



Fourth Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

STANDING COMMITTEE

on

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

42 Elizabeth II

*Chairperson
Mr. Jack Reimer
Constituency of Niakwa*



VOL. XLII No. 16 - 9 a.m., TUESDAY, JUNE 29, 1993

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ALCOCK, Reg	Osborne	Liberal
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	NDP
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	Liberal
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	NDP
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	NDP
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose	PC
DACQUAY, Louise	Seine River	PC
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	PC
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	NDP
DOER, Gary	Concordia	NDP
DOWNEY, James, Hon.	Arthur-Virden	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.	Steinbach	PC
DUCHARME, Gerry, Hon.	Riel	PC
EDWARDS, Paul	St. James	Liberal
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	PC
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EVANS, Clif	Interlake	NDP
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
FINDLAY, Glen, Hon.	Springfield	PC
FRIESEN, Jean	Wolseley	NDP
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	Liberal
GILLESHAMMER, Harold, Hon.	Minnedosa	PC
GRAY, Avis	Crescentwood	Liberal
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	NDP
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Liberal
LATHLIN, Oscar	The Pas	NDP
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	PC
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MANNES, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	NDP
McALPINE, Gerry	Sturgeon Creek	PC
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	PC
McINTOSH, Linda, Hon.	Assiniboia	PC
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
ORCHARD, Donald, Hon.	Pembina	PC
PALLISTER, Brian	Portage la Prairie	PC
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	PC
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
PRAZNIK, Darren, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	PC
REID, Daryl	Transcona	NDP
REIMER, Jack	Niakwa	PC
RENDER, Shirley	St. Vital	PC
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Gladstone	PC
ROSE, Bob	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Broadway	NDP
STEFANSON, Eric, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	PC
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	NDP
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	PC
VODREY, Rosemary, Hon.	Fort Garry	PC
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy	St. Johns	NDP
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	NDP
<i>Vacant</i>	Rossmere	
<i>Vacant</i>	Rupertsland	
<i>Vacant</i>	The Maples	

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Tuesday, June 29, 1993

TIME — 9 a.m.

LOCATION — Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRPERSON — Mr. Jack Reimer (Niakwa)

ATTENDANCE - 11 — QUORUM - 6

Members of the Committee present:

Hon. Messrs. Downey, Enns, Manness
 Messrs. Alcock, Ashton, Messrs. Pallister,
 Penner, Reimer, Rose

*Substitutions:

Mr. Dewar for Mr. Martindale
 Ms. Cerilli for Mr. Plohman

WITNESSES:

Stephen Holborn, Private Citizen
 David Johns, Private Citizen
 Marie Speare, Private Citizen
 Dan Gietz, Private Citizen
 Mark Golden, Private Citizen
 Jessie Vorst, Private Citizen
 Paul Fortier, Private Citizen
 Paul Phillips, Private Citizen
 Tom Booth, Manitoba Organization of Faculty
 Association
 Richard Park, Private Citizen
 Ian Goldstine, President, Manitoba Medical
 Association
 Jim Silver, Choices
 Alan DeJardin, Private Citizen

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS:

Betty Granger and Mr. Krahn, Winnipeg
 School Division No. 1
 Barry Wittevrongel, President, St. Vital
 Teachers' Association
 John Blaikie, President, Brandon University
 Faculty Association
 J.F. Dolecki, Brandon University Faculty
 Association

MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION:

Bill 22—The Public Sector Reduced Work
 Week and Compensation Management Act

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: The committee will continue to proceed with public presentations on Bill 22, The Public Sector Reduced Work Week and Compensation Management Act.

I have a list of persons wishing to appear before this committee. For the committee's benefit, copies of the presenters list have been distributed.

Also, for the public's benefit, a board outside this committee room has been set up with the list of presenters that have preregistered. I will not read the list since members of the committee have copies. Should anyone present wish to appear before this committee who has not already preregistered, please advise the Chamber staff at the back of the room and your name will be added to the list.

I have two written submissions for Bill 22. They are John Blaikie, private citizen, and Joseph Dolecki, private citizen. Copies have been made for committee members and were distributed at the start of the meeting. Copies of these submissions will appear at the back of the committee transcript for today's meeting.

At this time I would like to ask if there is anyone in the audience who has a written text to accompany their presentation. If so, I would ask that you please forward your copies to the Page at this time.

As moved by motion at the June 17, 1993, committee meeting, this committee agreed to hear from out-of-town presenters first, wherever possible. At this time I would ask all those who are present and from out of town to please raise their hands and the Clerk will circle their name on the list.

We will now continue with public presentations to Bill 22.

Committee Substitutions

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Yes, I just wanted to make a couple of committee changes.

I would move that the member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar) replace the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale), and I would also move that the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) replace the member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman).

Mr. Chairperson: Agreed? [agreed]

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: I will now call upon Mr. Stephen Holborn. Do you have a written text, Mr. Holborn?

Mr. Stephen Holborn (Private Citizen): No, I do not.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, you may begin then, Mr. Holborn.

Mr. Holborn: Thank you very much. Good morning, everyone. This is a usual standing position for me but not the usual smiling faces I see before me, since I am with the Department of Psychology at the University of Manitoba. This morning I would like to bring the world of professors a little closer to the world of politics and try to describe for you, in the context of the proposed Bill 22, how I see it affecting my activities and the activities of the students and clients I service.

Just to give you a little of my background, I was born and raised in Victoria, British Columbia, obtained my Honours B.A. in Psychology at the University of Victoria in 1964, my M.A. in 1966 and Ph.D. in 1968 from the University of Iowa, and my first academic position was at Boston University. I moved to the University of Manitoba in the mid-'70s and have been with the Department of Psychology since that time.

In terms of areas of specialization, my major areas in teaching are research methods in psychology and behaviour therapy, which is essentially the application of behavioural principles and techniques to help children and adults improve their skills and overcome problems in living.

In terms of research and applied practice, I am involved in behaviour therapy for children with physical, emotional, social or academic handicaps and behaviour therapy for adults with stress or anxiety disorders, such as panic disorder, post-traumatic stress, obsessive-compulsive disorder and so on.

I am also active in an area called behavioural medicine which involves bringing behavioural treatments to altered lifestyles in order to prevent or ameliorate illness.

In relation to Bill 22, I am going to speak about what I have identified as a key concept there, leave without pay. Having a predilection to analyze things, I am going to separate that into two things, the leave part and the without pay part, and try to present positions on how those two aspects affect the work that I do.

Essentially I am going to argue that while you may offer me leave, I cannot take it. I cannot take leave because of the ethical restrictions on the profession of psychology which prevent me from not providing service to clients, from not continuing to supervise graduate or undergraduate students in research or service. So while you may be able to offer me leave, I cannot technically take it.

I also want to talk about the fact that in academia we do not have a typical or traditional workday or workweek, and I am sure many of you here would relate to this. I have heard Mr. Manness speak on the television about often working long hours, and we do not simply have a nine-to-five workday or a Monday-to-Friday workweek, nor are the products we make easily quantifiable, to know what ideas would be lost, what students would not go on in the profession from missing particular days.

Just to give you an example from my own experience, since I remember this rather clearly. It was last Easter Sunday, which typically for me is not an intensive workday. It just happened to be that this particular Easter Sunday I spent 12 hours on academic work. That came about because I had two honours theses students, whose theses were due on the Monday.

One of the them, Brian Doerksen, who was working at the Society for Manitobans with Disabilities training handicapped children in skills to initiate play, had some delays there due to uncontrolled factors in the setting.

My other student, Terry Otto [phonetic], was working on a laboratory project which involved a computer, and programming took us some time to work through the various bugs, so we were delayed and things had to be done at the last minute.

That resulted in my being up very early that day reading two honours theses, squeezing in Easter Mass—if I had not, my spouse would have killed

me—and met with Terry during the afternoon. Usually I help prepare Easter dinner. This Easter my spouse was kind enough to do that for me. I sat down to an hour or so dinner. Then Brian Doerksen drove in from the farm in Steinbach, and we met at my home and went over his thesis. Then the two young folks were left to work all night and meet with me the next morning in order to finalize their theses.

I say this is simply an example. There is not a defined workday here. Often when research grants are due, papers are due, whether they are your own or reviews of others, book chapters are due, you work no matter the time of day or day of the week, or holiday or no holiday.

To give you an example of some of the effects already, we have had a brief, what I might call, pilot study, since I was teaching intercession, and I will try to describe the impact on teaching and research from the day that was lost during intercession.

* (0910)

The course I taught during intercession was Behaviour Modification, and there essentially were two aspects to that course. One was typical classroom instruction. We lost a day of that, which was two hours of meeting time. The other part of the course involves students interacting with me and study questions through the mainframe computer. What they do is, the various study questions are presented to them, and they answer them and then they receive feedback either from myself or a teaching assistant or a student that has already passed the particular unit that they are working on.

That computer is available 24 hours a day normally. I am theoretically available 24 hours a day, although you cannot always reach me at two or three in the morning, but at least the computer does take mail to me which is either a test to be responded to or questions from students about particular material. So instructional time goes on far beyond the boundaries of class time.

Now the loss of a day works out to about 6 percent of class time for an intercession course. That is about three or four days of a normal course in the regular academic year. It is very hard to determine how much is lost there. Of course, you try to recover. You try to be available to cover the material other ways than normally. You try to flex around that loss.

There were other impacts to that. The university unilaterally decided to close the university at 4:30 the day before the Friday that was the day of leave. Many of my students cannot afford computers, so they have to come into the university to use the computers in the rooms available for them to do so. They arrived, some of them, from working in the afternoon, came there in the evening, and found they could not get into the computer room. They also had read in the newspaper, or did read the next day, that the university was closed for the long weekend, as it theoretically was.

I am still dealing with complaints from students, I am still dealing with appeals from students, because they felt they were deprived of a fair opportunity to participate in the course which should have been available that Thursday evening and should have been available the other days than the Friday on that weekend.

Now I want to talk a little bit about research. Research, of course, is an ongoing process. I will talk first about direct effects which would be on those involving me. If my laboratory shuts down—that is where I run human subjects in research at the university—and I do not collect data, that of course stops that data from being collected. If I am out in an applied setting, as I am, and many applied settings, either to treat patients or to do research, whether it is a hospital or a daycare centre or the Society for Manitobans with Disabilities, that must go on. That cannot stop, so it does not shut down as such.

The library of course is not accessible, so I am not able to use its resources, if necessary. The mainframe computer, which I am used to accessing and getting output from on Sundays as well as other days, is also not accessible for output.

Well, what about indirect effects? Graduate and undergraduate students, either in terms of receiving training or participating in research is not available. Support services are not available, whether they are technicians to maintain equipment or clerical services secretaries. The Psychological Service Centre is not available.

Point of Order

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Chairperson, on a point of order. I apologize to Mr. Holburn, but I have been listening

carefully, and I gather you are speaking against Bill 22, are you?

Mr. Holburn: That is correct, yes, or at least against its implementation and the way it is described. I will try to answer that in closing.

* * *

Mr. Holburn: The Psychological Service Centre is not available to clients. Now, what does this mean? To me, the university is not simply the buildings that are there and whether they are closed or not. It is the people who work at the university. It is myself, my students and others who provide services and conduct applied research.

So the fact that the university closes, and the Psychological Service Centre closes, the Psychology office closes, I am not in my office, does not stop research from going on or service to clients from going on. If I start a client on treatment for anxiety disorder during a term, I cannot simply stop that treatment or not respond to a request for assistance when there is a relapse.

That means, for me, the university is either at home where I am responding to a phone call from a student or a client, or it is in the client's home, or it is at the Society for Manitobans with Disabilities. So I cannot ethically and reasonably take leave. While the university is closed, it simply makes it less convenient for me. I do not have the secretary there to take phone calls, the Psychological Service Centre is not there, things are not there normally, but the university activities that I am part of must go on once they are begun.

Normally, if I were away at a research conference or, as anyone else, I take holidays, I am able to see that another staff member is available to supervise my students or to take care of a client when I am away. When everybody is given leave on the same day and the university is closed, everybody theoretically is on leave, so if that happened I cannot refer to another colleague because they are not supposed to be there either. They are not supposed to be available or the Psychological Service Centre is not open to take referrals.

I want to shift now and talk about another area of work that is related to this and the impact on the staff members at the university. I am now part of a group that has come into being which is called Academics at Risk for Distress. This is an attempt to respond to the pressures that are affecting

faculty members more and more as increased stress is produced by increased class sizes and decreased resources as the years have passed.

I would argue that what we need is not a workday taken away in a month, we need at least a workday added and more people added to deal with the increasing pressure cost by increasing class size, less well-prepared students, as I now see them. They come with less skills in writing, less skills in logic and mathematics, and that increases the load on the faculty member.

I want to talk a little bit about the impact of the other side. One side is the leave, the other side is the without pay. About five years ago I persuaded one of the graduate students I had trained, Dr. Rayleen De Luca, to take a position in the Psychology department at the University of Manitoba. To do so she had to leave a position at St. Boniface Hospital in the Department of Psychiatry, and her salary was reduced by approximately \$10,000 to join the academic environment.

This year, in trying to persuade people to take jobs in the Psychology department, we have to tell them not only do they start at relatively low salaries in the mid-30s, but they can plan on losing a number of days of pay in addition once they elect, if they do elect, to join the Department of Psychology. It is no surprise to me, therefore, that when we advertised a position this year we only had seven applicants for a clinical psychology position. Four or five years ago we would have had 70 applicants.

The other impacts that I see is we are beginning to lose more and more of our quality faculty to other universities, to other countries, as we do not remain competitive in working conditions and in salary.

A further aspect related to this is the morale effects that are produced. Personally, I had a unique experience this year that was provided already by my employer taking early advantage of the so-called retroactive clause of Bill 22. That was, I got up on a Friday supposedly thinking I was not to work for the university today. I have never had that feeling in my 25-year academic career before, not that I work for the university every day. I took vacations, as someone else would, but I always had something along with me, a thesis, research papers to read which I sometimes did. I never had the feeling that I supposedly was not to

work for the university today. That was not a good feeling for me.

* (0920)

As my central point, it is really impossible for me to take leave from the university both in the sense of my ethical responsibilities to clients and to my students. Also really because we are professionals, a lot of our work is thinking. We do that every day.

So I would encourage you to consider the way this bill is being presented as giving leave. You can take the money away here and that will have impacts, but while you are asking me to take leave, I cannot really take leave. It is impossible for me to take leave in terms of the job that I do. The university may be closed, but I, along with my colleagues, will be faced with responsibilities that go on nonetheless.

Mr. Chalrperson: You have about two minutes left.

Mr. Holborn: I am two minutes early and finished. Thank you.

Mr. Chalrperson: Thank you very much for your presentation.

Do you have a question, Mr. Pallister? I am sorry.

Mr. Brian Pallister (Portage la Prairie): Thank you very much, Mr. Holborn, for your presentation this morning.

Mr. Holborn: You are very welcome.

Mr. Pallister: Your theme seems to be that you cannot effectively take leave from your position, and I think that speaks well of your dedication in your job. I think it is strikingly similar to my own experience, and I expect the experience of many other people who have taught, or people in private businesses as well. I know that in my experience, I was called many times at strange hours at home to come and do work for other people whom I served.

Given the reality that, in fact, thousands of people are being laid off in this country for various reasons, primarily I think because of the fiscal realities we face as a nation, would you think that that would encourage you, the fact that you cannot take leave, in terms of your future security in your position, in that you would not be one of those laid off?

Mr. Holborn: I wonder if you could just clarify that a bit for me.

Mr. Pallster: Given the dedication in your position, given the reality that you do work these extra hours and that you are dedicated to your job, you think about it constantly, would you not take some solace in the fact that you would very likely not be laid off?

Mr. Holborn: Certainly, that is an important aspect, job security, and there is no guarantee of that, however. One has to continue to do an adequate job as a faculty member, and there is continuous evaluation of that, so I like to take security in continuing to do the best job I can to serve both students and clients.

My major theme here would be that I would have much preferred to negotiate with the university administration to give up the money, if you like, and not the days, to continue to serve students on those days. I would have liked it to be a negotiated process rather than an imposed process, and it was just unilaterally imposed. The days were just chosen without consultation as well. The computer facilities were closed without consultation. That is what the impacts might be on teaching.

Mr. Chalrperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Holborn. Time is expired.

I will now call on Mr. Peter Hudson. David Johns?

Did you have a written presentation, Mr. Johns?

Mr. David Johns (Private Citizen): I have a written one but only one copy, I am afraid.

Mr. Chalrperson: Okay, you may proceed with your copy then.

Mr. Johns: Good morning, and thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak this morning. My name is David Johns. I am a full professor in the Faculty of Physical Education at the University of Manitoba. I have been there 22 years. It was my first university appointment, and I must say over the 22 years I have had some very positive experiences there.

My role has changed over the years since 1971 when I was first appointed. I was appointed there as a coach and as a teacher. As the years went by, we were asked to retool and began to realize the changes that were necessary in the changing world. I went back to do my Ph.D. at the University of Alberta in 1977 and graduated from there in 1979.

My role as a physical educator at the University of Manitoba and in this province has brought me very close to the community. I have worked very hard over the last 22 years to bring to our community an enrichment of life, I hope, through sport, physical education in the schools, and health and fitness in lifestyle to our citizens.

I have recently returned from Australia where I spent seven months on study leave, teaching, researching and speaking in the community, so I bring some comparison to the situation here. I might say that in Australia they are struggling with the economy just as badly as you are here in Canada. Unemployment is as high as it is here, but I noticed a distinct change in the attitude between health and education there and here. While they are complaining about cuts, they are quite fat compared with our institutions here in this province and also in Canada.

As I have returned from this study leave, I have learned that I will receive no increase in salary but instead will receive a salary cut. The reduction in compensation for services rendered as a professor at the University of Manitoba will be in the form of six unpaid days leave, which I am told I will be obliged to take. I find this approach to reducing deficits not only distasteful, but it clearly indicates that the government has an extremely uninformed opinion of how university professors do their work. I am thankful to Professor Holborn this morning because he has now enlightened you, if you were not already.

It also demonstrates that education and other essential services such as health—and my wife is a nurse, coming back to St. Boniface Hospital—in this province are not considered important by this government, or if they are, then there is a funny way of showing it.

I have been a staff member on this faculty for 22 years. I represented Canada as an Olympic coach on several occasions and, more recently, have delivered papers at international conferences. During that tenure, I have represented the province here and Canada at international meetings, sporting events and congresses. I have given tirelessly of myself on behalf of sport, recreation and physical education in this province. This service has always been at the convenience of the community centre or the Department of Education or the Sport Directorate or the Manitoba Sports Federation. I have given up my summer holidays

in order to accompany teams to major events. Over the last year, I have provided psychological services for several Olympic athletes, including Angela Chalmers who you may know won a bronze medal at the last Olympics.

For 17 years I have coached one of the teams at the university and was on the road for many weekends during the winter months as my team competed over North American cities. Much of the work I have performed for this community was accomplished during weekends, evenings, which rarely coincided with the nine-to-five workdays to which many of our agencies rigidly adhere. In fact, it was impossible to accomplish my lengthy record of coaching, teaching and research without working over weekends, evenings and frequently through public holidays.

My dean, Henry Janzen, at the university and the University of Manitoba encourages such efforts in the community which are recognized by the president of the university each year in an outreach ceremony. Such a ceremony indicates to the faculty that such work is valued and appreciated by the university, and it is to be encouraged. Indeed, the University of Manitoba understands that such work is vital in providing a link to the community, and it also understands that in order to accomplish this, professors must be willing to give of their time freely and flexibly because much of what goes on is off campus and beyond the normal hours of offices.

* (0930)

So the move through Bill 22 to reduce the working year by six days, in my opinion, does more harm than it is designated to reduce. Specifically, such forms of clawbacks are indications that economic rationality overrides any recognition that university professors are professional people who are largely generous with their time and expertise. What this bill assumes is that the university personnel on the teaching and research staff of our tertiary educational institutions can be reduced to hourly paid employees—they can actually switch work off for a day and nothing will matter. As Professor Holborn has just mentioned, it does matter.

If the university is to be considered in this light, then we are heading for a fundamental change in the way we conduct our work. By way of this legislation, you have effectively told me when I will work and when I will not. Will your next legislation

be that my office hours will be from nine till five? Will you soon force professors to refrain from coming to the university on weekends?

The bill has overtones, I am afraid, of a totalitarian regime, and you should have no business prescribing how our universities and their faculties should be run. Following these dangerous tactics in an ineffective effort to reduce deficit will in the long run cost this province. It is discouraging and counterproductive to what we do and how we do it. The costs will be manifested in the way students are taught, evaluated and counselled. It will determine the way we prepare, conduct our research, write our scholarly papers, attend conferences and generally follow a tradition that in other provinces and in other countries has been cherished and respected.

Contrary to what you may have been led to believe, most university professors in this country and throughout the world, through our training and academic experiences, strive for and achieve high-quality work. The peer evaluation of our research and scholarly work forms an advancing and rational core of knowledge which is central to any institution worthy of the name university.

To maintain this ever changing body of knowledge demands that professors read, write, visit, exchange their ideas and their discoveries. These activities are accomplished apart from the routines of teaching and daily office life. We take our work home because it is not the kind of job that is left at the office.

Moreover, in this age of personal computers, is it possible and desirable to work at home? So this cynical approach proposed by Bill 22 attacks those qualities in my estimation and the persons who possess those qualities. The legislation also undermines the values of honesty and dedication which professors must uphold to accomplish their work. Countless hours at home and in their offices are generously given in order to read student examination manuscripts, term projects and graduation theses. My students appreciate when I return their exams within a few days. If I am to work a very rigid schedule, that would not be possible. They would not receive their evaluations back, and that really helps them.

The development of journal articles, books and editorial duties are all missions that are really unseen by many people. The very visible aspect of

our lives at the university are found in the classrooms, and that does not represent the full force of our commitment to the university. There are a lot of things that go on behind the scenes, and that is really what I am trying to stress here.

What I find so distasteful about the legislation is that it preys on our willingness and takes advantage of what we normally do without coercion from our deans and department heads. We are generous, I think, with our time and much of this goes on without recognition or financial compensation. This legislation takes advantage of this generosity and treats those professionals in our society with dispassion and, may I say, contempt. It is representative of a government that displays no gratitude to those who willingly give their discretionary time with generosity, concern and compassion for their students.

While this community of Manitoba and indeed this country has gladly utilized my expertise, they have had the good manners to thank me and to recognize the services I have rendered over the years. However, I find this government to be hard, unforgiving and relentless in its efforts to not only order my life, but also to punish me for the efforts which I make on behalf of my students to provide the best possible educational experience.

I would like to thank you, therefore, for your attendance.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Mr. Johns.

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): Thank you, Mr. Johns, for your presentation. It sounds like you and perhaps your colleagues would be considering this simply a 4 percent cutback in wages and that you are not going to be decreasing your workload at all.

I know there have been other extracurricular activities that have been affected that have been withdrawn because of this bill, but I would ask you to comment if there have been any discussions like that at the university, what the reaction was amongst the staff to try to have some kind of a response to the bill.

Mr. Johns: I have not had the opportunity to speak to any of the members of the faculty because I am still officially on sabbatical leave, and I have not darkened the doors of the institution yet. However, this news came to me upon my arrival

back from Australia last week. So, therefore, this is my own personal reaction.

I can react to your question, if I may, by saying that it struck me that this was an imposition. I will not change what I am doing because someone has told me I cannot come to work next Friday, I think this Friday coming, because it is an official holiday, or it will be given to us as a holiday unpaid.

I will continue to work. I have my work to do at home. I am writing papers. I am preparing classes for next year. So like Professor Holborn, the clock does not dictate the role I play. I will continue to render services, and it would be very difficult for me to say that I am going to stop work today, and that will be all that is necessary.

I would also like to react a little bit to the question that came to Professor Holborn. I see university job security perhaps in a similar light to Professor Holborn, and that is that many of us are evaluated on research and scholarly work. Teaching, unfortunately, has been devalued in this North American society. I saw this in Australia as a very positive aspect because teaching was considered a very important part of an academic career, but it is not a secret that at the University of Manitoba, research is vitally important, and that is evaluated when it comes time for tenure and promotion.

Teaching, you have to be a reasonably good teacher, but no one really examines how effective that person is. That is not where people get promoted and secure their jobs. It is where you write research. It is where you can apply that research, as in my own case, to the community, that counts. In a long answer, and in the summary of it, I believe I will not reduce the efforts I am making because someone has said you will stay away from work today.

Ms. Cerilli: I would like to hear you talk more, as well, about the comparison between what is happening in your domain in Australia as compared to Canada and here in Manitoba. I know our countries are quite similar, and it would be interesting to see if they are sacrificing education in the name of the deficit there in Australia.

Mr. Johns: I was commenting to someone in Australia about Canadian politics, and facetiously I said, perhaps if we changed just the whole group of politicians in Canada for the ones in Australia—you may want to go along—there would not be very much difference. Perhaps you can negotiate that

with Mr. Keating in Australia, and we can perhaps do a switch, but, nevertheless, in all seriousness, I taught at the University of Tasmania for the first semester, and the head of the department was apologizing to me for the size of classes.

* (0940)

The size of classes here at the University of Manitoba—I will be teaching in the fall term 120 students divided into four sections, so that is four sets of 30. I will be standing in the gymnasium for this particular class for six hours, Tuesdays and Thursdays. It is a bit like teaching in a high school. After Christmas, I will be teaching two academic courses each with at least 60 students in them.

Now, in Australia, they were apologizing, as I said, for the size of classes, and they are under budgetary constraints as we are here in Manitoba, and Tasmania is a have-not state, but my gymnasium classes, there were 16 and 17 students in the classes, and when it came time to teach the academic class in the psychology of sport, they apologized profusely for not having very much support for me and that the class would be consisting of 40 students. It was large, abnormally large for that institution.

So class sizes alone are far better in the constrained state of Tasmania. It is very easy to compare that we really are at the bottom of the barrel here in this province in terms of the resources that are being channelled into the university.

When I taught here in 1971, the course I am still teaching, there were four instructors per section of 30 students. Now, I am the only person who instructs the whole of the 120 students. I have no help whatsoever. I prepare, and this may be a curse of the personal computer, but I prepare my own course outlines, I prepare my own examinations, I mark my own examinations and there is absolutely no assistance whatsoever. I think the university is getting its money's worth out of me.

I am not complaining. I enjoy it very much and I think if you look at my students' evaluations, they enjoy it also, but I do not know how much more we can cut. I do not know how much more we can put out without some additional resources. It is a very, very difficult situation.

Mr. Chalrperson: Mr. Alcock, there is only about one minute left, if you have a very short question.

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): Just very quickly and perhaps Professor Johns, it will be more difficult for you to answer this, given you have not been back.

One of the impacts of the days off over the summer, I understand, is that because the summer courses are compressed in a sense—they do not have the flexibility they have during the fall with the longer time frame—there is going to be significant competition for laboratory space. I am very appreciative of your comments that you are not going to be cutting back, but the suggestion is it will be very difficult to give students the same access to the resources they need in order to complete their work.

I am wondering if you are in a position to comment on that.

Mr. Johns: I have taught summer school over the years here, of course. It is a very condensed form of a full semester course.

One day off represents a large—it is usually about a week's work actually and it is irretrievable. You really cannot expect to say to students, well, you have to do this in the evenings because they are already in a condensed situation in terms of their studying, so it does impact immeasurably on the course.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Johns.

Just as a point of clarification, presenter No. 15 has withdrawn from the list but has submitted a written presentation, and there will be a new list of presenters. No. 15 was Betty Granger and Mr. Krahn who have withdrawn but have submitted a written presentation. A new list is being distributed right now.

I will now call upon Jennifer Johns. Jennifer Johns? Marie Speare? Marie Speare, do you have a written presentation?

Ms. Marle Speare (Private Citizen): Yes, I do.

Mr. Chairperson: It is being distributed. You may begin, Ms. Speare.

Ms. Speare: I did not know how many copies to bring. I was told to bring one copy.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, you may begin and they will make the copies and distribute them.

Ms. Speare: I would just like to introduce myself. I am a librarian at the University of Manitoba, and I work in the science library there. I would like to express my concerns on how the closure of the

university and subsequently the libraries at the university will affect the students, the staff and the outside community.

I and other librarians at the University of Manitoba have many other concerns regarding Bill 22 and its effect on collective bargaining, as well as the precedent it is setting, but I am going to concentrate my remarks on how Bill 22 will affect teaching and research at the university and the effect the bill will have on the outside community, as well.

It is obvious that when the libraries are closed, less research can be accomplished. Students and faculty do not have access to indexes, computer resources, books and journals while the libraries are closed. Most of the libraries at the University of Manitoba now also use computerized CD-ROM indexes which also need to be used in the library.

In some libraries, students already are waiting up to two weeks to use the computers. The closure of the library even for one day when students have to meet assignment deadlines will reduce the amount of time they have to complete their assignments. Students must find time to use the library between their lectures, their labs and their part-time jobs, and in many cases, do not have the flexibility of arriving on a different day or time in order to do their library research.

Libraries at the University of Manitoba are used all year round by different groups of the university community and by many outside organizations. A closure at any time of the year will affect some part of the university community. During September to April, students have to compete for library resources with fellow classmates and face many line-ups at computer work stations. Any closures during this time period will result in longer waiting periods and less time to spend finding research material.

When I was a student at the university, I found there was never enough time during the day to do all my assignments. Anyone who has ever written an essay that required library research must realize that it takes hours to find the material you need. The classes that are offered in the spring and summer are also of short duration, therefore students have very little spare time to access the library even in normal conditions. When they only have three to six weeks to complete a course, a closure of one day greatly reduces the amount of

time that is available for them to do their work. When there are no classes offered, which is only a few days per year, faculty, graduate students and the outside community still make use of the libraries.

Just to give you an example, at the medical library, the closures will have a very significant effect on medical students, especially those at the internship or residency levels, but also at the third or fourth-year levels when students are taking their clinical clerkships. The closures also have significant impacts on the medical faculty, especially the clinical faculty, who are supposed to continue to work during the extra closure days as their activities and responsibilities are to the patients and to the operation of the respective teaching hospitals. Students and staff working in hospitals or other clinical settings need access to the library during their working days and often need this information very quickly.

* (0950)

The outside community is also affected by the closure of the University of Manitoba libraries. The libraries at the university are a valuable resource to many businesses, engineers, lawyers, doctors and various citizens throughout the province, as well as a resource to other universities in the province. Many of these people need information quickly and will not be able to get it if the libraries are not open during normal working hours. In many cases, the University of Manitoba libraries are the only source of the required information in the province. People from outside the university community are also not aware of the days that the university is closed, and they expect the libraries to be open for their use.

Restricted access to the materials in the libraries at the University of Manitoba is not the only problem that will be encountered during a library closure. People seem to believe that books and journals just magically appear on the shelves ready for them to borrow. However, there is a large amount of work that needs to be done in order for the books to reach the shelves.

During a library closure, material waiting to be processed will also be delayed. For instance, in one day, over 400 journal issues are checked in and some 200 books are catalogued. This type of work has to be done at the library since computer databases need to be consulted and manuals need

to be checked. Closures will result in backlogs, and students and faculty will not have access to the most current information that is available.

(Mr. Jack Penner, Acting Chairperson, in the Chair)

Faculty and students are already aware there are many instances when publishers must be contacted to claim for journal issues bought but not received. Staff time is required for these claims for material desperately needed by our faculty and students. With the reduced number of working days, the number of outstanding claims will only increase and needed issues will not be available for consultation.

Since much of the material required to support faculty and graduate student research is also not held at the University of Manitoba, material must be requested from other institutions across Canada and throughout the world. In one day up to 200 requests for material at libraries outside the University of Manitoba can be processed. In many cases, material is needed urgently in order for faculty and graduate students to continue with their research.

It can take staff a week to process the requests that are left after being closed for a single day, because they also have their regular workflow to continue with. Any urgent requests therefore are not going to be processed as promptly as they are needed, and delays will exist for the other material.

The University of Manitoba, as I mentioned, also serves as a resource to many other libraries in the province of Manitoba. These libraries will also experience delays in receiving information that is required by their clients from the university. For instance, the University of Manitoba Libraries participates in a co-operative delivery system of loans between various libraries in the city of Winnipeg. In order to provide timely information, a courier delivers material between various libraries. Since many of the libraries in the agreement are affected by Bill 22 and each library has different closure days, it is difficult for the courier to deliver material on a timely basis.

So far I have only highlighted a few problems I can foresee that the faculty, students and outside community will experience due to the library closures. Of course, there are many other duties I have not mentioned that are performed every day that will also not be done since the amount of work

still remains the same but the number of days is reduced.

We also need time to upgrade our skills to assist faculty and students, and when there is so much work to be done it will be impossible to improve the service that is provided. Higher stress levels in staff due to the increased workload can also have the effect of reducing the quality of service that is provided to students and faculty.

Obviously, the closure of the University of Manitoba and its libraries for any number of days cannot help but have negative impacts for teaching and research at the university and will also affect many outside organizations as well.

In conclusion, I would just like you to take a moment and think about whether you would like to send your son or daughter to a university in Manitoba where they will be faced with larger classes, less class time, reduced time for research, as well as fewer resources.

The Acting Chairperson (Mr. Penner): Thank you very much for your presentation, Ms. Speare.

Mr. Alcock: Thank you, Ms. Speare. I am interested, you underline another aspect of the problem that is going to be faced particularly in the summer by summer students who are carrying a more compressed caseload. Has this been discussed at any length with management at the university? What has been their response to the concerns that you and others have raised?

Ms. Speare: Well, there have been no changes. The hours of the libraries are always, during the summertime, reduced because there are a fewer number of students and we also have fewer casual wage hours that we have to distribute throughout the year. Therefore, the libraries are just closed for that extra day. There is no compensation for students taking summer courses or spring courses.

Mr. Alcock: I mean, was this policy just—you one day got a notice saying you are going to be closed on these days and that was it? Or was there any discussion with management or administration at the university about which days, how they would be closed? Was there any chance for you to state that?

I tell you, I am asking this for a very specific reason. I raised this concern yesterday with the Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey) in Education Estimates and was told that the administration of the University of Manitoba had assured her that

there would be no impact at all on students from these closures.

Ms. Speare: Well, there was no discussion, as far as I know. The days were announced, and we followed the announcement. There was no discussion as far as what impacts the libraries would face or anything.

The Acting Chairperson (Mr. Penner): Thank you very much, Ms. Speare, for your presentation.

The next presenter is Dr. Dan Gietz. Have you a presentation for distribution to the committee?

Dr. Dan Gietz (Private Citizen): Yes, I have already submitted it.

The Acting Chairperson (Mr. Penner): Thank you very much. Would you proceed, please. By the way, am I pronouncing that name correctly?

Mr. Gietz: Yes, that is right.

My presentation is a bit shorter than most today, but I am here today to express my disagreement to Bill 22, and hope to convey the deleterious nature of this type of action on the medical research community in Manitoba. I am going to begin by stating that I work as an assistant professor in the Department of Human Genetics at the University of Manitoba. My many duties include teaching as well as running a medical research laboratory.

I feel that this bill will adversely affect the medical research ongoing in my laboratory as well as many others at the University of Manitoba and other institutions that carry out research in this province that come under its jurisdiction.

The University of Manitoba has chosen to administer six days without pay to all employees in an attempt to balance the budget due to the shortfall in funds received from the province in the last fiscal year. At first glance, it appears that this is just like closing any factory for a few days to allow the demand to catch up with production. Unfortunately, medical research also done at this institution, as I mentioned earlier, cannot be just shut off and turned on like light switches in a production facility.

Many experiments run days and even weeks in duration with specific operations to be done daily. One major problem with this bill is that although it may allow the university to decrease costs and balance budgets, it will unwittingly increase the cost to many medical researchers like myself. This is because many experiments cannot be just

shelved for each of these extra days off, but must be attended at an increased cost to the researcher.

When I require the technician working in my laboratory to complete an experiment on one of the days without pay, it will cost my research grant double the hourly wage. As my laboratory is run much like a small business on a fixed income for a granting term of one, two, three or five years, with salaries and equipment costs constantly increasing, this means that either experiments must be postponed or I must attend them myself if the funds are not available. I would like to remind you that I, too, have also been docked six days pay.

Due to the highly competitive and international nature of medical research, it is usually not possible nor very practical to postpone experiments. Thus, this means I will likely be working in the laboratory during my days without pay to keep my experiments going in the interest of maintaining my relative position with respect to other laboratories doing similar research. Many medical research laboratories in this province are in the same situation. I believe most will choose to continue the research in order to fulfill their granting obligations. This legislation will inevitably cost many researchers more money to continue these experiments during these days without pay.

* (1000)

We in the research community are measured, using an international scale, by the number of publications we produce. I believe this legislation will negatively affect my ability to produce publications by reducing the number of experiments that can be performed in the granting period. In addition, this will also affect my future ability to compete for federal grant funding and could potentially reduce the level of funding coming into this province.

Each laboratory in the Manitoba medical research community is like a small business, collectively pumping millions of grant dollars each year into this province's economy in the form of salaries and taxes. This legislation will definitely put Manitoba researchers at a disadvantage nationally, making it more difficult to complete their research and could potentially lead, again, to a reduction in the national grant funds coming to this province by interfering with their ability to succeed in grant competitions.

Many laboratories like my own already find it difficult to compete with the larger more well-funded laboratories in other countries, but we remain competitive by innovation and plain hard work. There is only so much blood one can squeeze from a stone.

Where will it end? If you, the government, choose in the future to further reduce funding to universities in this province, we may be forced to take another six or more days without pay, shutting down our laboratories for more nonproductive time. This may eventually develop into a climate where it is impossible to compete nationally or internationally in the medical research arena in Manitoba.

There certainly has to be a better solution to this problem. Everyone will agree that education is the key to the future. However, it seems that few politicians will act to ensure that this key can be forged. Medical research can be thought of as a lock or a series of locks that must be opened to give Manitobans and Canadians a healthier standard of living. By decreasing the level of funding to post-secondary educational institutions and enacting this legislation, you are unwittingly dealing medical research in this province a direct blow.

Better ways must be found to keep costs under control, yet still encourage education and research. We must not sacrifice education and research in Manitoba with band-aid solutions to the larger problem of funding education, but rather invest in the future by properly maintaining our educational institutions.

Before I finish, I would like to mention that most researchers like myself are not in research for the money. We are very passionate about what we do, and we all realize that the opportunity cost of our education will never be recouped in dollars earned.

When I was a graduate student, I was lucky enough to win a number of scholarships that allowed me to pay for some of my education, but I was discriminated against financially by the federal government by not being able to put any of this saved money that I did in fact save into an RRSP.

Many individuals in this type of work are having problems or, rather, they do not do it for the money, and they are being discriminated against financially because of these sorts of problems. Now, with this legislation, my big worry is that a lot of students I

see, they ask me, do you recommend that I go into science?

Unfortunately, I have a very hard time convincing them that it is a good place to be able to have a "normal life." This type of legislation will inhibit my ability to do my research on an international scale and could end up, actually, if things get worse, affecting my ability to get grants so I can further run my lab.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Dr. Gietz, for your presentation.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Thank you, Mr. Gietz. This call to public service, in your case as a researcher toward the betterment of science and ultimately to the betterment of humankind—I fully accept what you say, that you are not in it to necessarily to make money. I accept that. I would have to think there are an awful lot of people who accept a public call, who do it because of the best intentions and not to make themselves, necessarily, wealthy.

That is part of the dilemma. You say in your brief: "There is only so much blood one can squeeze from a stone." I identify with that statement. The stone that I am trying to get my arms around is about \$5.5 billion in size. I think there is only so much I can squeeze out of the economy, and I think there are only so many people or positions we can take out of the public sector employ. That is why Bill 22, the very essence of it, is to try and share forced, tough legislation, very powerful legislation, but try and force and get some additional sharing.

You go on further to say there must be better solutions to this problem. Would you care to tell me what they are, what these better solutions are?

Mr. Gietz: I think that instead of allowing the university just to cut salaries, there may be some formula that somebody might be able to come up with to allow them to become more efficient, instead of cutting salaries just with a broad sweep of the axe.

Many of the people who are hired in a research laboratory, the university does not benefit by their day off. Most people who are hired on a grant, the university does not get to keep that money.

So if we could somehow get the university to become more efficient, as well as—I still truly believe we have to invest in education. I truly believe that Canadian people do not value

education the way we should. We have to do something, put money into the system to stimulate Canadian students to go into higher education.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Chairperson, I hope Mr. Gietz understands that this government, over five budgets, has pretty well saved harmless from the reductions that have occurred in so many departments—basically all the departments other than Education this past year and Health this past year—has saved harmless those departments because of the very high priority we put on them.

Hopefully it says, in the sense that we had to turn to them this time, how difficult the situation is. I mean, I look at colleagues around this table. We have decimated their departments. When Mr. Gietz talks about efficiency, though, we have some presenters from the university who tell us to mind our own business in the sense of university efficiency, just keep the money rolling.

* (1010)

We believe there is still a degree of inefficiency at the universities, and yet we are told on several occasions to mind our own business, that we have no say in how it is universities should operate.

Should the government be more closely associated with the day-to-day operations of the universities to try and find these areas of inefficiency?

Mr. Gietz: I do not think the government needs to be more closely associated with the day-to-day runnings of the university, but I think the university should be given a mandate to do something other than this broad sweeping chop to try and cut back costs. I think it is a very inefficient way of doing that.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Gietz, there is nothing in this bill that forces the universities to accept this approach. This is empowering legislation which says universities can turn to this if they needed to. This does not impose a thou-shall approach onto the universities.

Do you understand the difference?

Mr. Gietz: Yes, I do. It is just, I think, an easy way out for university administrators.

Mr. Alcock: I think, Mr. Gietz, the minister is perhaps a little too cute when talks about this problem he has to solve. He solved his problem by cutting the university back 2 percent but did not

leave it open to the university to solve their problem.

But I am interested—you make a point here—I have two or three quick questions before we get to the size of this—the numbers of researchers, do you have any sense of the total grants that are coming from research into the province, and how many of the grants that you receive in your research come from the government of Manitoba?

Mr. Gletz: I think there are departments that have grants totalling in the millions of dollars. I think if you sat down and calculated the total number of grant funds coming into the University of Manitoba, it is in the millions of dollars. I do not know the figure, exactly, but it is quite high.

Myself, I have received funds from the province, and I am very grateful for that. Right now I am running on a grant from the Medical Research Council of Canada.

Mr. Alcock: I guess the point that comes to mind for me is, and I believe, I do not know the figure on the top of my head, but it was some \$56 million or \$62 million a year coming into the University of Manitoba in grant-funded research from outside the province of Manitoba.

So these are monies that are flowing into the province, and despite the fact it has no impact on Mr. Manness' budget—it does not save him a nickel—you make the point here, and I think it is easily underscored for him: "When I require the technician working in my laboratory to complete an experiment on one of the days without pay, it will cost my research grant double the hourly wage," so he is impacting on the money that you are bringing in from outside the province, reducing your ability to be competitive in the research market.

I have spent some days there myself; it is an incredibly competitive market. Does that not put you and other researchers in the position of, over time—those national grants are not things that are handed out easily. You do an awful lot of work and an awful lot of preparation; you are juried on them. Does it not reduce your competitive position over time?

Mr. Gletz: Yes, it does. I think that it is very difficult to obtain grant funding. Currently 17 percent of new grants submitted were funded last year, which is a very low level. Even people with very good granting histories have lost grants, have reduced their level of grant funding, because it is

becoming so competitive. Because we are on a fixed budget and because we definitely have to and we are always running on less money than we need, it does cut into our ability to do the research that we proposed in our grant proposal.

Mr. Alcock: It is interesting, this question of whether you save certain aspects of education harmless, and see certain things as investments rather than draws on the public purse. There is also a competitive environment for people like yourself. You high-quality, publishing researchers are in demand in other areas. Is there not pressure on researchers eventually to seek other pastures? Is there not difficulty in retaining and attracting quality researchers in this province?

Mr. Gletz: Yes, it is difficult, in my opinion, to attract students in Manitoba to do certain types of research and there are other venues, so to speak, that are easier. I have a number of colleagues that have many students and post-docs, so it makes it hard if one cannot attract the funds to pay students and to do the research, to actually stay at this institution if there are other better opportunities around.

Ms. Cerilli: We have heard a number of examples where it is obvious that the effects of the way this bill is introduced and being brought in—that it has not been thought through, and when you talk about—that it is going to be disrupting your ability to function, I would just like some more explanation about the kind of research you are doing, and how this is going to affect your operation.

Mr. Gletz: Well, basically, my research involves investigations into cancer-related genes, genes involved in cancer and things like that. Experiments do not just run a single day, they run weeks, and so many times things must be done. You have to come into the lab, you have to take plates out of the incubator, you must prep up the colonies on those plates, continue to do something every day if you want the science to proceed.

In other instances in my department, people have to come in daily to feed tissue culture cells. There are individuals that use animals to produce antibodies. They must be maintained.

So it is a very labour-intensive type of research. In many cases, myself, I am in the lab seven days a week for some period each day just to keep the research going, because it is so competitive internationally.

The Acting Chairperson (Mr. Penner): Thank you very much, Dr. Gietz, for your presentation.

I call next, Mark Golden. Have you a written presentation to distribute?

Mr. Mark Golden (Private Citizen): No, I do not.

The Acting Chairperson (Mr. Penner): No? Would you proceed with your presentation then, please?

Mr. Golden: My name is Mark Golden. I am a professor of classics at the University of Winnipeg. I am not a member of my union executive. I am not a member of my union bargaining committee. So you are free to regard what I say now as the view of one person only. You are also free to regard it as representative of many ordinary teachers, academics, members of the public sector and citizens of Manitoba.

When this legislation was first announced, I was quite upset—my wife can testify to this—and it took me a while to figure out why I was so upset. In the end, I decided I was upset because I regard this legislation as fundamentally dishonest.

(Mr. Chairperson in the Chair)

I think it is fundamentally dishonest in three ways. First, the process is dishonest. There is a pretense here that the government is maintaining its arm's-length relationship with Manitoba universities, that the government does not control the universities directly, that Bill 22, for example, only permits university administrations to pursue certain measures and it does not require them to close or indeed to take any other measures.

We raised this question, in a public meeting attended by several hundred people, with our president. We said, well, you do not have to do this. We do not see that our financial situation requires it. Why are you doing this?

Our president told us that she had received threats and pressures from the Universities Grants Commission and from the ministry which made it clear that consequences would follow if our university did not close on some number of days under this bill. If you do not believe what the president said, perhaps you would like to call her before you and speak to her.

Secondly, I believe this bill is dishonest because it is fundamentally unfair. There is a pretense here that those who work in universities are all very well paid. Some are, no doubt. The university also

includes many people who will be affected by this bill who are quite poorly paid. My boy goes to the University of Winnipeg preschool, which is a daycare. The people who look after him make under \$30,000 a year; in most cases, they make well under \$30,000 a year. The preschool will be closed that day. These people will not be paid, and some of the parents who send their kids to that preschool will have to find alternative arrangements which may involve them taking a day off from their work which is not in the public sector.

The secretary of our department, an extremely able and competent woman who is the secretary for classics, philosophy and half of sociology, makes well under \$30,000 a year, and there are many, many people in that position at the University of Winnipeg and elsewhere in the public sector.

Thirdly, I believe this legislation is dishonest because it does not do the job it claims to do, though it may well have another agenda in mind. The pretense here is that the public sector is responsible for the continuing deficits and the increasing debt of this government.

As a matter of fact, this is not so. These deficits and this debt is largely the result of government policy. It is the result of the failure of senior governments to live up to their responsibility to the citizens in provinces like this. It is a result of high interest rates which were pursued as a matter of government policy and continue to be pursued as a matter of government policy, and it is the result of a failure and unwillingness on the part of this and other governments to tax profitable corporations and individuals who make high incomes.

* (1020)

The minister asked the previous speaker, with whom I am fundamentally in agreement, what would he suggest? I would suggest the following. I make \$57,000 a year. On this, I support myself, my wife, my little boy. If you think I make too much money, you can tax me. You can tax me the amount of money that you are costing me by closing this important public institution. You can tax me and you can tax the lawyers and you can tax the doctors and you can tax the accountants and you can tax the hockey players and you can tax the business executives.

If you think this money is necessary, that is where you should get it. If you do not do this, I will have no other conclusion available to me than that

this is basically an attack on the public sector, a public sector important to the people of Manitoba and built up by my family and families of people like me for many generations.

Mr. Alcock: Thank you very much, Mr. Golden. I think you make the point at the end eloquently enough. I do not need to add to that.

I am interested in the discussions you had with your university president because I have had similar discussions with the university president from the University of Manitoba who suggests that when your major funder makes a suggestion, however innocently, that it is a direction. Was there any expansion on the kinds of threats, the kind of pressure that was brought to bear on the university president by the ministry?

Mr. Golden: No, there was not. I am just reporting what she said in a public meeting which was well attended. You would have to ask her for any details. I was not privy to those discussions, obviously.

Mr. Alcock: In that meeting, was there any discussion of alternatives, other ways to deal with this, other solutions to the problem, other action the university might take?

Mr. Golden: Yes, there were such discussions.

Mr. Alcock: And the conclusion?

Mr. Golden: Well, the conclusion is as you see. The university has decided to—whatever the verb seems suitable—to go along with it.

Mr. Alcock: Are you teaching in the summer program this year?

Mr. Golden: No.

Mr. Alcock: Have you any sense of the direct impact on the summer program this year?

Mr. Golden: Oh, spring and summer programs are both a problem at the University of Winnipeg. They are so constricted. Any time lost, particularly any library time lost because evening hours are cut down too, is a real problem for students. I have, in the past had to go to quite extraordinary lengths to assure that my spring and summer students can have access to materials, including just loaning my stuff out wholesale and hoping that I would get it back. But I do not have any direct experience this year.

Mr. Alcock: The experience you have had is in a normal year, and one would assume that with six

days lost over the course of the summer, it is going to be that much greater.

Mr. Golden: Yes, I assume so.

Mr. Alcock: Now, I wonder if you would take back to your administration the comment from the Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey) yesterday in Estimates here that the result of this was being implemented satisfactorily, and there would be, quote, and I underline, no impact on students at the university this year.

Mr. Golden: I am sure the president was very happy to have that assurance from the minister.

Mr. Alcock: In fact, the minister said that the president had given her that assurance.

Ms. Cerilli: One of the things the bill does is break a collective agreement, and I am interested with respect to the meeting you had.

I would like to know more about when that meeting occurred and what led up to the meeting with the president, and if it was after the fact that you first heard about the way the bill was going to be implemented and the effects of it.

Mr. Golden: Well, this was an unfortunate process at my university. We heard the bill was in the offing. We then were told we were going to be given six days off. Then at that stage, there was a public meeting, and what charitably could be construed as a process of consultation took place. None of the comments made from the audience were acted on by the administration.

Then there were further consultations, if you want to call them that, with affected unions, and various proposals were made by all of the campus unions about what could be done. I think some minor suggestions were accepted by the administration.

Mr. Pallster: Thank you, Mr. Golden, Professor Golden, for your presentation.

Mr. Golden: Mister is just fine. Thanks.

Mr. Pallster: I want to make sure I am accurate in this, but your suggestion is, rather than this approach, tax corporations and the wealthy more heavily than is currently done?

Mr. Golden: And people like me. If you think I am making a lot of money and can afford \$1,200, well, tax me.

Mr. Pallster: I was just going to ask you how would you define wealthy.

Mr. Golden: Oh, I am not concerned to define it. I am saying I am paying \$1,200 as a result of this. If you think that that is right, go ahead, tax everybody else that makes my kind of money this \$1,200. That seems fairer to me that picking on the public sector.

Mr. Pallster: So you would say I am accurate then in summing up your recommendation as being tax the rich and the large corporations. Is that it?

Mr. Golden: I think that is the answer, yes.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Golden.

I will now call on Mr. Vorst. Just as a matter of record, could I have your first name, Mr. Vorst?

Mr. Jessie Vorst (Private Citizen): Jessie.

Mr. Chairperson: Jessie Vorst. Did you have a written presentation?

Mr. Vorst: No, Sir.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. You may proceed with your presentation, Mr. Vorst.

Mr. Vorst: My name is Jessie Vorst. I am a professor of economics at the University of Manitoba. I am also co-ordinator of the labour studies program within the Faculty of Arts.

I think the first question that ought to be raised in this context is whether there is something called a sacred trust in the area of collective bargaining. The Manitoba Labour Relations Act, in fact, says that it is the purpose of labour relations in this province to provide a harmonious environment. This particular act does take away from collective bargaining and in a way definitely reduces the degree of harmony between employers and employees.

Is collective bargaining a sacred trust? Not necessarily. Obviously, in the case of true emergencies, like a war, it is not unusual to reduce the amount of freedom that both parties have in the area of bargaining for wages, salaries, benefits and the like.

The question now becomes whether we are facing here the kind of emergency situation that can be compared with a war situation in which the very survival of the country is at stake. I beg to differ. I think what we are seeing here is a strong downslide of the economy. I will come back to the causes of the downslide, but it is no more than a downslide of a fairly cyclical nature which will undoubtedly be followed by some kind of recovery, provided, of

course, public policy is implemented in due course. I suspect this is where some of the differences stem from between the introducer of this bill and myself.

In terms of the relations between the employers and employees, we see a curious situation here. First, we see if the bill is passed, employers are asked to contact their employees, whether organized in unions or not, and let them know in no uncertain terms that some layoffs, or whatever name, are necessary.

* (1030)

It is interesting to see, by the way, that this particular act does not refer, to my knowledge, to some agencies funded by the government very generously, in particular, such organizations as our elite schools which have been getting greater and greater grants from the government and seem to be exempt from present legislation.

The employer is required to sit down with employees if there is a union present. However, if after 30 days, no agreement can be found on which days to lay people off, et cetera, then it can simply be implemented unilaterally by the employer. Well, certainly that is not a situation that I would call harmonious.

Unlike other pieces of provincial legislation, I think particularly of The Pay Equity Act—and I was very much part of the implementation of that act at the University of Manitoba. That act talked extensively about negotiation, and only in extreme circumstances could anything be implemented and not by management, it could only be implemented by the Minister of Labour.

In this particular act, basically, employers have their hands free to impose whatever they find attractive. I do not think, with all due respect to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that this is an option for the employer. Certainly, a university that is funded by the government can simply expect a reduction in its grant if it decides not to impose this reduction this year. If anything, the government will say, we gave you the tools and we had better make sure you use those tools. That is not a matter of interference in internal university organization, it is just a matter of how much money we think you need, given the legislative mandate you are acting under.

The question then becomes—it is really the second one—whether the exercise is necessary to fight the deficit, however the deficit was caused.

Well, however it was caused is, of course, central to the question because this deficit, we all know by now, is caused directly by government policy.

By the way, I am not somebody—being an old-fashioned economist raised in the 1950s, I am not the kind of economist who is overly concerned all the time about deficits and government debts, but it has been proven beyond any reasonable doubt that a full 94 percent of the debt accumulated since 1984 is a direct result of the policies of the federal government, a federal government of a particular political signature. Ninety-four percent, that is an awful amount of money.

It has also been proven beyond a reasonable doubt that if the federal government through the Bank of Canada had followed a financial policy, an interest rate policy, closer to that of the United States—and we all know that was not the most progressive policy either—in fact, we would have an extremely small deficit, only \$5 billion, maybe \$6 billion at the federal level, and in fact, on the operating side of the government, there would have been a massive surplus.

To a large extent, all this has been kind of downloaded onto the shoulders of the provinces because of the reduction in federal-provincial fiscal transfers of various types. We have seen the reduction in the official arrangement, and that, in fact, started well before the current government in Ottawa took power. I think it started about 1977, 1978. But what has been absolutely staggering has been the redistribution of the tax load since the mid-'80s in two ways, away from corporations and toward individuals, incidentally also a process that dates back a few more years, but in particular, the shift of the tax burden from high-income earners to middle-income earners.

One result of that is, of course, an outcry about high taxes from a much larger group of people, a particular group of people toward whom the government may feel some certain kind of political responsibility.

But the main effect of that has been a redistribution of consumer expenditure, and one reason why economies are sluggish is because of this redistribution of taxation from the top to the middle, and as a result, middle-income people have much less disposable income now than they had in the olden days, on a relative basis, while the increased income for the people at the top is not

consumed, because how many suits can you wear, as Baron Thomson of Fleet once stated.

It goes into savings and much of the savings is not productive. It does not go to new factories, new machinery and the like. Those savings are used primarily as purely financial investments, and to the paring up of the price of existing properties, particularly in the real estate market.

That has been the fundamental cause of the current recession, starting in about, say, the late 1980s as a result of the massive accumulation of basically sterile funds in the hands of those people who used to pay a fairer share or a larger share of taxes. Fair is a subjective expression. [interjection] I am sorry I missed that, but I will continue and questions can be raised again.

There is nothing wrong with high incomes or low incomes. The question is, what is an economically efficient tax distribution, and with this particular act, what will it achieve? It will not just achieve a reduction in the incomes of some people. Many people, by the way, have fairly low incomes. A large portion of the civil servants affected by this bill are definitely not in the high-income brackets. They are not even in the middle-income brackets. They are in the low-income brackets, \$20,000 and even less, but it will have a massive effect on the services provided in the public sector.

There is one thing I find extremely disconcerting, and that is the fact that there has been this message being sent to the population at large, and not just in Manitoba, also in other provinces, that public services are basically a waste. Now, public services are at the core of Canadian society. We have grown as a nation because of the strong position of our governments and the strong position of our Crown corporations, so there is hardly any industry in Canada that was not developed with the help of government money or with the help of expertise assembled in Crown corporations.

The reduction of services we will see everywhere. We have seen it for a number of years, certainly at the university. We have seen it in other sectors as well, the health care sector, the personal care sector and the like. The effects of that on the social structure I will not even predict at this time, but it is going to be absolutely horrendous. We are sliding down very quickly to the level that some of the emerging countries in other parts of the world are now trying to achieve.

What does the cutback mean in terms of the employment status of individuals, regarding the reduction in the number of hours, number of days work? Well, I have noticed in the past few months a drastic reduction in staff morale, both in the civil service and at my own institution of employment, the University of Manitoba.

There is a term called work to rule. Work to rule is the most devastating measure that any kind of employee can ever take and any group of employees can ever take. I have known people at the university where a couple of years ago I would call them and say, look, I need something, can you help me? It was not within his domain but he would say, sure, we will do it; it is no problem, give the advice, we will go out and find a solution to this problem. For the past two years, and it has certainly accelerated in the past two or three months, no is the answer. People are discouraged. People see that their services are deemed expendable, and they simply will not put out more than the bare minimum, the bare necessity required by their employment relationship—no more than that.

We are, of course, talking about massive staff cutbacks which will offload work onto other people. I just discovered the other day that the typist to whom I could give some work, although I do about 80 percent of my own typing already—which work is not really mine, but okay—I am not a very good typist by the way, so it is always slow, but the typist has just received a doubling of workload because of cutbacks at the university. One secretary retired, and the secretary I used to give my work to has simply received all the people who used to bring the work to the now-retired person. That is a pretty massive increase in her workload, and it will, of course, mean an increase in my workload or a reduction in the activities that I can engage in otherwise.

Look at the impact on students of all this. Now we have seen already a tremendous increase in the number of students who for reasons of necessity cannot be full-time students. When I started working at this University of Manitoba, and it was 26 years ago, a working student was an absolute exception. During the academic year students were available for five, six days a week for 12 hours a day. They had time to sit down with the instructor. They had time to sit down with their textbooks, with their peers, et cetera, and the

results were analogous to that. They were on the whole quite good.

* (1040)

What I see nowadays are students, the majority of whom have at least a part-time job and many need a full-time job simply to stay alive because in many cases their parents do not have the income. This act will actually make that even worse.

I see students working part time, if not full time. I see students coming to class half asleep because they had to work the night shift. I have students who have trouble making ends meet in terms of family responsibilities. No time for study, no time for writing, and certainly no time for the reflection that is necessary in the educational process.

Then I come to the academic staff. Now you have heard a number of stories today, and I am sure previous days, of what cutbacks have meant at the university. Let me just tell you my own particular situation. As I say, I have been teaching here for 26 years, and I am getting to the stage that, in private enterprise, people will start getting a slight reduction in the physical responsibilities. Instead of that, I have seen a doubling in the number of students I have to teach, doubling in, say, about the past 10 to 15 years.

I have a heavy administrative load being a co-ordinator of a program for which I have so far received no reduction in administrative load. I carry a fair amount of the administration of my department, for which I get lots of applause from my colleagues, but there is no reduction in work load; otherwise, of course, there is no increase in salary which, by the way, I do not demand.

I need to do far more student counselling. I need to do it because the students have more problems. When I can sit down with them, which usually is then on the weekend when they are free and I am free, I hear horror stories. I have to go out and find solutions to their horror stories. I have to refer students to special financial resources because their money has run out. I have to talk to employers asking permission to let a student attend my class because there is a test and so forth.

My normal work load is such that I work 60 hours during the academic year; I kept track of that last year very carefully, 60 hours, 45 hours during the off-season, meaning once classes are over and until they start again in September, about 45 hours. In the past 10 years I have averaged two weeks of

holidays a year, which is about minimum, I think, in Manitoba under our labour legislation.

Basically, what I will have now is a compressed work year, the same work in less time at less money. Money, by the way, that I would gladly donate to a good cause even if that meant helping provide social services to people and education services that are now deprived. But, as the previous speaker said, that will have to be done firmly through the tax system and not through a tax system that has been manipulated very carefully by the government in Ottawa so as to reduce the burden on the top people and shift it to the people at the middle of the income distribution.

I am committed to good teaching. I am committed to making new course outlines and new lectures every year. I am available, basically, six days a week, even six and a half days, if students can only come out to campus on Sunday morning or Sunday afternoon.

I spend an enormous amount of time helping my students write their essays and reading those essays. I still demand essays of 40 to 50 to 60 pages. I know I am an exception by now, because once you have classes of 120 people, you cannot do it. Last year, for the first time in, I think, about a decade, I did teach a first-year course during the day. I had 120 students. I insisted that they write essay-type exams and tests. For each test I spent 50 hours marking. Now, 50 hours is more than a normal work load per week, if no other work is being done than that.

I do not complain about my work load. I love this job. I will probably continue doing it. As I say, I am going to donate money if I know for sure it goes to good causes. I cannot accept, possibly, the reduction in services provided by the university and the pressure from a government which, for reasons partly of its own, partly because of upper-level governments in Ottawa, have found themselves without funds.

Finally, I am in a fortunate position to command a fair amount of respect in the national scholarly community. I have to travel. I have to travel to attend meetings of the Social Science Federation in Ottawa and also meetings of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, which is a government agency. It is a government agency that is still in place, notwithstanding efforts to have it dismantled. People respect me there.

I have to figure out what I am going to do with the input I have to provide to those organizations if my workweek gets cut. Do I replace that work with something else? Do I deprive national bodies of the advice that they find useful? Do we really want Manitoba to become intellectual backwater that nobody ever calls upon for advice? Well, if that is the case, I think we are on the right track. If not, if we really like Manitobans to be respected around the country, I think that this particular bill is not a very good exercise. Thank you for your attention.

Mr. Chalperson: Thank you very much for your presentation. The member has about three minutes left for questions.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Vorst, I always appreciate listening to you. One of my regrets as an Economics graduate is that I did not take a class from you. That was not by design.

In fairness to other members of the committee, I will try to keep my one question very straightforward. Mr. Vorst, I know you know that the marketplace works, with all of its problems, indeed, that the supply and demand around money works. Notwithstanding many of the presentations—and some would say it is the fault of the Governor of the Bank of Canada, of course, who has great influence on 90-day money and, I would argue, has virtually no influence on 10-year money.

Yesterday the government of Manitoba floated a loan on behalf of Manitoba Hydro, 20-year money. We had to pay 8.6 percent all in. That was at a rate at 13 basis points better than the Province of Ontario. Are you troubled by that fact at all, and what do you read into it?

Mr. Vorst: I am not an expert in the field of the operations of the Bank of Canada. What I do know is that—and you say that in this particular case it is not really the Bank of Canada—although maybe I go too much by my textbooks, the Bank of Canada, by setting the bank rate and by either supporting the bank rate or causing it to slide, does set some kind of a standard which is used as a signal.

I see that we disagree on that. I may have to rewrite some of the textbooks, at least reread them. I must say that, on the whole, even the rather conservative economists of this country have, within the last year, stated very critical comments about the role of the Bank of Canada in this particular field. The attempt to wrestle inflation to

the ground which Monsieur Trudeau had thought he had done already in the early '70s, but that has led to a differential, as far as I can see, between American or U.S. interest rates which in itself increased dramatically the exchange rate of the Canadian dollar, which took away any kind of beneficial effect that the Free Trade Agreement could have had.

That is an avenue that I think has not been explored sufficiently, but, in my opinion, has been extremely serious. On the other matter, I hope you will agree with me that I am not a monetary expert. I am an expert in the operation of the real economy, so maybe some other time I could study that more.

Mr. Chairperson: Unfortunately, your time has expired, Mr. Vorst. Thank you very much for your presentation.

I now call upon Mr. Fortier. Do you have a written presentation, Mr. Fortier?

Mr. Paul Fortier (Private Citizen): I do not have a written presentation.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed with your presentation.

Mr. Fortier: My name is Paul Fortier. I am University Distinguished Professor at the University of Manitoba. I work in the Department of French, Spanish and Italian. I am not a member of the executive of my union. I hope to be brief because I have only two points that I wish to make.

* (1050)

The first one is, the work load which we are expected to carry out as responsible professionals has not been decreased. We are expected to continue our teaching, and the number of students we teach is going up every year. We are expected to continue our teaching, and the number of students whom we teach is going up every year. We are expected to continue preparing our classes, and that means doing research to generate new knowledge, to be taught, to keep up to date, et cetera. We are expected to continue participating in the administration of our university, and we are being told to carry out the same tasks in fewer working days with smaller pay.

I think the minister might recognize that this is demoralizing, in the sense of discouraging people like myself and others who have dedicated virtually their entire adult life to the young people of the province of Manitoba.

My second point: I had the privilege of growing up in a society of laws in Canada, in a society where rules for fair conduct are agreed on and accepted by all. As a result of these rules and laws, a number of groups at the University of Manitoba formed unions. Under these basic rules, contracts and working conditions have been hammered out, basically through a process of negotiation and compromise. Some things are given up in order to gain other things.

All of this now can be overturned by one side on 30 days notice, basically unilaterally, basically as a result of government-empowering legislation. I am concerned. I am particularly concerned, Mr. Chairperson, because I have visited societies where government is not seen as fair, where government is not seen as respecting its own principles or its own people.

In these societies, it is not seen as wrong to lie to the government. In these societies, the representatives of the state are not respected—police officers, public servants, et cetera. In these societies, those who accept political responsibility are held in contempt. In these societies, public morality has broken down. This is very clear in eastern Europe where it is possible to change the economic system, but public morality has not yet risen to the level which we take for granted here in Canada.

So I am most concerned to see a government, for financial expediency, beginning this process of demoralization in the exact sense, beginning the process of decreasing the perception that the government is fair, beginning the process of decreasing the perception that we live in a moral society. I do not care to see my children grow up in such a demoralized society. I do not care to live in such a society myself.

I would urge you to reconsider implementing this law. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Mr. Fortier.

Mr. Alcock: Thank you, Professor Fortier. I would like to get you to comment a little bit on one aspect of this that is troubling me coming out of the discussions taking place today.

The minister has said on many occasions and he said again today—he presents the picture that for the first five budgets, the universities were saved harmless, that there was no impact, and at the

same time—and I note that Mr. Enns is here from Natural Resources, and he has made the case at other times that his department had to pay such a big price, but that the universities did not have to carry any responsibility for the debt or the deficit or that sort of thing.

They present this action as something that is a new direction for the universities and that this is the first year the university is being asked to take less than it requires, yet my experience out there—and you touched on it when you started talking about how your workload has not decreased over the last five years. It has increased. Class sizes are larger. I think it was Professor Vorst who made the case that TAs are not as available to assist with marking and course teaching, so the quality of teaching has gone down.

I would like if you could comment a little bit on just what your experience has been at the university over these last five years while you have been “saved harmless” from the effects of the debt and deficit.

Mr. Fortler: Well, class sizes have indeed increased over those five years. We in the French and Spanish and Italian department have had to put on a maximum number of students we can accept in a class. One cannot honestly and professionally claim to be teaching a conversation class, for instance, with more than 20 people in it. One cannot honestly and professionally claim to be teaching a language class with more than 40 people in it. I have certainly noticed that the number of students at my door asking to be allowed in over the maximum has gone up.

My department is now teaching between 40 and 50 percent of its students on soft money. That is to say, instead of fully qualified professors, you hire someone on a temporary basis for a year, basically for nine months. You give that person the princely sum of \$26,000 per annum, and then you ask them to take six days off without pay because the government cannot afford that.

Mr. Alcock: It is interesting as I have sat through this the last number of days and heard some of the comments that take place around the table. There seems to be this image that professors, you know, have all sorts of free time and all sorts of time to be taking up the slack, if you like. I think there is a devaluing—as someone who has marked a number of university papers—a devaluing of the

time and effort it takes to provide proper feedback to students and to deal responsibly with your educational activities.

I think there is a devaluing of the role that course assistants and TAs play in providing a quality environment, and I wonder, in your experience, have you been losing those services within your department?

Mr. Fortler: In my department, there is not a lot of assistance from teaching assistants. It is one of the things that went by the board some time ago, a minimum of five years.

We tend to want one-on-one relationships rather than the model of the large lecture and then the teaching assistant. It has to do with the fact that even in the literature courses there is a large language-learning component. That is best done in the setting where the professor or the person in charge of the course section has a good idea of how people are doing, and the TA system does not work well with that. I consider entirely legitimate where there is not this language question, but it is just a difference in style. Styles vary very greatly from department to department.

Mr. Alcock: Another observation that one makes on looking at students going to university now, I think there is still this sense that students are out there playing bridge and drinking beer and having a good time that really does not support the kind of allegations that Professor Vorst was making. When I look at what has happened with the relationship being part-time and full-time students, we note that since '84 the number of part-time students has gone up dramatically, the number of full-time students has gone down correspondingly.

The analysis suggests that it is because students simply have to work, that working is not a part-time thing you do to earn a little money on the weekend, that it is necessary to support your life. Professor Vorst was making the case that—he called them horror stories. He says, he spends a portion of his time talking to students, just helping them sort out some of their personal issues so that they can continue their education.

Can you comment on that from your experience?

Mr. Fortler: My experience is quite similar to Professor Vorst's. I am appalled at the number of students who do not have a reasonable amount of time to put in their class preparation, and as for general public perceptions of professors having

lots of spare time and students having lots of time for beer drinking, I do not think it is particularly responsible to take this seriously—after all, think of the general public perception of politicians.

Mr. Alcock: Well, then, just maybe a final question, so in your experience over the last five years at the university, has the university been held harmless from budget cuts?

Mr. Fortler: That is certainly not my experience.

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): It is Professor Fortier?

Mr. Fortler: That is correct.

* (1100)

Mr. Enns: It bothers me, Professor, when somebody of your stature and place in our society makes the kind of comments that you concluded your presentation with this morning. Your colleagues before you—and this morning seems to be the morning where we have academia present, and they have gone out of their way to make, and understandably so, their qualifications known to us as committee members. I do not believe it is inordinate, then, that I make my qualifications known to you.

It has been my good fortune to every three or four years knock on about 25,000 doors of my constituency to ask them, among other things, as to whether or not they should continue to honour me with being their representative, but also while I knock on these doors is whether I should continue to extract the monies necessary to support organizations like the University of Manitoba, your salary, sir, and that of all other actions undertaken by government. I have been in the position where the position that I put forward has been rejected by the majority of people in the province. I have twice been removed from office, as you would expect in a democratic and representative form of government to operate.

You have heard the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), perhaps not at this meeting, but certainly on other occasions, and the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and this government state emphatically that we represented ourselves to the people of Manitoba in a very clear and precise way that levels of taxation had reached a point that they had to be addressed.

In fact, we made a commitment that we would not increase the major levels of taxation, knowing that

we know that we were, in 1988, among the highest taxed, if not the highest taxed in such critical areas as personal income tax, which had direct impacts on the public service.

It meant that we had to pay our nursing; we had to pay our public services; we had to pay everybody, substantially, \$1,000 more than other parts of the country if we were to retain them in our service, in this province. But, leaving all those other issues aside, I suppose your comments about—you know, I can accept, in the hurly-burly, an organized union leader who makes no pretence as to where his politics lies. He says they send their money to our friends opposite. They attend their political rallies, and so when the confirmed NDP'er accuses us of bordering on the fascist or the nazism—I am disturbed that you conclude your brief about suggesting that the path this democratically representative government is on is moving us in the direction of those demoralized societies that you spoke of in Eastern Europe.

I am a first-generation whose parents came from Eastern Europe, from the Soviet Union. Both my parents were teachers in the Soviet Union. They could not carry on that profession because a dictum came down from the government that you teach this and only that. That contained a lot of political philosophy. They could not accept that, so they came to this country in 1926, to my everlasting advantage, I might say.

But I am disturbed that a professor of the University of Manitoba would come and tell this committee, tell this Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) that what we are doing here borders on fascism, borders on totalitarianism when, sir, all you have to do is convince yourself, convince Mr. Doer of the opposition party to repeal this bill. He will undo anything that may be in this bill in 14 months or in 18 months.

If, for good measure, they want to be your friends, they want to add an extra 10 percent to it, they can do that too. But they will have to knock on the 600,000, 700,000 doors that we knock on every three or four years and convince the general public that that is the case. Would you, at least, not acknowledge that that is, in fact, the situation and that the kind of expressions, of irreversibly marching towards totalitarianism that you alluded to in this kind of legislation, is stretching the truth somewhat?

Mr. Fortler: I am not sure whether it is stretching the truth at all or not, when a certain group is singled out by the government for a special tax because six days without pay, as Professor Golden pointed out, is, indeed, a tax. This is not fair. You know it, I know it.

I am sorry, I will withdraw any suggestion that this government is fascist. I meant to make no suggestion. I carefully chose my examples from communism.

Mr. Enns: Mr. Chairperson, by the way, that is where the circle meets, of course, fascism or communism in their extreme. They are really not discernible in terms of how they afflict their misery on the general public and have inflicted their misery on so many millions of people around this globe.

But the only other issue that you make—you respond by saying that what you then see is the particular unfairness of this bill—is the singling out of the public sector, in this case, the university employees.

Do you not, from time to time, view the world around you? We have met, both our caucuses, with airline employees who are facing job extinction, who have voluntarily rolled back their salaries 5 and 10 percent. I have a group of 1,000 woodworkers in Pine Falls represented by a strong-willed international labour organization, the united woodworkers union of America, that have signed a five-year contract calling for wage reductions in order to maintain their jobs. Do you not see companies, bastions of industry like Great-West Life, laying off people and rolling back wages? The issue that has been plain to government that in fact the only sector in the last five years that has been saved harmless from the reality of the economics around has been the public sector, ergo this bill.

You, sir, in general, it can be said the public sector has been saved harmless totally from the reality of the economic world around us, and for that reason, Professor, this bill. I would ask you again to reconsider your position whether you feel yourself being singled out.

Mr. Fortler: Well, the point is yes. There have been areas where rollbacks have been negotiated, and as a member of the public sector, I am privileged to have the rollback legislated. It is a difference. It is a point of the difference which was

the point of the second section to which you alluded and took objection.

If the university cannot be funded at a viable level, that is unfortunate, but you people are indeed elected to represent us and to make those determinations. If you care to point out that we are all overprivileged and overpaid and roll us back by legislation, that is very different. That is singling out groups for victimization.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Fortier.

I would like to call upon Mr. Paul Phillips. Paul Phillips? Did you have a written presentation, Mr. Phillips?

Mr. Paul Phillips (Private Citizen): I do not have extra copies.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. One of the clerks will pick it up, and then we will get it xeroxed and passed around.

Mr. Phillips, you may begin.

Mr. Phillips: I am here to present a personal brief in opposition to Bill 22. I do so, I should point out that I am a professor of Economics and Labour Studies at the University of Manitoba. My comments will be a little bit different from my colleagues' previously in that I am going to argue on the grounds that the proposed act, Bill 22, is detrimental to the Manitoba economy and will have long-term negative effects on the productivity of the public sector in Manitoba.

* (1110)

While the individual public sector worker may suffer the pain of reduced income in the short term, the longer-run pain will be endured by the public generally in the form of lower productivity and a lower level of services.

Since time is limited, I will speak only at two points supporting my opposition to the bill. The first may be referred to as the false economy aspect of Bill 22; the second, the inefficiency of the wage policy implied in Bill 22.

First, on the false economy issue, enforcing public sector employees to take six up to 10 days unpaid leave reduces their wages proportionately. Since the marginal rate of taxation on the middle income and upper middle income, and that is the rate of taxation on the income earned on these days off, is approximately 50 percent—actually, it is a little over 50 percent—for the total government

sector, that means that any savings from this tax on the public sector to the government in reduction of wages paid to the public sector will be cut in half in the terms of the tax revenues that will fall by around half of the cut in the wage payments.

Furthermore, the furlough, which we sometimes refer to it as, has exactly the same effect as an increase in the rate of taxation on the public sector worker. That is public sector workers have lower levels of disposable income just as they would have had if the government had raised their levels of income tax by a comparable amount. So this is, in effect, an income tax on the public sector.

Quite apart from the fact that such a tax levied only on the public sector worker is grossly discriminatory, as was pointed out by previous speakers, it also depresses the provincial economy by lowering the incomes of others and increasing unemployment and underemployment through reduced consumption expenditure, thereby further decreasing government sector revenues.

This is the principle of the multiplier effect of wage cuts or tax increases that are unmatched by increased government expenditures, that Lord John Maynard Keynes developed in his *General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money* in the 1930s, and which any successful first-year student of economics at any university in North America or Western Europe will have mastered, if they pass, by the time they finish their first year. According to recent econometric simulations done, I think, by Econometrics in Ottawa with their model, such cuts—they were looking at the Ontario cuts—in public employee employment and wages, the net effect is to increase government deficits by decreasing the revenues more than the expenditures.

It is true that some of this increased deficit that is caused by these cutbacks will accrue to the federal government, not just to Manitoba. But with the federal government practicing the same types of policies, the net effect is terribly depressing on the economy and the province. Beggar-thy-neighbour government does not make a great deal of sense, particularly when that leads to further cuts to federal transfers to the provinces. Generally speaking, then, my first point is that these cuts, increased taxes on the public sector worker, are false economy and bad economics.

Secondly, the inefficiency in wage policy. The empirical evidence from North America is that unionized workers with good industrial relations with their employer are more productive than nonunion workers or workers that have poor industrial relations. This is well demonstrated in the empirical literature.

Furthermore, workers who are well paid are more productive than workers who are poorly paid. In modern labour economics literature, of which there is a multitudinous amount, these good wages are known as efficiency wages. It is more efficient to pay good wages than to pay lower wages because of the effects on productivity, that is, the evidence is that workers who consider themselves to be well paid, above what is merely necessary to get people to work, are more productive, more loyal, and most important, more willing to contribute to productivity-increasing innovation.

Smart employers, therefore, pay more than they have to in order to attract and retain a sufficient labour force. To pay less or to cut wages is therefore inefficient, and indeed many of the private sector companies that went for cutbacks found out they were very inefficient in doing so, because their net productivity declined.

Bill 22 cuts wages. It will also cut productivity. Furthermore, it cuts the levels of service to the public. That is, it cuts the output of the economy in two ways, by cutting the number of hours worked and by cutting the productivity of the workers by lowering morale, which we have heard a great deal about today, and worker effort when the workers are at work.

I want to close by giving a couple of examples of this from my own place of work at the university. Services are directly reduced. Students, faculty, researchers have no access to the library, computers, their offices on the enforced days off. One student who would like to do some work this week, Thursday and Friday, cannot do it. We have summer school beginning on Monday. I have professors coming in from outside. They cannot get into the libraries. They cannot get utilization. They cannot get secretaries to prepare their course properly, so any idea that there is no reduction of services to the public as a result of this is sheer nonsense.

Secondly, many professors who teach students overload. That is, we teach more than we are

required to teach. We have heard more about that again today. I will just give my own example. On several summers, I have taken courses that involve travel to Europe. I never got a single penny of pay for doing that. In fact, I paid a large part of the travel costs as a privilege to teach my students. Many of us work and teach more hours than are required. I kept track, as Professor Vorst did one winter, and I averaged over the winter period 70 hours of work per week, which, if I had time and a half for overtime, would entitle me to five months of holidays by the end of the time.

We teach more than is required. I think this year I have four students doing courses with me, reading courses that are not required in my workload, plus the fact that I am supervising something like six to seven graduate students, not only in economics, but also in history, in nursing and several other areas. We are also involved in community service work, giving lectures to service organizations, helping out with the Unemployed Help Centre—I was on the board of that—that kind of community service work for which, of course, we get no pay.

We are increasingly unwilling to do all this extra work when the only reward we get is a kick in the pants, an increased tax load on us, singled out, and the indifference of the politicians toward the status and the welfare of the university.

In both cases, the result is lower productivity, a lower level of service, a fall in efficiency. We are becoming more and more inefficient. To restore the level of service and of total productivity, it will require more resources than are saved by the cuts. In short, this is a case of inefficiency wages, rather than efficiency wages.

From the above, I would conclude that on economic and efficiency grounds, Bill 22 is poorly conceived, and therefore, I recommend that it be withdrawn.

Mr. Chalrperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Phillips.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Phillips, it certainly is not my role to comment on the quality of the presentation, but I tell you I am a little disappointed. I was expecting a little bit more in the sense of coming off your turf and putting yourself into my shoes and how it is I deal with some of the real, gut-wrenching issues.

Before I specifically move to a question, you talk about morale and I accept that. Certainly, your

comment about morale probably similarly exists—I am talking about the lack of it—in other parts of the public sector, and you go on to talk about indifference. I do not believe there is one member around this table as a member of the Legislature and certainly not one member within our government who is indifferent to education and to the university.

But, sir, have you ever had a banker deny you a big loan? The theory has to come to practise if it is going to be worth anything. Have you ever had a banker say, no, I am not going to give you the money?

Mr. Phillips: As a matter of fact, yes, on a mortgage.

* (1120)

Mr. Manness: And were the health institutions and the educational institutions of the day and indeed the public sector as a whole and indeed all of the social caring services, were they all holding on to the decision as to whether or not you can get a loan?—because I can tell you, the last loan I floated in New York was the first time in the history of this province I did not get it because I presented our credentials. I had to share for the first time ever significant forecasts of amortization schedules dealing with the Health capital, the first time asked for. I dare say that scrutiny is going to continue to increase.

In talking to very close colleagues of mine of different political stripes, particularly from the provinces of Newfoundland and Saskatchewan, they were told in no uncertain terms what their level of borrowings would be and net deficit.

How does the world of theory hit square with the world of reality when individuals like myself have to make these decisions?

Mr. Phillips: A number of points. One is, I think it was last week, some of the bond-rating agencies in the United States came out and pointed out that, in fact, Canada's debt load and the province's is not particularly high and that we are not, in fact, bad credit risks. So that is one thing.

Secondly, I would argue and if you follow my argument, it is you making the problem worse.

Thirdly, although I had no hand in the preparation of it, Choices produced an alternative budget that was prepared by economists and finance people. I looked through it and it did not have those cuts. It

did not end up with a higher deficit, and, in fact, it lowered it by creating jobs and by increasing government revenues through fair taxation.

If you are not willing to go to the fair taxation route that has been mentioned already several times, then you are going to have problems. I admit you are going to have problems, but they are problems of your own creation and to put them off onto the university and to the public sector and, particularly, to the poorly paid public sector, our secretaries who are paid terribly, I mean, you are just creating more social problems and more expenses in the long run.

Mr. Manness: With due respect, Mr. Phillips, I do not borrow money from the rating agencies. Rating agencies have no money to lend. It is the institutional lenders, particularly the pension funds of the U.S., who lend me money, people who want a return commensurate with the risk they are prepared to take.

When you talk about the Choices budget, I would love to follow the Choices budget. Unfortunately, they assumed away two-thirds of the problem. They assumed full employment and that would be nice to get to, but I found out long ago, you make the solutions easy when you assume away two-thirds of the problem.

I guess I am still trying to grapple with the fact that a province just to the east of us, Ontario, thought they were going to buy their way out toward fuller employment. They had committed to a \$30-billion deficit over the course of the next number of years to try and get there, and after two years, they aborted very quickly because it does not work.

Yet, today, there are still people advocating that we in Manitoba follow that course, which I would love to do. I am a Keynesian. I would love to do it. I was trained at the University of Manitoba to be one. Unfortunately, when I asked Howard Pawley in 1984, when he had revenue increases at the rate of 15 percent, I asked him was this not the time to begin to run a surplus budget and begin to reduce the debt and prepare things for the next cycle of downturn, but unless a different type of politician comes along who is going to say, during these good times, yes, let us retire some of the debt, unfortunately, some of us, therefore, are left with almost impossible decisions to make. When is the Keynesian system going to work?

Mr. Phillips: There are two points. One is, you stated that the Choices budget assumed full employment. Well, you must have read a different document than I did, because the document I was asked to look at did not assume full employment.

Secondly, on this Keynesian thing, the Ontario government tried it, and many of us supported it. Unfortunately, you then had your fellow Conservative Party members in Ottawa taking exact counter-effects to eliminate all of the beneficial spread effects of the Ontario budget, plus the Bank of Canada setting interest rates at historically very high interest rates relative to the United States in such a way that it drained all of the impact of the expansionary forces.

I think now in retrospect, it could have been designed to reduce that. Obviously, Clinton, if he ever gets his policies through the Conservative forces in Congress, has also realized that there are certain types of—you can structure your expenditure in such a way that it does not drain into foreign trade, and indeed this is the kind of thing. Education is one of those that has the best form of Keynesian policies to structure so it does not drain into imports because it goes directly into employment and innovation and productivity within our own society.

Mr. Manness: I would ask Mr. Phillips, to the best of his knowledge, how many long-term decisions necessitating the borrowing of large amounts of money, either for personal purchases or indeed, more importantly, for wealth-creating activities leading to employment, are based on 90-day money, as compared to mortgage rates, five-, 10- and 15-year money? Furthermore, does he honestly believe that the Bank of Canada has influence, any influence, on 10-year money?

Mr. Phillips: Yes.

Mr. Manness: Maybe then he can explain to me how, because I deal with the money lenders on a daily basis, and right now, there is one big bet going on that is between those that provide 10-year money, for the most part institutional money, to governments like the government of Manitoba, and they are betting spades on spades that, indeed, governments will not be able to control their deficits, and ultimately will be in the marketplace bidding up the price of money, they will so desperately need it, and right today refusing to give 8.5 percent 10-year money.

When I talk to them, they do not even talk about 90-day money or John Crow or the Bank of Canada. Why is that so?

Mr. Phillips: A lot of what you are talking about is based upon expectations.

Mr. Manness: Right, exactly.

Mr. Phillips: To a certain extent, I sympathize with the lenders in thinking the governments are not getting control of their deficits. Because of the kinds of policies of Bill 22, we are going to increase the deficits in the long run. So, in fact, you are feeding the problem.

Look at what has happened to the federal government. The more they cut, the bigger the deficit goes, or at least the income shrinks and the deficit stays the same. You name me a government that has got its way out by cutting, anywhere.

Japan? Japan has the biggest government deficits. Germany? [interjection] I would like to have total collapse at 2 percent unemployment.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Phillips, your time has expired. I thank you very, very much for your presentation this morning.

Mr. Phillips: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

Mr. Chairperson: I will now call upon Mr. Tom Booth. Tom Booth? Did you have a written presentation, Mr. Booth?

Mr. Tom Booth (Manitoba Organization of Faculty Association): No, I do not, but I will be referring to written materials that have been available to members sitting here.

Mr. Chairperson: You can start then, Mr. Booth.

Mr. Booth: I would like to present a simple message this morning, and the message builds on the premise of changing times, changing institutions and a need for imagination and creativity. My message is a message of caution. It refers to Bill 22 in that sense.

I would like to introduce myself in various ways. As a professor, I am a member of a small and shrinking department. As a teacher, I teach first-year classes with very large enrollments, but it is not in that vein that I am speaking on this cautionary note with you.

* (1130)

I am the president of the Manitoba Organization of Faculty Associations. I represent an

organization with approximately 1,800 professors in it. We have concerns, we have talked about the matter, and I would like to express some of those concerns. In order to do that, I would like to talk a little bit about the historical context in which I am standing here.

I dealt with a proposed rollback to the faculty salaries and to all salaries of employees at the University of Manitoba as the president of UMFA, the University of Manitoba Faculty Association. We processed that request by asking for long-range planning, and you might remember, some of you, that I said things about Manitobans deciding, and I said that publicly.

Then the Roblin commission was announced, and it was with great hope that this announcement arrived, and we began as members of locals as well as the provincial organization to process some of the aspects of the mandate of the commission, and I read to you: The commission will confer with the citizens of Manitoba, various associations and organizations and the university community as to their expectations of the role and missions of universities.

I will not go through the other seven. You know them, but they are all very, very hopeful, and they are the sorts of points that we addressed very seriously.

Then there appeared in the Winnipeg Free Press in July 1992, two articles, both on the same day, July 26, once by Marsha Hanen, the president of the University of Winnipeg, and Clay Gilson, a very senior professor at the University of Manitoba, respectively entitled: A Plea for Imagination; and, secondly, Above All, A Place for Training Minds. We were hopeful. We were very, very hopeful.

We then made our submissions. Our submissions were made in December of last year and January of this year. The MOFA submission is entitled Access, Learning, and Quality: Quality Access for Quality Education. It addresses some of the concerns that I have heard members of Legislature voice, and it addresses some of the questions that I have heard—hopeful, always hopeful, so hopeful, in fact, that I was quoted in a CAUT bulletin, and I will read to you with your permission a portion of that:

The MOFA brief focussed on improved university facilities in rural Manitoba, maximizing students' choice of courses and facilitating smooth transfers

of credits between schools. It emphasized the importance of maintaining up-to-date and culturally relevant courses. Tom Booth, president of MOFA, said that there was currently often a real problem with culture shock when lifelong residents of northern Manitoba move south to go to university, and there is a need to address the underrepresentation of northern people in Manitoba's universities.

One way to deal with this access question would be to place facilities in underutilized centres in middle and northern Manitoba. He concluded that he has been impressed with the commission and its chair, and that they have demonstrated interest in and knowledge about the issues raised in the briefs.

Roblin indicated that he hoped to produce a report in April or May. That has now been amended to December, or will it be July of the next year? Ever hopeful, ever hopeful.

The next historical event that occurred, occurred while I was sitting at the CAUT council meeting in January. For those of you who do not know what the CAUT is, it is the Canadian Association of University Teachers, ACPU in French, and in fact it represents 52 universities across the country.

While sitting at that meeting, I was informed that there had been announced a government clawback of operating funds, a little over a million dollars. Ever hopeful. Then came Bill 22, and of course the announcement of the holidays. On May 8, again at a CAUT meeting, there was a unanimous condemnation of the Manitoba government and of another provincial government for instituting similar action, and that is history. That is in the historical context. Still we are ever hopeful.

This, by the way, has been reported in the recent CAUT bulletin. Finally, in the historical content, where were we on our first furlough? I was sitting in a foreign country, namely Brazil, saving a \$2.3-million project on the very day of my furlough, and by the way, part of a planning mission to save that project. What about the future? Are we hopeful about the future?

Well, I have just been in a country, I came back about two and a half weeks ago, in which you can see the effects of an undereducated population. It is not a pretty picture, and it is getting worse. I have heard members of the current government use phrases like education is the engine that drives

the economy, and I have heard the word competitiveness used. I have a question, and I do not really need to say much more, but my question is, is taking the engine apart a means of being able to improve competitiveness? Is taking the engine apart, taking the bolts out of it, a way of driving the economy? Previous speakers have addressed this issue.

There are various ways of taking the engine apart, and those have been described to you. I am hopeful. I am waiting for the Roblin Commission. I am waiting for the report to come down. I want to see it. By the way, presidents of our universities have been asked to meet with the commission—the faculty associations have not been asked to meet with the commission—fairly soon now, within a few days. I am kind of curious as to why, but still and all, I am ever hopeful. Yes, in 22 years of living in Manitoba I have become a Manitoban. I am ever hopeful. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Booth.

Mr. Alcock: Thank you, Mr. Booth. I would like for you to just expand on that last one. You say that the commission is meeting with presidents now, but there has been no indication that they want to meet again with the faculty association?

Mr. Booth: That is correct. That was announced fairly recently at a board of governors meeting in which I was in attendance, not the second part, only the part about the university presidents being invited to speak with the commission in a few days.

Mr. Alcock: Mr. Booth, yesterday in the Estimates, the Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey) indicated that the implementation of Bill 22 would have no impact on the quality of educational services provided to students at the university. Can you comment on that?

Mr. Booth: I can comment on it from a personal point of view. There are, as Mr. Fortier described very accurately, ever increasing numbers of students in our classes, and it is only going to get worse. I have one class that I teach that has 280 students in it, and I have another that has 120 sitting in it.

I have become very good at putting on a show, and there is a certain amount of information, a fair amount of information that gets passed across. The students do remarkably well, most of them, but not all. I sort of like to reach all of them if I can. I

am sorry, I guess I have an idealistic view of my role. But there are erosions occurring.

* (1140)

My department has shrunk from 13 down to about eight now. By the way, my department is a department that is rather crucial to a faculty of science, and certainly to the life sciences; I am a botanist. I work on plants and on fungi. Those critters are crucial to any understanding of environment or of living systems.

Mr. Alcock: Mr. Booth, you indicate that your department has dropped from 13 to eight. Would it be your position that, certainly, your department has not been held harmless from the government attempts to cut the deficit over the past five or six budgets?

Mr. Booth: I have to go back even further. I can answer, yes, to your question. Our department has been affected in the last five or six budgets. But, in fact, it has been affected over the last 11 or 12—for a long, long time. The erosion has been continual and in areas such as ours it has just been steady. We have 10 people, but effectively we have eight, because of part-time appointments, et cetera.

Mr. Alcock: So that the sense that the university has not in the past, quote, paid its fair share or shouldered its part of the burden is simply untrue, that Bill 22 is an addition to a series of cuts, clawbacks and reductions in support to the university that have gone back, you are saying, even predating this current government?

Mr. Booth: I have to, unfortunately, be extremely affirmative.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Booth. I will now call on Mr. Ron Oberlin. Catherine Collins. Guy Boulianne. Richard Park.

Do you have a written presentation, Mr. Park? We will just distribute it around. You may begin, Mr. Park. Thank you very much.

Mr. Richard Park (Private Citizen): Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Chairperson, and committee members, thank you for this opportunity to speak about Bill 22 and specifically its negative effects on pensions.

I am a resident of St. James-Assiniboia, and I am an employee of Manitoba Hydro and a member of IBEW Local 2034. I am also on our union's

pension committee as well as the superannuation and insurance liaison committee.

At the outset, I would like to say that I am opposed to Bill 22 in its entirety, and fully agree with the positions of Mr. Ron McLean of the Canadian Federation of Labour and IBEW Local 2034, Mr. Bob Dooley of IBEW Local 435, and many others that presented.

The two-party bargaining process is the proper place to settle compensation issues. But, being realistic, as well as most members of Local 2034, I recognize that Bill 22 is a political fait accompli; therefore, our union came to an agreement with our employer, Manitoba Hydro, to implement the legislation in as fair and equitable a manner as possible. In our case it was a 3.95 percent wage reduction over 25 pay periods and an extra 10 days vacation.

Our union membership approved this package and it was done by a secret ballot vote, but they also let it be known at the meetings the vote was held at that they did not approve of it and did not want the impression that they agreed with what was going on. So that is one of the reasons that I am here today; it is to reaffirm that.

One of the negative side effects of this legislation is the 3.8 percent reduction in pensionable earnings this coming year. This penalty affects only those people who will be retiring in the next five years because of the best five-of-12 rule for us, and I have some concerns also about if it is another year, even more drastic, and it could be even further effects farther down the line.

Because this bill does not affect people retiring before the legislation comes into effect, including 191 Manitoba Hydro employees taking advantage of a rightsizing opportunity that is available right now, or people like myself who will not be retiring until at least six years in the future, I would ask you to seriously consider an amendment to the bill eliminating this inequitable extra penalty, or interpretations of the regulations, however it could be done. If all public sector employees have to take a 4 percent cut in pay this year, it is not fair that only some employees—and the majority of these people will be in the 50 to 60 year age group—have to take this extra pension penalty. Thanks for hearing my concerns.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Park.

Ms. CerlIII: I would just like to clarify further, the inequability of the penalty on the pension.

Mr. Park: Anybody, like myself, will take a 4 percent cut in wages for a year, but when I retire, of the best five years, this year will not be one of them. So there will not be that 4 percent drop, including a bad year sort of thing, if you will.

Normally, as time goes on, you progress up the ladder or get some increases, so there is a steady increase in your pension. It grows accordingly. Now, for a lot of people, it is like working an extra year almost to eliminate this one-year penalty.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Park. I call on Dr. Ian Goldstine. Ian Goldstine? Did you have a written presentation, Dr. Goldstine?

Dr. Ian Goldstine (President, Manitoba Medical Association): It was distributed earlier, I believe.

Mr. Chairperson: Then you may begin. Thank you very much.

Mr. Goldstine: Mr. Chairperson, members of the committee, thank you for allowing me to address you this morning. I am here representing the Manitoba Medical Association. I am the president for this year. I am here to add the association's collective voice to the widespread protest against Bill 22.

It is proposed legislation which unfairly places the burden of government fiscal mismanagement on approximately 100,000 citizens who provide important services to Manitobans. Among those unjustly penalized will be the physicians and surgeons of this province, but the more serious implications of Bill 22 will be upon the patients, generally, who stand to be deprived of necessary medical services.

Recently, government-employed doctors were informed that their clinical services to patients will be cut back by 10 days in 1993-94 by way of Bill 22. Psychiatric services in particular, already strained to the breaking limit, will be further reduced. Will you assume the responsibility should any tragedies occur?

Part 2 of Bill 22 seeks to arbitrarily cap the total amount that may be spent in '93-94 and '94-95 for insured medical services, regardless of need. When the money allotted runs out, medicare coverage evaporates unless doctors will donate their services at a reduced rate.

This is the same rationing scheme hatched by the government prior to the 1990 general election. Manitobans by the thousands wrote letters to protest this attack on their health care system. Rationing, in its many guises, already results in waiting lists of six months and even years for many diagnostic services and treatments. These are ultrasound, CT scans, hip and knee joint replacement, cataracts, cancer therapy and treatment for heart disease.

Scolded by public opinion back in 1990, the government retreated prior to the election, but now you are back again with the scheme to withhold vital health services from the province's most vulnerable people, notably the sick and the elderly. Manitobans rejected your rationing scheme in 1990, and the association is confident that the recycled version will be roundly defeated.

We are not unsympathetic to the government's fiscal problem. However, you have at your disposal policy solutions from which to choose. Unfortunately, this is a bad choice. A government that suppresses free collective bargaining in a democratic society shows contempt for its citizenry and an arrogance that knows no bounds. Such a government betrays the trust of ordinary citizens who believe that a deal made is a deal to be kept.

If the government repudiates a collective agreement, how can any business person enter into contracts with the government with any degree of security? Phrased alternately, when is a deal a deal? With the stroke of a pen, the government positions itself above the existing law.

* (1150)

I know you will argue that Bill 22 is similar to legislation enacted in other provinces, but that is not an excuse. That amounts to arguing that the Filmon government should be permitted to rob its citizens because other governments elsewhere have been getting away with it, at least until the citizens of this province go to the polls possibly next year.

Manitoba's doctors will urge their patients to prevent an injustice before it occurs. We will not wait for sentencing on election day.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you for your presentation, Dr. Goldstine.

Ms. CerlIII: Thank you very much for your presentation.

We have heard from a variety of educational professionals today that there was a decision made in the way that this was implemented by the administration at the universities. Can you describe how this was implemented in terms of the doctors and surgeons of the province?

Mr. Goldstine: We were not consulted prior to the tabling of this legislation in terms of the construction of this legislation. If I might just quickly—I know Dr. Booth has gone, but you talk about putting things down to nine to five, putting everything in its square pegs in square holes and round pegs in round holes. Dr. Booth was a professor of mine way back on a cold winter's day in 1974, and I did not understand a particular thing about botany.

Unfortunately, I do not think that has changed much, but I had to go to him for some help about a problem I could not understand, and he was there. It is 10 minutes out of his life that I am sure he does not even recall. The fact is he was there when I needed him on a frosty Friday, and I would shudder to think what will happen to future generations of students if people like that are not there. That is just an aside, I am sorry.

But in terms of your question, the association was not consulted prior to the tabling of this legislation. We were informed that something was coming. Again, that is one of our problems with this entire process. It is not proactive, it is reactive. No one who has presented today is unaware of the fiscal realities of today's society, but if that is the case, then you have to sit down and talk with the people.

If you want people to participate in something, it is far better that they do it willingly, and one of the ways to do that is to make them feel that they are part of the process. Not coming and giving the speeches and kind of arguing a bit maybe and maybe getting a couple of brownie points, but in the end not making a great difference in how things come about. People have to be involved on the ground floor from the beginning. That is the best way to do it.

Ms. Cerilli: As I sit and listen to the presentations and learn more about the effects of this bill on the variety of services, I think, realizing how poorly thought out the effects would be. I am surprised to see that it is going to affect all of the doctors in the province. Is that correct? So all the doctors will have one less day when they can see patients for a

number of weeks. Or, how does this work in terms of the services that doctors would be providing?

Mr. Goldstine: Again, that has not been worked out. There are a lot of gray areas in this bill. I do not know if that is going to be closing clinics for a day, closing the hospitals for a day, we really do not know. The government has not told us. But our concern is that this is a means of enforcing rationing of medical services. When you reach that cap, that is it, people.

I am concerned that every day in my office I see people who have to wait, and I am not talking about waiting for a booboo on a finger, I am talking about people waiting for joint replacement. A 63-year-old woman, who prior to needing her surgery was an active, vital woman. She and her husband had worked hard to retire. They used to enjoy travelling and just even going for walks in their own neighbourhood. She had to wait 15 months for a joint replacement. By the time that joint replacement came around she was wheelchair bound.

You take an old person and make them in such pain that they have to lie around in bed at home because they cannot mobilize at all, you subject them to the risks of pneumonia, of blood clots in their legs, blood clots flying to the lung, heart attacks, et cetera. Where is the quality in that in our quality health care system?

You take young people who need joint replacements, young people who are working, earning income, paying taxes. They are so immobilized by their pain they cannot work. Where is the justice in that? Where is the quality in that?

Mr. Ashton: I want to deal with sort of the broader ramifications of what you have identified in terms of the breakdown of not only communication. I mean, you were basically informed of Bill 22 but any kind of discussion, consultation, dare I say negotiation, particularly when we are looking at so-called health care reform in this province. Obviously, you know, there is at some point going to be those questions that are affected too. I mean, if we do not have collective bargaining that leads to consultation and a partnership, it seems to me it is going to be a very difficult situation in terms of health care reform.

I am just wondering if you see any connection between the way government treats people in the health care field when it comes to collective bargaining in the sense of consultation, discussion

and health care reform where, presumably, the first people that should be involved anyway, whether they are or not, are health care professionals and practitioners.

Mr. Goldstine: It is interesting that for a government that preaches TQM to be the saving philosophy of our economy—and I am not saying pro or con to TQM—but the one kind of keystone of it is to consult with the front-line workers, okay? The people who are on the assembly line, the people who are seeing the people, the people who are doing the job.

As far as the MMA is concerned, that has not been done when it comes to health care. The MMA is not concerned when it comes to health care reform. The Urban Hospital Council was constituted to come up with ways of reforming health care in the city. The MMA asked for space at that table, and we were denied by the deputy minister and, I believe, also by the minister.

You do not consult with people, you cherry-pick a few experts here and there to tell you what you want to hear. That is not consultation. It is not meaningful and, in the end, it does not accomplish anything. In terms of health care reform, it was May 1992 that the paper was tabled. I have seen cuts; I have not seen reform.

Mr. Ashton: I find your comments very interesting, because that is one of the concerns that certainly we have expressed. I mean, it is fine to bring out a document, talk about health care reform, see budget adjustments, but where is the real reform?

I wanted to take further a point you mentioned because it is interesting, you mentioned the term TQM and we have governments, both civic and provincially pushing TQM, QWL which is all based on a more participatory management system. I guess what you are saying is that not only are they not doing this in a collective bargaining sense, they are not seriously looking at any kind of participation by the health care practitioners themselves in any aspect including health care reform.

Mr. Goldstine: The frustrating thing—and I say this in my speech of May 1, when I became president—we just want to get in the door. We get letters at our association from physicians all over the province who want to help out. They have ideas, ways they think that they can find efficiencies, et cetera, and they are looking to us to

help bring those ideas forward to government. It gets a little frustrating when you say, well, we keep asking government, but in the end if they do not let you sit down at the table, there is not much you can do.

Mr. Ashton: Well, I also want to take this further, because we heard the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) in this committee talk about Bill 22 and say, well, what other alternatives are there? It seems to me when we are talking about health care, obviously looking at some real health care reform that could also save the system money would make sense.

I know from my own discussions, sometimes the best ideas come from doctors, nurses, people who are working in the field who know on a daily basis what can and cannot be done. I am wondering if you feel, based on your observation of this committee and the Minister of Finance's comments that rather than looking at Bill 22, and if the government was serious about not only reforming the health care system but also cost savings that they might want to involve doctors, nurses and other health care practitioners rather than completely exclude themselves from the process.

Mr. Goldstine: In order for it to be meaningful, I think you have to speak with the organized voices of the professions you are mentioning, whether it be the nurses, the doctors, et cetera. That is basically what we have asked for. I do not pretend to know anything, for example, about agriculture. I sure would not make decisions about agriculture without speaking to people who do it every day. Those are people who have grown up with it. Those are the people who know what is good and what is bad, and those are the people you have to talk to, but it has to be meaningful. It cannot be hallway consultations. It cannot be phone calls. It cannot be cherry-picking a few people here and there.

We, as the association, have the infrastructure to help the government and that is one of the frustrating things. We are not averse to helping the government in all its problems that it has to handle, but you have to let us in. You also have to remember that you are talking about health care.

When you change things, you have to make sure that because you are dealing with people's lives—this is not GM, and I do not single them out above anybody else for any reason, but this is not

GM. You cannot just recall faulty brakes and hope that no one suffered in the interim. If something goes wrong and someone dies or suffers grievous injury because the system failed them, it is not a question of a simple recall, if someone has suffered or died because of it. So before things are instituted you have to make sure that the system is there and is working and is efficient and is quality before it is instituted.

* (1200)

Mr. Ashton: I just want to deal with them, because I know you had mentioned where the MMA had requested a specific participation in terms of the process. Am I correct from what you are saying that essentially the MMA has been totally excluded from health care reform in not only the broadest sense, but has really had only very limited involvement even through, as you say, hallway discussions or perhaps as aside to other meetings you might have? Maybe I should be more direct. I mean, is the MMA really part of the health care reform in any significant way?

Mr. Goldstine: To answer that, I would have to say only in a very limited sense. We have made proposals to government about things like a joint management committee, ways to sit down and address everybody's issues and to come up with a positive solution rather than just kind of butting heads, et cetera. But I think the point being, you can be on a committee. That does not necessarily mean that your input is valued or that you have much of an influence on the determinations of that committee or on the draft or the final report.

We have had some membership on some committees but not on all, and we have served notice to the government. We said, look, just give us a call and we will send members to your committees. We have the expertise and we are just looking for a place to use it to help you out. Like I said, some committees, we get on; some committees we do not. It seems to be purely at the discretion of the government.

Also we have asked for reports about various subcommittees and committees dealing with health care reform. Some we have gotten; some we have not. Some took nine months to get, could have had a baby in that time. I mean that is what I am saying, it has got to be meaningful consultation on a proactive basis. As I have said before, we are not averse to change but you have to let us in.

Mr. Ashton: Well, it is interesting, too, you mentioned before about TQM. One thing I know that being part of the previous government that brought in—and this is in a slightly different context but you know within Crown corporations—brought in participation by employees, whether it be professional employees, hourly staff, et cetera, on our Crown corporation boards, one of the concerns that was expressed at that time was the concern there might be some conflict; in that case, where the boards actually did have a role in collective bargaining.

Here we are talking about a situation where there is no collective bargaining and any perceived conflicts are obviously more indirect. I am wondering if you do not feel—I think this is important to the government as an alternative to what they are looking at, that perhaps it is more important if the government could put aside some of its—this is my words, I am not suggesting yours—prejudice against organizations whether they be unions or associations that bargain collectively, and put aside some of their biases on their difficulty in dealing with groups such as that and treat the organizations as representing the people they do, in the case of the MMA, representing physicians in this province, a vast majority, whether they might not find that those perceived conflicts may in fact disappear.

You will be better off having people inside. I do not want to use analogies about tents and whatnot, but if you have people inside the process rather than outside looking in, in the sense that then you have an ownership in any decisions, would that not be a better way of dealing with the kind of budget crisis the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) keeps talking about?

Mr. Goldstine: One of my criticisms of the bill would be that it is shortsighted. It will not help the system in the long run. What do we do next year? What do we do the year after that? I am no economist in any sense of the word, but I do not see things picking up all that quickly, and if so, and if we do not address the major problems that are happening now, cutting 2 percent here and a few percent there and maybe we will do some more next year, in the long run that will not help. You have to remember physicians, we are in this for the long haul. I hope to be here next year and the year after that and maybe the next decade and a couple of decades after that.

If things are not dealt with now, on a long-term basis, there ain't no quick fix, and I would think it could lead you into folly, and that scares me because who that impacts is the people I see every day in my office and that is—the government calls them taxpayers, I call them patients—call them what you will, these are the people of Manitoba, and they are looking to us for leadership. They want something here for their children, for my children, for your children and our grandchildren, and that concerns me because I do not see any long-term solutions here.

Mr. Ashton: I think those are wise words because we are often reminded that governments are only temporary. I think Sterling Lyon used to like using that phrase. [interjection] Well, Ontario governments are temporary, and governments are temporary, wherever, Legislatures are temporary. I have often remarked on the irony that sometimes when governments are in power they seem to have a different sense of their mortality than members of the public. The fact is there are a lot of cases. As you said, the MMA will be around a lot longer than this particular government or this Legislature will be.

I just want to focus in on what you are saying. You are talking about the difficult situation we are in, but you are also, I take it from your comments, acknowledging the fact that the medical system needs reform. Maybe we should ask for that clearly on the record because I think sometimes, again, the government, everytime it does something with its own sort of sense of immortality, seems to feel that this is the only way to go, that Bill 22 is the only solution to the problems, or if we are discussing health care reform, it will be the particular document that was tabled in the other room a short while ago.

You are saying then that the MMA supports health care reform in a general sense, but feels that they are being excluded by the current process. In fact, the current process, and these are the exact words I think you used before, has resulted in cuts without the alternative services that were part of the original plan.

Mr. Goldstine: It is pretty scary when you see cuts when you do not see alternative services available prior to the institution of those cuts. When you are looking at health care reform, Dr. Cleghorn, who was my predecessor, came out with limited support for health care reform. I think if you

talk to any doctor around, he or she will tell you reform is coming, but if you want someone to take ownership of something, there has to be involvement. It is that simple. I hope I keep my buzzwords straight because you need a dictionary for it, but if you want people to be in a process and to be responsible for what happens, they have to be in on the ground floor or it becomes meaningless.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Dr. Goldstine. I will now call on Rick Burns. Rick Burns?

Floor Comment: Not here.

Mr. Chairperson: Susan Rawdon?

Floor Comment: Not here.

Mr. Chairperson: Barry Wittevrongel.

Floor Comment: Not here.

Mr. Chairperson: Shirley Diakowich?

Floor Comment: Not here.

Mr. Chairperson: Kevin Richardson. Garry McCowan. Michelle Masserey. Beatrice McTavish. Rob DeGroot. Nadine Semenchuk. Dan Goodman. Barry Wolfe. Shirley Lord. Jean Altemeyer. Jim Silver.

Mr. Silver, did you have a written presentation?

Mr. Jim Silver (Choices): No, I did not.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, you may begin then, Mr. Silver.

Mr. Silver: Thank you. My name is Jim Silver. I am co-chair of Choices, a coalition for social justice. We are the organization that has, among other things, prepared three alternative provincial budgets and an alternative civic budget. We have been active in a number of other social justice related issues.

I am also a faculty member at the University of Winnipeg, and perhaps I will start my comments by saying a few things about the impact of Bill 22 on the university system. Bill 22, it seems to me, accentuates already existing problems with the salary structure that we have at the university. We have a very low starting salary, particularly given the years of study that are needed to acquire a Ph.D. People are employed at the university, usually at an age when they have a young family and they are taking on a mortgage, right at the point when they have the greatest need for cash flow. It

is these people who are being, I think, disproportionately hurt by the impact of Bill 22.

Here in Manitoba, it is made worse by the fact that the University of Winnipeg, in particular, has pretty close to the lowest salary level in the country. Now, it is this government which talks incessantly about being competitive, and we in the university system are having a great deal of difficulty in being competitive in that it becomes increasingly difficult for us to attract the best young academics. If we do not attract good quality young academics into the university system, then it goes without saying the quality of education that we are able to offer deteriorates further to what has already been the case.

I do not think that I need to tell you that the quality of education at the university level has already deteriorated significantly. A long-term underfunding of the university system in large part is the consequence of federal offloading, but I think also the consequence of provincial underfunding has had a variety of negative consequences.

For example, my department, a small department of 10 members, just last week went through the exercise of cutting \$13,000 out of our periodicals acquisition budget. The consequence of that is that a good many good quality and necessary periodicals that we need for our undergraduates to do essays are not going to be available. Again the quality of education will suffer as a consequence.

* (1210)

Similarly, class size has gone—when I was a student in the early 1970s, it was frequently the case that undergraduate classes were 20, 25, 30 students, a very, very good size for good quality teaching. I now have 100 students in my intro classes. It is 100 because that is the maximum that the classroom will physically hold. If the classroom could physically hold more, I assume there would be more.

That requires that I use the lecture method. The lecture method is not pedagogically as good a method as should be used because it is a passive method. People sit passively reading newspapers, for example, as you can see. They are not required to actively involve themselves in the learning process. Furthermore, large class sizes discriminate against the least advantaged students. Those students who come in without as

good a grounding as other students are discriminated against by large class sizes because they need the personal instruction that is possible only with reasonably sized classes. So in these ways the quality of education is being adversely affected by long term funding cuts, and this process will be accentuated by Bill 22.

So what if the quality of university education is eroded? What do universities do anyway? Well, to put it in terms that this government might understand, universities are absolutely superb at preparing students for the job market. That is, I think what we are best at, though we do not usually couch it in quite those terms, what we do in the university is to attempt to instill in students the capacity of critical thought. I do not mean by that being critical of others, but critical in the sense of analytical thought.

We try to instill in students the capacity for abstract thought. One has to be able to think abstractly to understand the complicated and rapidly changing world. We provide for students the opportunity to develop their capacity to articulate their ideas in written form and in oral form, and in those kinds of ways, we create people well suited to the rapidly changing job market of the late 20th century.

So we are factories producing the kind of people that your government, Mr. Manness, insists are needed for this brave new world, and yet, contrary, it seems to me, to the philosophy that you extol, we, though we are doing the job, have our funding continuously cut, worsened by Bill 22.

Bill 22 further will impair our capacity to perform this valuable role and, of course, further will hurt those who are more disadvantaged, those who are at the bottom of the income scale employed at the university, and those students who are among the most disadvantaged coming into the university system. So it has a discriminatory sort of impact as well as an overall impact and this, it seems to me, and the main theme of the comments that I want to make this afternoon is, that this is extremely shortsighted.

I think that Bill 22 is shortsighted; I think it lacks a vision of the future; and I think that is completely consistent with the provincial budget that you have recently brought down. Bill 22, it seems to me, exemplifies or represents this government's misunderstanding, continual misunderstanding of

the importance of the role of government. You see government as wasteful. You see government as performing no productive purpose, and you see government services as things to be cut.

My view is, Choices' view is, governments deliver crucial services. Government employees provide educational services, child care services, health services, social services. All of these, I believe, in accounting terms are not expenses, though you are bound and determined to see them as expenses. They are investments. They are investments in our future. They are investments in our most productive assets. To the extent you are insistent upon cutting your investments in our human resources, you impair the future capacity of this province.

Again, what this represents, it seems to me, is the absence in your overall approach to governing of a sense of the future, a sense of where we are going. There is also, I believe, no sense of the past in the way in which you look at government and the role of government, no sense of how this country was built. This country was built in very large part through an active role played by the state.

It was not built by private enterprise alone, but rather private enterprise assisted in a wide variety of ways by an active interventionist state. We developed in this country a mixed economy. We developed a balance between the private and the public sectors which I think was very, very advantageous.

Those countries which continue to perform best economically are those countries in which there continues to be a mixed economy. They are the countries of northern Europe, in particular, countries where the state intervenes actively and progressively in the economy.

Yet we here in Manitoba and in Canada generally move in the opposite direction. We move more and more toward the American model. That, of course, has been accelerated by the Free Trade Agreement and next the North American Free Trade Agreement.

So the model which we aspire to, apparently, judging by the actions of this government, is the American model with all of its many ills, the American model with its completely unsuccessful health care system, extremely inefficient and expensive health care system, the one which, ironically, you draw upon for advice, bringing

Connie Curran here and dropping bags of money into her pockets, which is absolutely unimaginable to those of us at Choices and unimaginable to the general public at large, the America which is inner cities which are characteristic of the third world where children die with extremely high rates of infant mortality, where the quality of education is even worse than it is here and deteriorating further, where violence is the norm.

This is the model, it appears, to which your government aspires, your government which seeks to move more and more into the private sector and to pare down further and further the progressive role that historically has been played by government and which continues to be played by government in those countries which are most successful. We model ourselves based upon our neighbours to the south, a model which I believe most Manitobans do not wish to pursue.

Generally, you have consistently pursued this path, though not entirely consistently, because every once in a while, you find it advantageous for the state to intervene. When do you do that? Well, when you want to beat up on labour; when you want to intervene in the collective bargaining process, in free collective bargaining, as was the case with Bill 70, and as it is again the case with Bill 22.

Again, I think, Canadian history shows very, very clearly the merits of free collective bargaining. Why are we interfering with a system that has served us well? Collective agreements freely and mutually negotiated are the basis for positive labour relations. Harmonious labour relations are what the preamble to The Labour Relations Act strives for, yet this government seems to be introducing legislation which can only be detrimental to that purpose.

The constant overriding of free collective bargaining, especially with such draconian legislation as Bill 22 which simply imposes terms and supersedes all other agreements on all other legislation, can only sour labour relations.

Of course, it merely demonstrates, it seems to me, the ideological character of Bill 22. The whole philosophy of this government is to reduce the role of the state, to reduce the role of government, to turn more and more decisions over to the private sector, yet when the state is needed to attack labour, then you find it advantageous for the state

to play an active role, an active interventionist role, precisely where the state has no business, reminiscent, of course, of the kind of general philosophy practised by Margaret Thatcher.

* (1220)

I want to comment a little bit more on the ideological character of what this government is doing, because the argument that I wish to make here is that Bill 22, and the provincial budget as a whole, is a purely ideological document. Your whole government activity is ideologically driven, divorced, I will argue, from the real world, driven by some abstract ideology developed a very, very long time ago and now adopted by you in a way which is actually not what Adam Smith—I mean a rereading into Adam Smith might prove extremely advantageous, Mr. Manness, because I think even in adopting Adam Smith, you have not listened to the cautions which he very carefully put up about turning everything over to the private sector.

But let me look a little bit at the ideological character and the class character of your budget as a whole, of which Bill 22 is but a part. Your budget targets the poor. It targets the weak, and interestingly, and I think revealingly, when one goes through the budget as a whole, it targets—and shame on you for this—children. Children and young people over and over and over again are the targets of cuts. You, the very government that talks incessantly about the future, about the need to cut the deficit because of the needs of our children and our grandchildren, yet at this very moment, extolling the needs of our children, our grandchildren and future, you attack our children and grandchildren now—totally senseless, in my view.

Let me give you a couple of examples, not that I need to since presumably you know them. You have inexplicably eliminated the Student Social Allowances Program, some 1,100 or 1,200 students who are not sitting in front of the television watching the afternoon soaps and are not out doing drugs, but have the get-up-and-go to go to school, to try to improve their circumstances. You have wiped out that program.

What is the sense? Even the sycophantic Winnipeg Free Press referred to this measure as nutty beyond belief, and indeed, it is nutty beyond belief. This, Mr. Manness, is a stupid measure, plain and simple. It is absolutely inexplicable.

You have also cut ACCESS programs, very significant cuts to ACCESS programs. ACCESS programs make it possible for many of the most disadvantaged students to acquire higher education. Why in Heaven's name would you wish to deter students from going to school?

The Winnipeg Education Centre has had its funding very severely cut. This is a centre which offers university level training in education and in social work for disadvantaged students from the inner city. What a wonderful program! What a good ideal. These are kids who are anxious to improve their circumstances, consistent with the philosophy that you espouse, and yet you cut the funding to them. Where is the sense in this? Where is the vision of the future? Where is the idea of investing in productive assets?

You have eliminated bursaries. Manitoba, I am told by the director of student aid programs at one of our universities, has gone from having just about the best student aid program in the country to having just about the worst student aid program in the country. Again, where is the sense in this? This is not investing in our future. This is not building for our future. Quite the contrary.

Similarly you have cut the child care budget. Consistent with the philosophy that is inherent in this budget, you have more than doubled the costs for the lowest income users of child care, so that single moms, who are in very, very difficult financial circumstances, are not now going to be able to get child care. Either that, or they are going to have to use the food banks to save up their dollars to pay now for the more than doubled fee that they have to pay to the extent that they are not able to work as a consequence of this. Where is the economic sense in it?

You have cut Child and Family Services; you have done this in a province which already suffers the shame of having the highest rate of child poverty in this country, a country recently condemned by the United Nations for the lack of action that we have taken on the issue of poverty.

But you do not stop there. You eliminate funding to the Manitoba antipoverty organization. You eliminate funding to the Indian and Metis Friendship Centres. You eliminate funding to SKY—Street Kids and Youth, a program which does not perform miracles. It is not a revolutionary program, no, not at all, but what it does is help kids

who are in difficult circumstances and who are living on the streets. It provides for them a safe place to go. It provides to them some positive role models with whom they can associate.

Well, of course, we have to concern ourselves with the deficit, do we not, because the deficit is running out of control, \$586 million or whatever the amount is. What is the tremendous cost of SKY that we must cut provincial funding to? One hundred thousand dollars, I understand, is the amount that the province has withdrawn from SKY. One hundred thousand measly dollars—that is like me pulling out from my pocket a nickel. Meanspirited, Mr. Manness, meanspirited and shortsighted.

You have cut property tax credits. You have cut payments to foster parents. You have imposed user fees upon home health services like colostomy bags and crutches. You have imposed huge increases in nursing home costs. You have eliminated a child dental care program.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Silver, you have approximately two minutes left.

Mr. Silver: Thank you very much. I am close to the end of this long list, because thankfully I am not going to read the whole list of cuts. If I were going to read the whole list of cuts imposed by Mr. Manness, I would certainly run out of time.

Now, according to this morning's paper, there are further cuts to home care services for seniors. Business is spared out of all of this. The number of businesses exempt from the payroll tax has been increased. Corporate taxes have been frozen. We have failed yet again to introduce a surtax on those earning more than \$70,000 as was recommended by the Choices alternative provincial budget.

So Bill 22 is consistent with this entire provincial budget. This entire provincial budget is ideologically driven. It has no pragmatic base. It is driven purely by ideology, by a government which is out of touch with the real world. It is targeted disproportionately at kids and targeted disproportionately at poor kids. For a government that talks about building for the future and the need to cut the deficit in order to—you shake your head, sir.

Explain to me the merits if you would, please, in cutting and cutting and cutting the programs which assist young people who wish to improve their circumstances? There is absolutely no sense in

that. This is purely ideologically driven. It is mean-spirited. It has no sense of the future, and this is a direction which I think most importantly is absolutely not necessary.

The argument you consistently make is you have no choice. You have no alternative. There is no alternative. We must make these cuts in the interest of reducing the deficit. Choices has consistently put before you alternative budgets, a different way of approaching things which would deal in a fiscally responsible manner with our admittedly difficult financial circumstances, and you continue to ignore this reality.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Silver.

Point of Order

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): We are about two minutes away from our adjournment time. I would suggest we not start another presentation, but that we give some notice currently as to when we will sit again.

Mr. Chairperson: I believe there was no adjournment time established at the beginning of the presentations.

Mr. Ashton: Our normal hour of adjournment in these committees is 12:30. We started sitting at 9 a.m. We have been in the committee for three and a half hours, Mr. Chairperson.

I would suggest that we adjourn currently, and we provide notice as to when we will be back. That is the normal procedure in the committee.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Chairperson, I understand there is a presenter in the audience, or two, who cannot be here tomorrow, and I would think we should indeed sit until one o'clock.

Mr. Ashton: Well, I am wondering if we can indicate when the committee will be sitting again tomorrow for members of the public so they can make that decision and also so other members who might not be immediately next on the list can also be aware of when the next hearing is.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Chairperson, the opposition House leader knows better than to ask those questions. We are in bills today, and it all depends ultimately, I guess, on how much is accomplished in passing those bills out of second reading.

At that time, I will know then how to order the business affairs of this House and the committees over the course of the next number of days.

Mr. Ashton: All I am asking for, and I understand there will be other bills today. I am asking for some indication for Bill 22, which I assume will be scheduled currently. I have no problem if there is somebody who cannot come back, but there might be other people—instead of sitting here for the next half hour and not knowing if they are going to be able to present or not, I would suggest we recognize the fact that we normally adjourn at 12:30. To accommodate members of the public, we may wish to sit a little bit longer.

* (1230)

I do not see us going beyond 1. We have caucus meetings. We have to be in Question Period, but all I am asking for is some indication whether the committee will be sitting tomorrow, for example, Mr. Chairperson, and if not, when it will be sitting again. I think that is fairly normal procedure, to try to give some advance notice on when these committees will sit.

Mr. Manness: Well, Mr. Chairperson, let us close it off at one o'clock today. But as far as when we sit again, I mean, it is obvious that I have been calling this committee rather regularly, and no doubt, I will continue to do so. When it is called again will depend ultimately on the discussion you and I are going to have later on this afternoon once I see how the bills are going.

So this committee will not be held in abeyance for a long period of time, I can assure you of that. It is up to, of course, all presenters to call into the Clerk's office and to find out after it has been announced.

Mr. Ashton: Well, I am asking particularly for those who are here currently, and the normal hour of adjournment is 12:30. If we sit beyond that, it is to accommodate the members of the public. But I can say to the government House leader that I think it is fairly easy to give some indication. There will be a number of bills that will pass through to committee today. The minister is aware of that.

All I am asking is as to whether the committee will be sitting tomorrow. The minister does not have to announce that. We also do not have to pass bills this afternoon in the House. All I am asking for is some indication, and I realize what the minister is saying, but normally the minister has been

scheduling one or two committees ahead of the current sitting to provide some notice.

I just want to give some advance notice to those, because I know there are a couple of people I assume are further down the list who will not be amongst the one or two presenting. I think it is important that people know when they can come back.

Mr. Manness: I cannot answer that question, in all honesty, Mr. Chairperson, at this point in time. I have not done enough thinking forward. I would think that the committee will be called sooner rather than later. I think that is the best information I can provide at this time.

Mr. Chairperson: I would like to just read into the record that we have received a written brief from presenter No. 19, Mr. Barry Wittevrongel.

So now we will proceed with calling people on the list. Mr. Alan DeJardin?

Mr. Ashton: Before we proceed, it is my understanding that there were two people who indicated that they cannot come back at a later point in time. What I am asking for is that we not proceed—I mean this individual is actually next on the list. The fair thing to do, if we are accommodating two people that cannot come at another time, is to call those two names only.

The normal hour of adjournment in these committees is 12:30.

Mr. Chairperson: The order of the list is the order of the—

Mr. Alan DeJardin (Private Citizen): I would be willing to accommodate the two people who cannot come again. This is really a cattle call, as you gentlemen well know. It is inappropriate for you to be very specific.

Floor Comment: No, it is the way it has been.

Mr. DeJardin: I know it is the way it has been, but I am just saying it is a cattle call, and I am quite prepared to—

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Chairperson, we just had a discussion before. It was indicated there are two people who wish to make presentation who cannot come back. We cannot sit beyond one o'clock, period. We have Question Period at 1:30. There are various meetings at one o'clock.

What I am suggesting we do is that we call those that cannot come back again and not go down the list. If we call the next individual who is on the list

who may be able to come back at another point in time, and that individual goes 20 minutes, we will then be at five to one and we will have two individuals who cannot come back at another point in time and we will have five minutes in which to deal with the presentations.

The way the committees have always dealt with this is towards the end of the sittings, we accommodate those who cannot come back ahead of those who might otherwise be on the list. That is all I am suggesting at this point in time is that we have the two presenters who cannot come back and then that we adjourn following that point in time.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Chairperson, we can do it one of two ways. Mr. DeJardin could be the last presenter today, and everybody else will follow the list as indeed everybody has up to this point in time except for out-of-town presenters. We can do it that way.

I am not going to be hard-nosed on this. If the committee wants to retire after the presentation of Mr. DeJardin, or if it wants to come back at the next calling and begin with Mr. DeJardin, fine, but nobody can go out of order, because I have seen people come here now for three sittings and have been waiting for their name to be called, and I think it is unfair for any person to ask, regardless of their circumstances, to come forward at this time and ask for special dispensation.

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Chairperson, we have always in committees accommodated out-of-town individuals, and always, wherever possible, attempted to accommodate those who cannot return at another point in time.

What I am suggesting in this particular case is that the two individuals who have indicated they cannot come back in the future, and if Mr. DeJardin is able to come back, that is really his call whether he requests to be called now or to come back. It has always been the practice in committees.

In fact, we have done this even this session. We have had a call that around eleven o'clock the number of bills, and in one case it went till two in the morning because of people who had—but what I am suggesting—

An Honourable Member: Committee rise.

Mr. Ashton: Well, Mr. Chairperson, I thought we were going to hear the two.

Mr. Chairperson: Committee rise at this time.

COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 12:36 p.m.

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS PRESENTED BUT NOT READ

Submission to the government of Manitoba
Standing Committee on Economic Development:

On behalf of the Board of Trustees of The Winnipeg School Division No. 1, I would like to express our appreciation for the opportunity to appear before the Standing Committee on Economic Development in regard to Bill 22, being The Public Sector Reduced Work Week and Compensation Management Act.

The purpose of this act is to provide the opportunity for all public sector organizations to require employees to take days or portions of days as leave without pay within a 12-month period as authorized, provided the total of days and portions of days does not exceed 15 days in the 12-month period for any one employee.

There is also provision in the legislation for notice to unions and a consultation process regarding the method of implementation. However, if no agreement is reached with employee groups, employers may unilaterally determine the reduction in working days and file a copy of the determination with the minister, at which time it becomes binding on the employer and the union and all employees of the employer who are represented by the union.

Related to school boards, Section 8 of the act provides that where a reduced work week is implemented, the leave without pay to be taken by teachers:

shall not exceed 10 days for any one teacher in a 12-month period;

shall be days that are set aside for teacher in-services, parent-teacher conferences, administration and pupil evaluation days;

shall be counted as teaching days for the purpose of computing grants.

The Board of Trustees of The Winnipeg School Division No. 1 has many concerns regarding both the substance of the legislation and the way in which it is implemented for school divisions.

Public Sector Employees Being Targeted

Firstly, it appears that the public sector employees are bearing the major share of the

reductions in the provincial budget, both through reduction in departmental budgets and through grants and funding to various government-funded agencies.

While it is difficult to argue against the position that control over salaries and benefits in the public sector is an essential component of deficit reduction, the unilateral application of the reduced workweek is not a long-term solution to the problem and singles out the public sector employees to provide solutions to the problem.

If there is to be a solution to the deficit, it must be found in the expectation levels for public services that have been developed over a period of time and a repriorization of services within available resources.

Collective Agreements

The Board of Trustees of this division is also of the opinion that collective agreements should be honoured and that all measures for cost and program reductions should be explored before commitments to employees are broken.

The purpose stated in the current collective agreement between the division and the Winnipeg Teachers Association is as follows:

It is the intention and purpose of the parties to this agreement to promote peace and harmony, to improve the working relations between the Division and the members of the Association, to establish acceptable provisions to facilitate the peaceful adjustment of all grievances and disputes between the parties and to provide a basis for both parties to improve the professional services rendered to the taxpayers and the students of The Winnipeg School Division No. 1.

The current collective agreements with employees which were negotiated prior to the introduction of Bill 22 contain salary increases to December 31, 1994. These increases were freely negotiated in good faith by both employer and employee groups. The trustees of this division believe very strongly that these commitments should be honoured.

Subsequent to the announcement of funding and special levy restrictions, employee groups have recognized the severity of the current financial situation, and one union has accepted a two-year contract with no salary increase.

It is only through these types of co-operative arrangements that long-term solutions to current fiscal problems will be found.

In-Service Days/Parent-Teacher Conferences

With reference to the specific provisions of the bill related to school divisions, this board has serious concerns regarding the perception that teacher in-services, parent-teacher conferences, administration and pupil evaluation days may be treated as low-priority services and such services not provided.

The in-service days used by teachers for professional development are an essential part of the education system. Both new and experienced teachers alike require the contact with their peers and professionals in the education sector to provide them with the insights and perspective on current educational issues.

The teaching function, with all the challenges of today's society related to inner city problems such as migrancy, low-income and single-parent families requires a substantial investment in professional development time to ensure teachers are as prepared as they can be to function in today's classrooms.

In-services, parent-teacher conferences, administration and pupil evaluation days are not services that can be cut with little consequence, and for this reason, this board will be looking at other means of expenditure reduction.

Summary

In summary, while the intent of the legislation and the fact that it is not compulsory is understandable, the inconsistency which has been created by the fact some employers have implemented the provision of Bill 22 while others have not has created a great deal of animosity between employers and employees in many areas of the public sector.

Without the support of employees and the dedication which they have shown in the past, continued use of measures such as reduced work week to solve fiscal problems will result in a deterioration in the quality of social services in this province.

Betty Granger and Mr. Krahn
Winnipeg School Division No. 1
Winnipeg, Manitoba

* * *

A brief to the committee studying Bill 22:

There are two critical sections to Bill 22: loss of in-service days by being designated unpaid leave days; and the removal of collective bargaining rights.

In-Service Days

The St. Vital School Board has indicated by Motion 205/93 the following; "BE IT RESOLVED that for the school year 1993/94, the St. Vital School Division will designate 10 days for inservices, administration, parent-teacher conferences, and pupil evaluation." Our board's noncompliance with Bill 22 was courageous in respect to surrounding divisions.

In-service days have two basic components. They are administrative and professional development days.

A. Administration Days. The components of administrative days include:

Organizational Days. Planning of school openings, short- and long-range planning (setting goals and objectives).

Effective schools are not administered by the top-down approach, but by teachers who share and are committed to common goals.

Parent-Teacher Interviews. It has been the norm that PTI days are given one per term and teachers then give up one or two evenings in return. If there are no PTI days, then it is not likely that evenings will voluntarily be given up.

Promotion meetings/placement. Always done near the end of term. Teachers discuss common students and assess achievement.

Graduation Day. Convocation is always held in the afternoon. When will this happen? Facilities have to be rented to accommodate both students and parents.

B. Professional Development Days. The St. Vital Initiative:

The development and implementation of The Principles of Teaching and Learning. As part of the process, administrators and teachers have expressed a need to identify a set of guiding principles and accompanying classroom practices for teaching and learning across the curriculum and across the grade levels. The attached principles and practices are reflective of our best current

knowledge about teaching and learning. They have been developed in accordance with the mission statement of the St. Vital School Division.

"The mission of the St. Vital School Division is to empower each student with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes essential for developing his/her full potential as a responsible citizen through stimulating and challenging learning experiences and effective resource management."

The Principles and Practices of Teaching and Learning are intended to be used as a guideline for teachers and administrators to examine their beliefs about teaching and learning and their current classroom practices. The document is intended to stimulate an ongoing discussion at both the school level and divisional level with respect to the principles of teaching and learning. It is expected that this document will become a vehicle through which we can promote best teaching practices in the St. Vital School Division.

The board has identified the implementation of The Principles of Teaching and Learning as a high priority and has specifically addressed this through board Motion 541/92:

"THAT the Board of Trustees selects the following 'Principles of Teaching and Learning' as its priority for implementation with the expectation that by September 1995 best teaching practices which are based on these principles will be practised throughout the St. Vital School Division.

1. The expectations of the learners and the activities in which they are engaged are reflective of their needs, abilities and interests.
2. Learning experiences are deliberately structured to take into account the social nature of learning.
3. Open-ended experiences are provided to enable the learner to construct his/her own meaning.
4. Learning experiences are deliberately designed to enable learners to make connections between the curriculum and the real world.
5. The learning environment supports risk taking by giving the learners responsibility for their learning and by providing them with experiences in problem solving and decision making.
6. Learning occurs through all of the senses.

7. Administrators, parents, teachers and support staff are also active participants in the learning process.

8. Evaluation is an integral component of the teaching/learning process.

9. Partnerships among home, school, and community are encouraged."

The superintendent has asked a planning committee to develop an implementation plan for the above motion.

Implementation Plan

The implementation plan is based on three major considerations:

1. All staff, but particularly professional educators in the division, need to acquire understanding of the principles of teaching and learning on two levels:

(a) the conceptual/philosophical meaning of the principles;

(b) how these principles manifest themselves in the daily practices of classroom teachers, support staff and administrators.

2. A high priority must be visibly assigned at both the divisional and school level to the implementation of these principles as per board Motion 541/92.

3. A firm time line for implementation, with clear expectations, must be articulated in conjunction with a clear statement of the resources/supports that will be provided (eg. leadership, time, staff development, funds).

The following specific objectives have been established:

1. A divisional in-service will be held for all school administrators and teacher representatives from each school to promote a common understanding of the principles, generate illustrative classroom practices for those principles and clarify the intent of board Motion 541/92.

The persons attending this in-service would provide a "resource base" for each school to carry out the implementation objectives established for each school in this implementation plan.

This divisional in-service will consist of two half-days, the afternoons of Wednesday, February 24th, and Tuesday, March 9th, 1993.

2. A selected bibliography relevant to the principles of teaching and learning will be prepared and distributed to all schools early in the spring term of 1993.

3. Each school will be required to accomplish the following objectives by December 17, 1993:

(a) develop a set of illustrative practices for each of the nine principles;

(b) prepare an implementation plan/strategy that is intended to meet the goal stated in board Motion 541/92, namely, "the expectation is that by September, 1995, best teaching practices which are based on these principles will be practised throughout the St. Vital School Division."

4. Each school's illustrative practices and implementation plan/strategy will be reviewed by the assistant superintendent and superintendent for the purpose of monitoring and reporting to the board. Reports on implementation progress will be provided to the board as follows: February 1994, September 1994, September 1995.

The illustrative practices developed by each school will provide a foundation for reflection and action:

1. by individual teachers and administrators regarding their personal professional growth;

2. for each school to assess the degree of implementation and school-based staff development needs;

3. for division-based staff development efforts.

5. The division and each school must assign a significant portion of in-service days and budgets to this high-priority goal over the next three years.

(The superintendent's department has made a commitment to allocate two half-days of divisional in-service time for this purpose in 1993-94 and 1994-95 and to allocate a significant portion of the division's PD budget to support implementation over the next 20 months.)

6. The division will organize and deliver additional in-service sessions (release time) during the next 30 months directly related to the implementation of the principles of teaching and learning.

The St. Vital Teachers' Association, at a council meeting on January 20, 1993, passed the following

motion: "That the SVTA recommend the adoption of 'The Principles of Teaching and Learning' document."

Without professional development days, how could the St. Vital School Board and Association work together to articulate, set goals, plan implement this strategy?

From: The Teacher of Tomorrow: A Paradigm Shift, The Board of Education for the City of London.

OLD PARADIGM THE TRADITIONAL TEACHER

The teacher knows more than the students.

The teacher must tell students what they need to know.

Essential knowledge must be broken into chunks to be given in specific grades at specific times in a specific way.

The teacher must train the memory to retain the information.

Some students will learn well, some will fail.

Failure is the result of inadequacies in the learner.

Testing is the essence of the measurement of achievement.

NEW PARADIGM THE TEACHER OF TOMORROW

Empower students as learners by giving them ownership of their learning from an early age.

Help students to seek out information and develop the thinking skills necessary to use it effectively.

Encourage collaborative as well as independent learning.

Use a variety of approaches and aids to learn to accommodate differing styles and needs.

Build on the knowledge base of each student.

Use a wide variety of assessment strategies to provide feedback to the learner.

Collective Bargaining Rights

This bill removes the free collective bargaining rights of teacher associations. Both parties, when entering into a collective agreement, must have faith in the process. To destroy this faith destroys the relationship each party has built over a period of years. Our collective bargaining has always been viewed as problem solving. In the past, we have worked together to come to an agreement without

the use of arbitration. If this relationship changes because of this bill, the trust we have established will be destroyed, and along with that, the morale of our teachers.

Morale is a key factor in the business of education. Low morale means less enthusiasm and a lessened commitment to voluntary activities. This has already been demonstrated by other associations. I expect our association would be no different.

It is of great concern to our association that all boards within the Perimeter Highway who used Bill 22 did so as an attack on teachers. To levy a special tax on teachers to support board surpluses is immoral.

If the government wanted to make the cuts, they should have created legislation that would have frozen and/or reduced the salaries of teachers equally across the province. To pass this on to boards is an abdication of their responsibility. This spattering of boards taking advantage of Bill 22 has created inequities across the province. Quality education/public school education ("the integrity of the classroom") is under attack. As I have indicated earlier, PD has positive effects in the classroom, some immediate, some long-term.

Teachers are angry. This committee's recommendation to the government should be to withdraw this legislation as well as Bill 16. Save face now before you totally destroy public education.

"My government realizes that Education and Training are the keys that unlock a world of opportunity and a future of economic growth and prosperity. To this end my government will chart a course to equip Manitobans with the knowledge and skills they require to meet the challenges of a new century."

Teachers ask, for which Manitobans? Certainly not for children of the public school system.

Barry Wittevrongel, President
St. Vital Teachers' Association
Winnipeg, Manitoba

* * *

Memorandum to the Standing Committee on Economic Development:

I am presenting this brief in my capacity as President of the Brandon University Faculty

Association, BUFA, a union local affiliated with the Canadian Association of University Teachers.

BUFA has been bargaining with Brandon University on terms and conditions of employment since 1971. From 1971 to 1978, the bargaining relationship was based on the voluntary recognition of BUFA by the employer. In 1978, BUFA confirmed its status as a union by obtaining certification through the Manitoba Labour Board.

Every round of negotiations between BUFA and the employer since 1971 has resulted in a collective agreement mutually acceptable to both parties, collective agreements which have both respected the basic institutional arrangements of the university—academic freedom, tenure, collegial decision-making arrangements, et cetera—and created conditions which have allowed the university to expand and enrich its programs.

Contrary to popular belief, the practice of collective bargaining at Brandon University has not resulted in excessive salary and benefits increases. On the contrary, Statistics Canada data for 1991-92 placed Brandon University 46th out of 50 Canadian universities/colleges outside of Quebec—i.e., almost at the bottom—in terms of the average salary paid to academics.

In sum, the bargaining relationship that exists between BUFA and the employer is an enduring one that has demonstrated much resilience in the face of changing conditions.

This has been particularly evident in recent years when universities in Manitoba have been subjected to a fiscal squeeze by the Manitoba government. Some indication of the extent of this squeeze is provided by the data in the following table which compares various aspects of university funding in Manitoba to the total for all provinces combined.

It should be noted that the increase in the provincial operating grant per capita in Manitoba from 1987-88 to 1990-91 was 5.6 percent as compared to an average of 19.4 percent for all provinces combined. Indeed, Manitoba had the lowest percentage increase of all provinces during this period.

Source: Statistics Canada, University Financial Trend Analysis 1981-82 to 1990-91 (Catalogue 81-260)

Clearly, given the trends in university finance in Manitoba, conditions have not been especially propitious for collective bargaining. Despite such

conditions, however, negotiations at Brandon University have produced settlements acceptable to both parties.

The last collective agreement between BUFA and the employer expired March 31, 1993. Given a 2.15 percent reduction in provincial operating grants to the university, we entered the current round of negotiations recognizing the constraints on the university's resources and prepared to negotiate a collective agreement acknowledging such constraints.

Bill 22 represents an unwarranted and reprehensible intrusion into collective bargaining in the Manitoba public sector. In the Manitoba public service proper the bill was imposed despite the existence of collective agreements—presumably negotiated in good faith—which extend to 1994.

In the case of universities and many other public sector institutions, the bill was interjected into the collective bargaining process. The interjection of Bill 22 has had two results at Brandon University.

First, negotiations on a new collective agreement have been delayed because the employer has been preoccupied with trying to figure out how to exploit the provisions of Bill 22. Secondly, the employer has taken advantage of the climate created by Bill 22, the government's signal that respect for the rights of employees and the institution of collective bargaining is passé, to seek changes to the collective agreement which would fundamentally alter institutional arrangements at Brandon University. These results are not unique to our union. Other campus unions have been similarly affected. Indeed, if anything, the attack on the rights and benefits of employees in other campus unions is especially harsh and mean-spirited.

At Brandon University the employer has used Bill 22 to compel employees to take six days off without pay. The employer went through the pretense of "consultations" required by Bill 22 by convening a meeting and informing us that our members would be required to give up six days pay. We rejected the suggestion that these were meaningful consultations and indicated that we would not be prepared to consult until Bill 22 became law. As well, we indicated that once the bill did become law we would ask the employer to show just cause for invoking the provisions of Bill 22. The representative of the employer advised us that the

employer is not required to show just cause for the action. In short, Bill 22 gives the employer the power to unilaterally impose days off without pay, without demonstrating that conditions at the university warrant extraordinary measures.

There is no appeal process. End of story. Surely the draconian nature of Bill 22 is so transparent that it needs no explanation or elaboration. It is an ill-conceived piece of legislation with insidious implications. Bill 22 should be withdrawn.

In recent speeches and statements by the Minister of Finance and the Premier, much has been made of the idea that we are in a crisis situation and that we must all join together in making sacrifices to resolve this crisis. Surely, even the author of Bill 22 can recognize the incongruity of such legislation with their call for shared sacrifice.

In effect, what the government has done with Bill 22 is single out public sector workers for a special tax, imposed on them because they are public sector workers. At Brandon University, this tax amounts to 2.3 percent of our gross salary. How can the government justify and defend such an obviously unjust and inequitable piece of legislation.

There is no justification for such legislation. There is no defence for such legislation. It should be withdrawn.

John Blaikie, President
Brandon University Faculty Association
Brandon, Manitoba

* * *

Memorandum to the Standing Committee on Economic Development:

Frankly, I am at a loss to understand why this particular bill, Bill 22, was ever placed on the legislative agenda in Manitoba. The bill has no logical foundations. Its purposes are obscure. It seems to have been authored by a government that perceives a crisis but has no coherent understanding of precisely what that crisis is, where it originates, or what needs to be done about it.

Nevertheless, the government believes it is compelled to react; it must be seen to be taking some kind of action to deal with the crisis. And so it resorts to something like Bill 22, uncertain about its impact and implications, convinced only that it

will be well received by segments of the population who are not directly affected by the legislation.

Bill 22 is, in short, an act of desperation by a government bereft of insight and vision. I find Bill 22 abhorrent on a number of grounds.

First, it represents scapegoating of the most gratuitous sort. The cabinet does not declare that public sector workers are responsible for the problems facing Manitoba. Instead it devises a bill, Bill 22, which is designed specifically to claw back wages, salaries from public sector workers. The implication: public sector workers are the cause of the problems facing Manitoba. The government will, of course, deny that this is the intended result of Bill 22. I would suggest that this is precisely the result intended: shift the blame for Manitoba's problems from the government to public sector workers and create the illusion that the government is taking action to remedy the situation.

Secondly, Bill 22 repudiates important values and traditions that have been entrenched and nurtured in Manitoba since the Second World War. The rights of private sector workers to join unions and bargain collectively with their employers was recognized in Canada and Manitoba in 1944 with the passage of the federal government's Order-In-Council PC1003. These rights were confirmed in Manitoba legislation in 1948. In the 1960s and 1970s similar rights were gradually extended to public sector workers in Manitoba. By the end of the 1970s virtually all employees in Manitoba could avail themselves of the right to join trade unions and the right to have the terms and conditions of their employment determined through collective bargaining.

Twice in recent years the Manitoba government has unilaterally used its legislative powers to suspend these rights. The first time was in 1991, when the government brought in Bill 70. Now we have Bill 22. The pattern in both these situations was the same. Rather than use the procedures and practice of collective bargaining to try and achieve its objectives, the government unilaterally imposed its agenda through legislation. In the case of Bill 70, the government aborted the bargaining process and imposed its will on public sector workers. In the case of the current bill the government did not even bother to go through the motions of consulting with the employees affected by the legislation. It simply imposed its will on its own employees and imposed pressure on all other

public sector employers to follow suit, i.e., to unilaterally take back wages owed to their employees.

Thirdly, other segments of society look to governments for guidance and examples of how to conduct themselves in the affairs of life. With Bill 22, the government has shown contempt for both the rights of its employees and the practice of collective bargaining. By so doing, it has signalled to other employers that it is acceptable to trample on the rights of their employees and to use the favourable circumstances created by the high levels of unemployment to attack unions and collective agreements. The government will no doubt deny that this is what it intended by its example. Denial will not, however, alter the fact that this is how the government's actions will be interpreted by other employers.

Fourthly, one of the results of Bill 22 is that it has demoralized workers in the public sector. These workers were singled out for special, and punitive, treatment by the government. Bill 22 degrades both the work done by public sector workers and the workers who do public sector work, i.e., the workers who produce the services provided through the public sector. This situation cannot help but have harmful effects on the quality of working life in the public sector and, therefore, on

productivity and the quality of services in the public sector.

Finally, in its rhetoric in defence of Bill 22, the government has invoked the idea of shared sacrifices as a means of achieving desirable community objectives. Indeed, according to a media report of previous hearings on Bill 22, the Minister of Finance chastised a low-paid government employee from The Pas for her inability to understand her obligations to contribute to deficit reduction by giving up 10 days pay. This is blatant hypocrisy. In fact, by his own admission, the Minister of Finance has taken great pains to exempt the wealthy, the privileged and the powerful in Manitoba from sharing in the sacrifices he is imposing on public sector workers and other groups in society.

In conclusion, I would say that, in my opinion, this is such an utterly bad piece of legislation that it should be removed immediately from the legislative agenda. If the government does this, then it will be possible to begin collectively to address the problems confronting Manitoba. If Bill 22 passes, then I fear these problems will become more severe and more intractable.

J.F. Dolecki
Brandon University Faculty Association
Brandon, Manitoba