© 1989 Tom Wayman. From *In a Small House on the Outskirts of Heaven*. 1989, Harbour Publishing, Madeira Park B.C. Reproduced with the permission and solidarity of the author.