

e-Torque

Welcome to the November 2011 edition of *e-Torque* – the newsletter for ALAEA members across the country.



President's Opinion

Where should I start?

In the last week we've seen the lengths Qantas CEO Alan Joyce is prepared to go to just to get his own way. He has shown what complete disregard he actually has for the Australian people as our own customer base, despite his multimillion-dollar newspaper ads telling them how "sorry" he is, how schedule has returned to normal or splashing 100,000 free tickets as a bribe for his abhorrent behaviour. He has shown the level of disrespect he has for his own employees who have been taking minimal, completely legal protected industrial action only to be told they will be locked out until he gets his way. And he definitely has shown that he can't be trusted with running an airline that is such an essential service to Australians and the Australian economy.

In the lead up to the Qantas AGM, we told Qantas we would be putting our industrial action on hold. We made it quite clear that we were committed to negotiations and getting those aircraft, 'allegedly' grounded by our action, back in the air. That's because unlike Qantas management, professionalism is second nature to us, we want to see this company succeed and stay as strong as possible to ensure we all have jobs into the future. But by 1730 on Saturday 29 October it appeared Alan Joyce had other ideas.

Alan Joyce's decision to ground all aircraft and lock out employees was we believe, an act of industrial blackmail, despicable treachery and utter madness. We suspect he deliberately set out to wreck the national economy and cause irrevocable damage to the Qantas brand. He forced a situation, which was nowhere near crisis point, to a head just so he could deny us all our workplace rights. He just snapped his fingers and plunged our industry and the Australian people into darkness. Simply put, the Qantas board was playing backyard cricket with its employees, got bowled out fair and square, protested that the ball was wide, started crying then took their bat and ball and went home. Their action was absolutely reprehensible, and clearly the behaviour of a spoiled brat.

We spent the best part of that weekend in Fair Work Australia fighting for our rights and to hold Alan Joyce to account, to which end saw Qantas' underbelly exposed in a series questionable decisions and documents. We fought for a suspension of industrial action – on both sides – to ensure the negotiation process could continue in good faith. Part of the Qantas submission was to accuse us all of possible sabotage, to quote directly from Lyell Strambi's testimony about a risk assessment dated the 20 October, "Common threats are – Intentional unsafe acts by ground staff / engineers – undiscoverable by flight crew". In all my years of aviation involvement

I have never seen our profession so insulted. The submission also included Sue Bussell saying that the only reason for the “Lock Out” was to force negotiation on their terms as the unions had put the company in an untenable position. But the decision in the end was to terminate all action, and this followed the government’s application and thus instigated 21 days of conciliated negotiations with Qantas management overseen by FWA.

While we are committed to further negotiations with Qantas, let me tell you I will do what is best for all of us. If negotiations look to be going nowhere by November 20, we will be forced into arbitration with Fair Work Australia. Any outcome there will be binding, and we will need to do all we can to get the best outcome in both the long-term and the short-term for members.

I’d also like to thank members for being so professional throughout this whole process. You are a credit to the industry, your company and the ALAEA, and it’s a pity the Qantas board are not. It has been a tumultuous few weeks and I know many of you will be feeling cheated and betrayed by Qantas management. But I also know you will all be back on the tools showing true professionalism in every task you perform. That’s because as LAMEs we have a duty to this airline and its passengers that goes above and beyond anything a Qantas CEO can ever do.

Keep Safe,
Paul Cousins, Federal President



ALAEA federal secretary Steve Purvinas talking to media outside the Qantas AGM in Sydney on 28 October.



Last chance for the AMT Competition 2012!

This is your last chance to nominate to represent the ALAEA in the 2012 AMT Society Maintenance Skills Competition (MSC) to be held 7-9 March 2012 in Las Vegas, Nevada, USA.

The ALAEA will fund reasonable travel, food and accommodation expenses for the team, but individual team members will be required to make their own arrangements for leave from work.

All members are eligible so if you are interested please contact the ALAEA Federal Office as soon as possible!

Qantas RB211 and Trent Engines... Disaster in the wings?

By Gary Norris, ALAEA Senior Industrial Officer

Since the infamous QF32 Trent 900 A380 incident on 4 November last year, Qantas management has continuously attacked the ALAEA for making well-educated and knowledgeable comments in the media about airline safety. Rather than admit a safety incident had occurred, the Qantas spin doctors instead attempted to portray the Association's concerns in regard to the Qantas "brand" as part of an industrial campaign.

Qantas management, and in particular CEO Alan Joyce and the Qantas Board, missed the point. The ALAEA's actions are founded on a genuine concern for the sanctity of the famous Qantas brand, with its impressive long-term aircraft safety record being probably its only distinguishable marketable advantage.

That record and consequently the Qantas brand has been created and protected by strict quality control and the skill and diligence of Australian licenced aircraft engineers performing the major overhaul and repair work on Qantas aircraft (including engines) in Australia under the Australian regulatory regime. The only thing that distinguishes Qantas in a very competitive market, where Qantas suffers the disadvantage of remote location from major world markets and unfair competition from subsidised airlines is its brand, being its safety record. Australian aircraft engineers have proudly been the protectors of this brand.

The ALAEAs objective has for a number of years been aimed at correcting the current Qantas board and management direction of cost cutting without considering the serious threats to its main product, and the safety of the fleet.

The ALAEA's objective is to protect the Qantas brand from ill-considered short-term cost cutting and a lack of investment in Australian-based engineering that will have a detrimental medium to long-term effect on Qantas, its employees and ultimately the Australian aerospace industry skills base.



Having said that, Qantas' approach after the 2010 incidents involving Rolls Royce aircraft engines had to be applauded. It drew the line on the world aviation chalkboard in black and white when on the 4 November 2010 Alan Joyce told reporters in Sydney, "We will suspend all A380 takeoffs until we are fully confident we have sufficient information about (flight) QF32."

It was reported that Joyce said the plane was capable of flying on two engines. He said it was a significant engine failure and Qantas were not underestimating the significance of the issue, therefore it was grounding the A380 fleet. Effectively what this meant was that the Qantas A380 fleet would be grounded until they could inspect all engines and be sure they were safe to fly. Qantas have six A380s. That's 24 engines to inspect. Joyce had firmly placed "safety before schedule" and safety before revenue. The Qantas fleet remained grounded after Qantas engineers conducting thorough and detailed inspections found oil in areas of other engines where it shouldn't be.

By contrast, after the Qantas incident, Singapore Airlines decided to ground its entire fleet of 11 A380s (44 Rolls Royce RB211 Trent 900 engines) for only a short space of time and had them back in the air after about 24 hours later, declaring that after checks they were fine. (It seems logistically impossible to carry out detailed inspections on 44 engines to ensure their safety within such a short period of time but Singapore Airlines was prepared to risk it).

Then a few days later, Singapore Airlines could no longer ignore the issue. They conducted further inspections on their engines and found similar problems, and this time grounded three of its A380s but left the other eight flying. Singapore took what I would call a calculated risk favouring revenue over safety.

These events and the different approaches demonstrated by the two airlines illustrate the massive difference in safety and risk management philosophy of the two airlines: they were like chalk and cheese. On one hand we saw the cautious, absolute safety approach taken by Qantas, and on the other there was the prepared-to-take-the-risk approach by Singapore Airlines.

The "cheese" relevant to this situation is well known in the aviation industry as the "James Reason Swiss cheese model", which in summary is based on the hypothesis that a series of seemingly unrelated safety events occurring like holes in Swiss cheese one day line up and add up to a major catastrophic event. Safety and risk management practice should therefore be designed to address the minor events so the catastrophic one doesn't happen. In the current situation Qantas decided to take definitive action to arrest the sequence of events whilst Singapore appears to be waiting for the holes to line up.

But whilst there may be "events" that appear unrelated, it is important to consider that there may also be factors that are common or actions or changes that could have been taken that could directly or indirectly cause the events.

Prior to July 2009, since the introduction of the B747-400, Qantas maintained and overhauled all its RB211 engines for B747 jumbo jets in its Rolls Royce centre of excellence Sydney engine



line facility. Qantas established world records for reliability in longest engine hours on wing for its Rolls Royce engines, fuel efficiency and Rolls Royce used Qantas experience to improve its RB211 engines.

Then in early 2009 Qantas decided to shutdown its Rolls Royce engine overhaul facility after making a cost cutting decision to outsource its RB211, including Trent 900, overhaul work to HAESL in Hong Kong. This meant 360 Australian aircraft engineering jobs were lost. This cost cutting approach sacrificed some of Qantas' control over its own product in that it handed over the safety and security of its engines to a competitor, Singapore Airlines.

In the late 1980s and early 1990s Qantas would never have considered making such a decision. Work was done in-house mainly because it was easier to track parts and the hours of usage for those parts – important factors when determining when particular parts should be serviced, repaired or replaced. Outsourcing would mean no guarantee the records of usage for the parts used on your engine were in fact true and correct from a previous user. In effect Qantas had identified too many 'holes' in the cheese and would not take the risk. It decided the best way to control the quality of its engines, and ultimately the safety of its product and aircraft, was to do the work in house.

So what changed for Qantas after being the world's best practice in engineering for Rolls Royce RB211 engines? Fundamentally Qantas decided to take the risk and sacrifice its control over the safety of its product for a perceived cost reduction by handing over its RB211 and Trent engine work to Hong Kong and Singapore. Thus they have created their own Swiss cheese "hole" by taking the risk they purposely avoided in the late 1980s and early 1990s. In July 2009 Qantas handed over its RB211 work including the RB211 Trent 900 to HAESL and SAESL.

On 13 August 2010, the USA FAA issued an airworthiness directive for Rolls Royce RB211 Trent 900 engines; the engines used by Qantas, Singapore Airlines and Lufthansa on their Airbus A380 aircraft.

In part the directive said, "Rearward movement of the IP turbine would enable contact with static turbine components and would result in loss of engine performance with potential for in-flight shut down, oil migration and oil fire below the LP turbine discs prior to sufficient indication resulting in loss of LP turbine disc integrity".

Almost immediately Qantas experienced a range of issues relating to aircraft with Rolls Royce RB211 Trent 900 engines:

On 30 August 2010, a Qantas B747 jumbo powered by Rolls-Royce RB211 engine with a Trent variation had an 'uncontained failure' with one of its engines shortly after it left San Francisco and had to turn back.

On the 4 November 2010, a Qantas A380 powered by Rolls Royce RB211 Trent 900 engines had a massive "uncontained" engine failure after take-off from Singapore and returned safely to Singapore.



On 5 November 2010, a Qantas Boeing 747-400 made an emergency landing after leaving Singapore due to another Rolls Royce RB211 engine failure. Passengers on board the flight said they heard a bang and saw smoke coming from the aircraft's engine minutes after takeoff.

One thing needs to be kept firmly in mind. Rolls-Royce, the maker of the Trent 900 engine that disintegrated, knew about the faults that the current airworthiness directive concerning these engines said were likely to have caused an intense oil fire in a structural cavity in the intermediate pressure turbine area of the engine. But for some reason Qantas was not informed.

In response to these claims, Alan Joyce said, "If this was significant, and was known to be significant, we would have liked to have known about that."

The admittance by Alan Joyce identifies a major problem, as the above is a direct ramification of "outsourcing". Once you outsource offshore you lose not only control over your product, but control over the flow of relevant information affecting your product and in Qantas' case you jeopardise the sanctity of your "brand". Something that Qantas and its shareholders cannot afford. If you are world's best practice, which Qantas was, there are some things that are crucial to your product and your control over the quality of the product, that just should not be outsourced e.g. engine and aircraft overhaul and repair.

Whilst Alan Joyce had distinguished Qantas from Singapore by grounding the Qantas A380 fleet he still faces the same engineering quality problem of having no real control over the quality of the engines on its A380s and some B747s. In fact Singapore Airlines (through its engineering subsidiary SIAEC, SAESL, HAESL and IECO) and its higher risk taking philosophy has more control over the Qantas brand than Qantas has.

Whilst Alan Joyce made a valiant and in principle stand on safety in November 2010, by grounding the A380 fleet, one year on Qantas is adopting a high-risk model brought on by its own cost cutting. Joyce and the Qantas board continue expose the Qantas brand to risk. The holes are starting to line up in the James Reason safety risk model.

What the shareholders don't know is that a relatively small investment of about \$50 million or less (less than what the grounding of the fleet has cost Qantas) would have kept the Qantas Rolls Royce engine facility in Australia, maintaining the RB211 Trent 900 (A380), RB211-524GT (B747) and the RB211-524HT (B767) under Qantas control.

The Qantas board should be intelligent enough to recognise that putting the control of the Qantas "brand" in the hands of overseas engineering is an unacceptable risk, both from a commercial and a passenger safety consideration.

The Qantas board now has an opportunity to commit to and spend the capital (approximately \$100 million) to have its A380 and new B787 fleets overhauled and maintained in Australia. It's a cheap price to pay to protect the only market advantage Qantas has: its brand and its safety record.



Qantas subsidiaries need more protection under the Qantas Sale Act

By Gary Norris, ALAEA Senior Industrial Officer

On 4 November a Senate Inquiry began into Senator Nick Xenophon's proposed amendments to the Qantas Sale Act 1992. His private members' bill entitled *Qantas Sale Amendment (Still Call Australia Home) Bill 2011* was designed to ensure the spirit of the Act is strengthened and Qantas subsidiaries are covered. So why is this so important?

Prior to this inquiry the ALAEA wrote to Alan Joyce seeking assurances on behalf of employee shareholders that the new Asian strategy (announced on 24 August) would not breach the provisions of the Qantas Sale Act by shifting the bulk of Qantas' facilities used in the provision of scheduled international air transport services away from Australia.

Mr Joyce replied stating that, as "Qantas" would not be "conducting" either the new premium airline based in South East Asia, or the joint venture in Japan, then the Qantas Sale Act was irrelevant. He also took the opportunity to re-state the Qantas position that neither the Qantas Sale Act nor the Qantas Constitution applied to subsidiaries of Qantas.

It is clear from the Act itself and the second reading speeches and explanatory memorandum that the Qantas Sale Act was intended to apply to the Qantas board's actions, and in turn the entities that they ultimately controlled. From time to time they may refer to "Qantas Airways Ltd" or the "Qantas Group" when they really mean "Qantas", but it is the board of Qantas Airways Ltd that is controlled by the requirements of the Qantas Sale Act and it is the board of Qantas Airways Ltd that controls the "Qantas Group" (e.g. the board appoints the CEO of Qantas Airways Ltd and also appoints the CEO of wholly-owned subsidiaries Jetstar, Sunstate, Eastern, Qantas Defence Services etc.).

The Qantas subsidiary issue has been mentioned on many occasions over the last six years that I am aware of. It last specifically arose during the Management Buy-Out (or Private Equity Bid) funded by Airline Partners Australia in 2006.

Put simply, if Joyce was correct and the Qantas Sale Act does indeed not apply to Qantas subsidiaries then Qantas could simply avoid the Act by transferring the assets and business of Qantas into a subsidiary company.

For example, if the Act did not cover Qantas Airways Ltd's board-controlled subsidiaries, Qantas could have transferred its operations to Jetstar, and then sold them to a foreign entity pursuant to the Air Navigation Act 1920 requirements of 49 per cent ownership, not the greater restrictions on foreign ownership provided by the Qantas Sale Act.

And if that premise were true Jetstar, a Qantas wholly owned subsidiary which operates various Qantas legal entity aircraft and is controlled by the Qantas Airways Ltd board, could have its



operations sold off and bought by a foreign controlling interest.

The same foreign entity could also theoretically buy 100 per cent of Sunstate and Eastern, let alone all the other Qantas subsidiaries such as its leasing companies, therefore bypassing the foreign shareholding restrictions outlined in Section 7 of the Qantas Sale Act.

It appears to us that the purpose of Section 7 of the Act is to protect Qantas from foreign takeover and the other provisions ensure the assets (or the majority of them) remain in Australia for the benefit of the national interest. So what assets are we talking about as coming under the control of the Act?

An airline's largest capital investment is in the purchase of its aircraft (or alternately leasing aircraft), tooling, equipment and hangars. But who exactly owns Qantas' aircraft fleet including Jetstar, Sunstate and Eastern?

Of the total Qantas group fleet, 64% per cent is claimed by Qantas to be owned, which includes hire purchased and finance leased aircraft with 36 per cent on operating leases.

The owner of an aircraft is the holder of the aircraft's registration, making them the registration holder. The operator of the aircraft must hold a CASA approved Aircraft Operators Certificate (AOC). There may be a distinction between who operates and who owns the aircraft because the registration holder does not necessarily have to be the operator of the aircraft.

It can be seen by reference to the CASA aircraft register that not all the Qantas fleet, including airline subsidiaries are owned and operated by Qantas Airways Ltd. So are these assets, paid for by Qantas Airways Ltd, either purchased or leased? Are they accounted for as "assets" or "expense items"? Are they accounted and claimed for depreciation purposes and tax benefit? Are they meant to come under the intended controls and purpose of the Qantas Sale Act 1992?

A number of the aircraft are owned by Qantas subsidiaries being finance or leasing companies.

On our count approximately 28 per cent of the Qantas Group aircraft fleet is actually registered to Qantas Airways Ltd as the owner. Whilst our analysis is not comprehensive suffice to say it provides sufficient information to outline the situation, which in our view requires a full forensic legal and financial investigation of who owns what Qantas assets and who controls the legal entities that hold the assets.

It is noteworthy that the Qantas Airways Ltd entire A380 fleet are not owned by Qantas Airways Ltd as the Registration Holder but are in fact owned by QF BOC 2008-1 Pty Ltd, QF ECA 2008-2 Pty Ltd, QF ECA A380 2010 No.2 Pty Ltd, and QF ECA A380 2010 No.4 Pty Ltd.

One view is that unless the Qantas Sale Act applies to the wholly owned subsidiaries, which effectively own most of the Qantas Airways Ltd assets (aircraft), the Qantas board could effectively strip all Qantas Airways Ltd assets, denying the shareholders any benefit from the utilisation of those assets.



The ALAEA submits that it was not the intention of the Government back in 1992 to allow or enable stripping of the Qantas Airways Ltd assets, one reason being that they had been assets of the public. If those assets were to be stripped into an overseas based subsidiary and used overseas, the benefit from the use of the Qantas board-controlled asset would not necessarily flow back to the benefit of Qantas Airways Ltd, or Australia for that matter. In fact the assets could be wholly deployed overseas, generate income under another Nation's laws, and the revenue would never flow back to Qantas shareholders or the Australian Government. This would be of no benefit to Australia's national interest and therefore contrary to the intention of the Australian Government and the Qantas Sale Act.

If what Alan Joyce claims is actually true, and the Qantas Sale Act doesn't cover the wholly owned Qantas subsidiaries, then it should be amended as Senator Xenophon is suggesting.

It should be amended to include the wholly owned subsidiaries and associated entities to ensure that the provisions of the Qantas Sale Act capture the assets as well, so there is no longer a risk it could Qantas could have its assets stripped by an out-of-control board.

Advice on workplace injuries – NSW

In this month's e-Torque we offer some advice on what to do if you are injured at work, your rights and obligations and your employer's rights and obligations. This article is primarily related to NSW Workers Compensation legislation. We hope to include further state-specific articles in future editions of e-Torque. If you have any questions relating to a work place injury please contact the Association for advice.

There are two common questions that workers ask when they are first injured at work:

Can I choose my own doctor?

If you are injured at work, you must notify your employer that you have a workplace injury "as soon as possible after the injury happens". You should ensure that you notify the employer in writing. Usually, an employer has an Injury Log Book or a Register of Injuries in which you can record the incident. Some of the information that should be reported to your employer includes your name and address, the cause of the injury, the details of the injured body part and the date the injury happened.

If your employer does not have an injury log book/register of injuries, then you can write the details (as described above) on a piece of paper and hand it to your employer. You should keep copies of any documents handed to your employer.

You should also attend your nominated treating doctor (usually your own general practitioner) as soon as practicable after the injury. This ensures that you receive the appropriate treatment quickly, that there is another record of the injury, and if your ability to work has been affected, then the doctor can provide you with a WorkCover medical certificate. This certificate should be



given to your employer as soon as possible.

Do I have the right to choose my own nominated treating doctor?

In short, the answer to the above questions is "yes".

Section 42 of the Workplace Injury Management and Workers Compensation Act (NSW) 1998 defines a "nominated treating doctor" as meaning the treating doctor nominated by a worker for the purposes of an injury management plan for the worker. The WorkCover brochure titled "Doctors and WorkCover - Your Nominated Treating Doctor" defines a nominated treating doctor as being "the doctor nominated by you (normally your GP) to manage your recovery from injury and to assist you with a return to work safely".

The WorkCover document titled "Your Recovery And Return To Work After A Workplace Injury" states that an injured worker has the right to choose their own nominated treating doctor. In fact, it defines nominated treating doctor as being a doctor "nominated by the worker to co-ordinate all aspects of treatment and return to work management. It is generally a worker's general practitioner (GP)".

Flowing on from the above are two more common questions:

What happens if an employer insists that I attend their nominated treating doctor?

Although an employer can ask that you attend their nominated treating doctor, you are entitled to choose your own nominated treating doctor. As long as your own doctor is prepared to treat your workplace related injury, provide you with the appropriate WorkCover medical certificates and assist in your injury management and return to work, then you are entitled to choose your own nominated treating doctor. If an employer informs you that they will cease paying you weekly benefits if you do not attend on their doctor, then they should immediately be reported to WorkCover. You should ensure that you have current WorkCover medical certificates in the event that an employer ceases paying weekly benefits. WorkCover medical certificates are required if a claim for weekly benefits needs to be pursued in the Workers Compensation Commission in the future.

What happens if my employer wants a 'second opinion' from their doctor?

When differences arise between the nominated treating doctor, the employer, insurer and/or injured worker about return to work, it may be appropriate for an injury management consultant (IMC) to review an injured worker. WorkCover have created guidelines to assist this process. The guidelines state that prior to any referral being made to an IMC, there must be a specific return to work or injury management problem. Efforts should have previously been made to rectify the area(s) of concerns without success. For example, an employer can refer you to an IMC where there are:

- Confused goals;
- Complexity of injury or workplace environment;
- Poor communication between insurer, employer or nominated treating doctor;



- Perceived conflict between the nominated treating doctor's recommendations under workplace requirements;
- Unexplained changes in medical certification;
- Disagreement about the suitability of duties offered to an injured worker;
- Worker not upgrading duties at work.

Where you are required to attend an IMC, the Guide states that the location should be geographically close to your home address or accessible by direct transport routes. If the WorkCover certificate places such restrictions on travel and sitting periods, then they need to be taken into account when arranging an IMC assessment.

IMC's are unable to answer questions about the appropriateness of treatment or diagnostic procedures, or liability for a workers compensation claim. These issues are usually addressed by an Independent Medical Examiner.

You must be advised in writing at least ten working days before the appointment with the IMC (unless a shorter timeframe is agreed by all parties). The letter discussing the appointment with the IMC must include information such as the specific reason for the referral, that the injury management consultation is an opportunity for them to actively participate in your return to work, that you may be accompanied by a support person (with the agreement of the IMC) and that you will receive a copy of the report from the appointment.

It should be noted that WorkCover has a list of approved injury management consultants. In the period following an injury, **further questions will arise depending on your individual circumstances.**

It can become overwhelming when juggling an injury, your employer, treatment, the insurance company and the return to work. The union and Maurice Blackburn Lawyers are there to assist and guide you through the system.

Emirates EA voted down

After several months of negotiations earlier this year and with a number of contentious issues still outstanding, Emirates management decided in September to issue a draft enterprise agreement directly to employees against the advice of the ALAEA and ASU and other employee bargaining reps.

Both unions strongly advocated a No vote in the EA vote because feedback from members indicated the offer was not acceptable in relation to a number of issues including only offering an annual fixed rate increase to base pay of 2.5 per cent, which is well under the prevailing CPI rate.

The outcome was that when the vote concluded on 24 October, those who participated in the ballot registered a 70 per cent No vote.



The ALAEA and ASU have now called on Emirates management to reconvene the bargaining reps negotiation group promptly so that the parties can move forward to resolve all outstanding issues. However it is clear that for there to be an acceptable outcome, Emirates will have to substantially improve their current pay and conditions offer.

Eastern Tamworth

A further EA meeting took place at Tamworth on 26 October. The parties revisited discussion on several of the outstanding issues including getting acceptable wording for Investigation, Discipline and Grievance Procedures, an improved severance benefit payment and the application of EASA changes.

Whilst no resolution came out of the meeting, the parties have agreed to further consider the various issues and have committed to meeting again at Tamworth on 8th December.

Cobham update

A third meeting was held in Cairns on 25 October in relation to the Cobham HMU enterprise agreement covering employees working in this unit in Cairns and Darwin.

Reasonable progress was made in the discussions and a draft EA document will now be updated to reflect changes agreed at the meeting and the ALAEA will seek the views of members in December via an informal straw poll process to indicate whether the EA package would be acceptable or not. The outcome of the straw poll process will determine whether further negotiations are required or there is support for the draft EA to be put to a formal vote as required under the Fair Work Act.

A separate meeting of the Cobham Engineers Line Maintenance Working Group is scheduled to take place at Cobham HQ in Adelaide on 8 November. The Working Group is charged with seeing if a revised pay and classification structure can be agreed with the Company so that agreed changes can be incorporated in to the next Cobham Line Engineers enterprise agreement from mid 2012, noting the existing EA has an expiry date of 30 June 2012.

Latest CASA industry brief

The October issue of the CASA Industry Brief is now available from the CASA Website. It contains a number of articles that may be of interest including:

- Advice on Aircraft Welding;
- Cessna Safety Issues relating to Horizontal Stabiliser failures and Landing Gear collapses; and
- Robinson R44 Exhaust System warning.

There is also a short article from John McCormick on the newly formed General Aviation Task Force.

For those interested in Australian Civil Aviation History, information is provided on a special exhibition at the Airways Museum at Essendon Airport

For more information on the above go to:

http://www.casa.gov.au/scripts/nc.dll?WCMS:STANDARD::pc=PC_100709

Beat the crowds and save \$ this Christmas



Union members can save big dollars and avoid busy mall crowds at Christmas by purchasing online or over the phone with Union Shopper.

From theme park tickets to fragrances, manchester to jewellery, and groceries to holiday costs, Union Shopper has a huge range of discounted products and services for members to enjoy.

“Union members can save valuable time and literally thousands of dollars on gifts and holiday costs over the Christmas period by shopping with Union Shopper,” Union Shopper executive officer Brett McCreddie said. “Members can save on a range of Christmas time purchases, including electrical and white goods, perfume and jewellery, books and DVDs, new and used cars, groceries, travel and accommodation, tickets and passes, and car hire.”

Union Shopper reduces holiday costs, with a number of hotels and resorts offering discounted rates for members, and Hertz providing members with “mate’s rates” on car hire.

Gift-giving is a breeze with Perfume123 fragrances discounted by up to 75%, Amante jewellery discounted by at least 15%, and popular deLUXE linen offering beautiful manchester at 5% less than wholesale prices.



Union Shopper even helps members save on Christmas groceries and beverages, with Coles and Woolworths WISH gift cards reduced by 5% (credit card fees and other conditions may apply).

Doubleday also offers 50% off members' first online orders over \$20 with free delivery on all items, including books, music, DVDs and games (conditions apply).

On average, Union Shopper members save 9-13% off their best price on white good and electrical purchases, which make great Christmas presents.

“Over the years, when needing to purchase white goods and assorted items for the home it has been our family’s practice to do the rounds of the various stores to check prices and attempt to get a good deal for our dollar,” happy member Kathy Patterson said. “Despite visits to stores that claim to offer discounted competitive pricing, we always contact Union Shopper with the price we had been quoted to see if they can get us a lower price for our goods. Union Shopper has never let us down and we have without exception been able to purchase our selected goods at a lower than quoted price.”

To register for free with Union Shopper or to find out more about Union Shopper’s range of products and services, please call 1300 368 117 or visit www.unionshopper.com.au

Workplace Noticeboards

ALAEA reps are reminded to check that their workplace noticeboards are up-to-date. Latest notices are available at www.alaea.asn.au