



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. 17 - 7 p.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 — 7 p.m.**

**LOCATION — Winnipeg, Manitoba**

**CHAIRPERSON — Mr. Jack Reimer (Niakwa)**

**ATTENDANCE - 11 — QUORUM - 6**

*Members of the Committee present:*

Hon. Messrs. Downey, Enns, Gilleshammer,  
Manness

Messrs. Alcock, Ashton, Laurendeau, Penner,  
Reimer

Substitutions:

Mr. Santos for Ms. Cerilli

Ms. Barrett for Mr. Dewar

**WITNESSES:**

Alan DeJardin, Private Citizen

Ken Guilford, Private Citizen

John Loxley, Private Citizen

Tracy Libitka, Shauna MacKinnon, Twilla  
MacDonald, Private Citizens

Mark Gabbert, Private Citizen

Michael Shaw, Canadian Union of Educational  
Workers

Kenneth Emberley, Private Citizen

Robert Chernomas, President, University of  
Manitoba Faculty Association

Diane O'Neil, Private Citizen

Jettie Zwiep, Private Citizen

Barry Wolfe, River East Teachers' Association

Mary Wallace, President, CUPE Local 500

Richard Sparling, Private Citizen

Robert Hilliard, Private Citizen

**MATTER UNDER DISCUSSION:**

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

\* \* \*

**Mr. Chairperson:** Will the Committee on  
Economic Development please come to order.  
This committee will consider 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 the  
committee room has been set up with the list of  
presenters that have pre-registered. I will not read  
the list since members of the committee have  
copies. Should anyone present wish to appear  
before the committee who has not already  
pre-registered, please advise the Chamber staff at  
the back of the room and your name will be added  
to the list.

At this time I would ask anyone in the audience  
who have written texts of their presentations, if so  
would you please forward your copy to the Page at  
this time.

As moved by motion on 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 present  
who are from out of town to please raise their hands  
and the Clerk will circle your name. No hand.  
Okay, then we will continue calling names.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader):**  
Mr. Chairperson, I want to raise a matter of  
procedure and I also have a motion afterwards.

Members of the committee may recall, Mr.  
Chairperson, at noon, in fact at 12:28 to be exact,  
we were sitting in this committee when I raised a  
number of matters of procedure, at which time I  
asked that we give consideration for a number of  
presenters that were here that indicated it would be  
difficult for them to come back at another time.  
There was also another presenter that was next on  
the list, and I indicated at the time that I asked the  
government House leader for some indication as to  
when this committee would be rescheduled to  
make sure that we had proper opportunity for  
members of the public to be aware when that took  
place.

At that time the government House leader gave no indication when this committee would be scheduled. In fact, without accommodating two individuals the government members of the committee walked out and called, committee rise, and, Mr. Chairperson, we went into the House. Following Question Period there was no announcement in regards to Bill 22, and it was not until four o'clock in the afternoon that the government House leader announced there would be a sitting of this committee tonight.

That gave exactly three hours notice to members of the public, including members of the public who were sitting in the committee room at that time, and that was assuming that the Clerk's Office was in a position of being able to contact those people. I feel this was a deliberate attempt of the government, by calling the committee on three hours notice, to attempt to run through the remaining names on the list and deny the members of the public, a number of whom were here this afternoon, the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Chairperson, I am, quite frankly, amazed that the government would start it off by limiting the situation in terms of public presentation by limiting it to 20 minutes, on the guise that this would allow for greater input from members of the public, of course, something that we said was not the case is now, after we have been sitting in this committee for the last number of days, is now attempting, once again, to use whatever tactic it can to wind up the committee meetings.

Mr. Chairperson, that is absolutely unacceptable. I, quite frankly, do not know what the government is so afraid of. We currently have, according to my calculations after a number of names have been eliminated earlier in the day, 23 names remaining on the list. I do not understand why the government felt it necessary to try and call this committee back on three hours' notice, when it could have given ample notice this afternoon during a meeting of the committee and, even notwithstanding that, could have given the same notice at 2:15.

In fact, I was in the House most of the afternoon. It was actually called at a time when I was out of the House for about five minutes. So I walked in and found the Bill 22 committee had been called after four o'clock.

Mr. Chairperson, I think there is no doubt about the intention of the government on this. The intention was to call it with as short a notice as possible to ensure that as many people on the list as possible would not hear about the committee hearing, and they would be able to wrap up this committee this evening by having only a small number of presenters, and then running through the names afterwards.

That is absolutely unacceptable. I want to say, it is particularly unacceptable to us because we made every effort when this bill was voted through in terms of second reading to ensure that there was ample notice to members of the public. That, I think, is something that we are trying to do with other bills in this session, Mr. Chairperson.

The bottom line is that this government has once again shown contempt for the political process. I think it is absolutely unacceptable. I therefore move

THAT this committee condemn the government for deliberately delaying calling this committee in an effort to thwart members of the public from participating in this committee this afternoon.

**Mr. Chairperson:** I would like to read the motion into the record.

I move that this committee condemn the government for deliberately attempting to prevent members of the public from participating in committee on Bill 22 by deliberately not announcing the committee until 4 p.m., this afternoon, thereby not providing adequate notice.

All those in favour of the—

**Mr. Conrad Santos (Broadway):** Every committee has an obligation morally as well as legally to give ample notice. This is just a basic principle of natural justice. No person can be expected to do or perform anything unless there is sufficient and adequate notice, and notice is essential in order that there be fairness or justice or fair play. Without it, there can be no mutual trust, no confidence in the process of decision making or of the wrapping up of decisions.

Notice is essential because it is part of our democratic process, part of our democratic tradition. No one can be condemned without notice because that would be illegal as well as immoral. The government, in order to achieve legitimacy, has to give notice particularly to those whom it perceives as its opponents. When the

government cannot co-opt into its own decision making those elements in society that are particularly opposed to its position or its ideology, there could be no peace, no orderly process in the process of democratic policy making.

\* (1910)

Without notice, nothing can be considered legitimate because it will be unfair. If it is unfair, it will be unjust. If it is unjust, it will be resisted to the very end by those who have never been heard or have not been given notice.

Mr. Chairperson, I think it is essential that particularly those in positions of governmental power be generous to the opponents by giving them the most ample notice that is possible in order that they may achieve some kind of respect, some kind of legitimacy and therefore exercise some moral authority in the process of policy making.

Thank you.

**Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (St. Norbert):** I move the question be put.

**Mr. Chairperson:** It has been moved that the question be put.

All those in favour of the motion that the question be put, please signify by saying yea.

**Some Honourable Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Chairperson:** All those against the motion that the question be put, please say nay.

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Chairperson:** In my opinion, the Yeas have it. The motion be put.

**Mr. Ashton:** I request a counted vote.

**A COUNTED VOTE** was taken, the result being as follows:

Yeas 6, Nays 1.

**Mr. Chairperson:** On the motion put before the committee, all those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

**An Honourable Member:** Yea.

**Mr. Chairperson:** All those opposed to the motion, please say nay.

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Ashton:** I would like to note for the record that it was on division.

Also, because of the lateness of the hour and the fact that we had no notice of this committee meeting until four o'clock, we were unable to

arrange the committee substitutions till after that point in time, and the Liberals were unable to attend. Someone might be interested that they were denied the opportunity to vote.

Mr. Chairperson, I also want to ask a question in terms of procedure. I want to ask what time the Clerk's Office was notified in terms of this committee—we received notice at four o'clock in the House—and whether they were able to reach everyone that is remaining on the list. I assume that a number of people were able to be reached.

**Mr. Chairperson:** It is the opinion that as it was announced in the House it was on the monitor in the Clerk's Office, and the Clerk was then on the phone phoning people at the same instant, at the same time.

**Mr. Ashton:** I just want to receive some assurance that the remaining 23 people on the list have all been contacted and will be able to come tonight.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order, please. It has been brought to my attention that the people on this list have all been contacted up to No. 20, and the last three, 21, 22, and 23 phoned, and they were also contacted. They were informed when they registered. It was just after.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Chairperson:** We will now proceed with the list. I will call on Mr. Alan DeJardin.

Mr. DeJardin, for your presentation, did you have a written presentation?

**Mr. Alan DeJardin (Private Citizen):** No, Sir, I do not.

**Mr. Chairperson:** You may begin then. Thank you very much.

**Mr. DeJardin:** Thank you, Sir, and I would like to particularly thank the member of the Legislature who has just left. He has performed, for the public, yeoman service regardless of which party he has represented—[interjection]

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order. You may proceed, Mr. DeJardin.

**Mr. DeJardin:** Mr. Chairperson, members of the committee and most importantly members of the public. I tend to think we sometimes forget that they are present. At least they should be present in our minds if not in person.

As I came to the Legislature this morning, and I am not going to continue unless the members pay attention, so when I stop you will know why, and I will not speak as long as the member has his back to me.

**Mr. Chairperson:** I would just like to point out that the presenter has 20 minutes to make a presentation, and the clock is running, sir, so you make a presentation within the 20 minutes.

**Mr. DeJardin:** I do not know who the member is, but he is certainly displaying his ill-breeding.

### Point of Order

**Mr. Laurendeau:** I believe the rules of the House state that I have to be here, but nobody says I have to listen. Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

**Mr. Chairperson:** The member did not have a point of order. Mr. DeJardin, to continue with his presentation.

\* \* \*

**Mr. DeJardin:** I would like to know the name of the member.

**Mr. Laurendeau:** Marcel Laurendeau, sir, if you have a problem. Do you want to write it down? L-a-u-r-e—

**Mr. DeJardin:** No.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order, order, please. We have members of the public here that have come to make—order, please. We have members here of the public to make presentation.

**Mr. DeJardin:** Reviewing this spectacle, it was the name of the member that—[interjection] Mr. Penner, thank you.

Mr. Chairperson, members of the committee, most importantly, members of the public—[interjection] Thank you, I do not think civility should be too much to ask the more mature members of the Legislature.

As I came to the Legislature to attend my third hearing this morning, this is my fourth, I passed by the Cartier statue on the parliament grounds. Now, the inscription reads: May the new province of Manitoba always speak to the inhabitants of the northwest the language of reason, truth and justice.

I would suggest that is the key to the matter at hand on Bill 22. It is always difficult to know how to approach a hearing such as this. Should one assume a totally partisan stance and fight it out

verbally? Should one assume the government is still listening to the people and watch the ministers of the Crown exchange knowing glances and wait to be carved up for their supper?

No matter, I prefer a dialogue with participation, and I would request answers to my questions. First, I recognize for some of you that is probably a great deal. First procedure, when tryouts are held on the Great White Way in New York on Broadway, they are called cattle calls. I suggest these hearings have a similar flavour.

May I simply suggest to the nonpartisan members of the committee, and I suggest we could all adopt that status at one time or another. If these hearings are to be a sincere reflection of what the Legislature would be interested in hearing, and what the public would be interested in putting forth to their elected representatives, then a procedure such as this might be more helpful.

\* (1920)

When you have scheduled three hours of a hearing, if you feel you might go through six or seven presenters per hour, then simply call the 18 or 20 that should be present, hear the 18 or 20. If they finish a half an hour early, I do not think that it would hurt anyone of you to have another half hour of quiet period or an extra piece of cheesecake, perhaps which you may be able to afford. If the presenters run long, which can be the occasion, then simply ask the two or three of them to return with another 18 or 20.

It seems to me that we make a mockery of this kind of procedure when we have to have 60 or 80 or—

### Point of Order

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. DeJardin, I apologize for interrupting you, but you were invited here today to make representation on Bill 22. You were not invited here to make representation as to the process that this Legislature has chosen to conduct, the manner in which it conducts its hearings.

Another opportunity will probably come when we are trying to redraft the rules, sir. At that time, collectively, you may want to give input to process. Now we are—

**Mr. DeJardin:** I would suggest that this government is not going to allow the public to assist them in redrafting the rules.

**Mr. Manness:** I am on a point of order, sir. Although we have been very allowing to let people talk what they want to, the reality is, by the strict rules of our House and our Legislature, sir, you are out of order. You have been asked to be here to make reference to Bill 22. I will not say it again; you can talk about anything you wish. But I know you seem to be very concerned about rules and process, and I am telling you, sir, what you are doing now is outside the rules.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. DeJardin, to continue.

The minister did not have a point of order. You may continue, Mr. DeJardin.

\* \* \*

**Mr. DeJardin:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I will draw the connection for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) to the rules a little bit later in my presentation. I do apologize to him if my presentation may be a little hectic and disjointed. I would suggest it is not any more hectic or disjointed than the hearings themselves.

Now I have made that suggestion and will go on from there. Now, at that point, you will not have inconvenienced 60 or 80 people, et cetera.

I always remember my mother telling me that the saving grace of Conservatives—and in our household, at that point, this was 20 or 30 years ago, they still had one—was that they are supposed to be businessmen. They deal in a businesslike methodology.

Well, I would simply suggest that we could save time, we could save money and, certainly, the time of two Clerks, remembering every presenter each new day. I, by the way, stand before you as No. 72, No. 54, No. 53, No. 52 and No. 25 this evening. Now, that is idiotic, I am sure you will agree. I am sure that the Minister of Finance, being the serious chap that he is, will do something about that.

My second point. This kind of hits home, and please, Mr. Manness, interrupt me if you wish. There is a distinct irony when the committee majority, headed I would suggest, by the Honourable Mr. Manness, requires the utmost respect for agreements made on procedure, a procedure to discuss, by the way, Bill 22, which you reminded me, Sir, is an absolute abrogation of procedure—

**Floor Comment:** Democratic.

**Mr. DeJardin:** Well, let us say democratic only when one changes the rules in the middle of the game, and there were some very famous Europeans who also did that for their government in the 1930s.

I would like to simply mention a couple of further points about the bill and the reaction of this government, because I know that Mr. Manness relies on legalities for his points, but the law to a great extent is based on morality. Although we forget that on occasion, it seems to me that it might be worthwhile considering it this evening.

Yesterday was Seniors Day at the Legislature—  
**Floor Comment:** Today is.

**Mr. DeJardin:** Today is Seniors Day. Well, there were a lot of seniors here—pardon me, I have become confused in terms of the number of committee meetings that you had, and I apologize for that.

This morning certainly there were a lot of seniors who were enjoying cake and cookies and lemonade and coffee, and that is a very nice thing for the government to do.

While the people celebrated that day, the government celebrated it by slashing their basic support by \$3 million. Now, I guess Marie Antoinette said it best, and you gentlemen know your history far better than I do, "Let them eat cake," I think. So while they are having cookies and cake, the axe is descending as it were.

Now, it is important that the government understand that many of us who come to present are not unmindful of the fact that government has to make hard decisions. We are not unmindful that cuts have to be made. Families certainly have had to cut the children's allowances and have had to have an explanation.

But I think there is a way of doing that. Simply because we have to disappoint people on occasion, we do not have to be mean, we do not have to be ill-natured about it. It can be done in a caring fashion, and one of the things that we see, day after day, time after time, is that this government, through its actions, all we see is a very uncaring face. We do not see a government that says, I am very sorry I have to do this. We do not see a government that says, let me try to find a better way to do this. As a matter of fact we do not see a government of much logic or emotion, and that is important.

This government has been given, time and time again, alternatives to the kinds of things they are doing now, and they have not even looked at them, let alone studied them. There are many, many solutions to the problems that this government faces, and I know that you are going to feel that I am as rhetorical as you because I do not give you any answers.

\* (1930)

Well, I give you one just as a suggestion, for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. They say they are going to have to raise motorists' rates by 10 percent. If this Legislature—and this is the solution for those who have not been listening—part of this solution is if this government were to simply pass a bill requiring every motorist to have their lights on whenever their car was moving, the safety council of the United States says you would save four to five percent in damage claims. Could we do something about these things? Could we do a little study, a little thought, a little creativity?

Premier Filmon takes the Manitoba private jet, flies down to see the new Prime Minister, spends \$7,000. I do not mind him going. I do not care how many political sycophants he brings with him, but do it on his own money. Do not do it on provincial money. This is a ceremony that he was the only Premier that attended. Now, he has no right, and he should be sued for using the government jet on that occasion. We have here another example, as we did with the senate federally, of people who just do not have any idea of what is going on in the public mind.

Political jaunts should be paid for personally, and if, for instance, the Premier (Mr. Filmon) feels that he is building up this incredibly new and dynamic and superb relationship with the new Prime Minister, it seems to me one specific action would suggest to us that he has missed the boat. Ms. Campbell, our Prime Minister, was once the Minister of Justice not too long ago, and were they not the people that just walked into Manitoba Hydro and raided their files? Does she not talk to the Premier except to invite him to the champagne dinners?

It certainly would seem not to be starting out a relationship in a very auspicious manner if that is how Ms. Campbell's Justice department regards the province of Manitoba. However, of course, one might—

**Floor Comment:** That is totally inaccurate.

**Mr. DeJardin:** Totally inaccurate, I see; they did not do that. Are you saying that, are you saying—

**Floor Comment:** Not the Justice department.

**Floor Comment:** What would you know? You did not know anything about it when we asked the question in the House.

**Mr. DeJardin:** I do not know where you get the fountain of knowledge all of a sudden, but at any rate, I must confess that I—[interjection] I am sorry, was that a question? I apologize, but the fact that I do not suffer fools gladly puts me at a distinct disadvantage when dealing with this government.

Now we have—

**Mr. Chairperson:** I would just like to point out, Mr. DeJardin, you have about two minutes left in your presentation.

**Mr. DeJardin:** Oh, great, I have just two minutes of talk left.

For a government that espouses self-help, it is ironic that you depend on charity. You depend upon the charity of citizens to understanding your philosophy, one that is rarely espoused in terms of where you are going, and you depend upon the charity of nonprofit organizations to fill the gaps that you create, and I would suggest that you will exhaust people such as this very quickly.

It has been suggested by Mr. Mulroney that the Filmon-Mulroney team took the hard road, the difficult road, the impassable road. I would suggest not. I would suggest that they took the easy way out, just as this government has. This government has not put much thought or much philosophy forward in terms of the actions that they have taken. A great part of the consternation which goes far beyond partisanship is, where the hell are we going? What are we doing? What do we end up with?

As one prime example, the lottery connection and the VLTs and gambling and gaming in the province, a quick story just before I end. Prior to Premier Filmon taking the reigns of government I was employed by a large concern who wished to purchase the Hotel Fort Garry, and I came to the Legislature to see him because it occurred to me that there might be a change of government, and I wanted to chat with him about this particular item. I found him in the hallway, and we did chat. I made



a suggestion to him about the purchase of this facility—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. DeJardin, I am sorry but your—

**Mr. DeJardin:** Well, I will just finish this—and the fact that I would like to put the casino into the hotel. Mr. Filmon said, entirely unacceptable. Not only will we consider closing the casino and have no further gambling in the province of Manitoba, but we will certainly under my leadership have no extension of gaming whatsoever—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you very much, Mr. DeJardin. I am sorry, Mr. DeJardin, but I have extended your time over a minute from the normal. So thank you very much for your time.

I will now call on Mr. Ken Guilford.

**Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington):** On a point of information actually, Mr. Chair.

**Floor Comment:** There is no such thing.

**Ms. Barrett:** Well, is there a point of order when we are having public hearings?

**Floor Comment:** Yes, but there is no such thing as a point of information. You know the rules.

### Point of Order

**Ms. Barrett:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair. When presenters are making presentations and the minister or any one other member of the committee asks a question or interjects with a point of order, is that taken out of their 20 minutes?

**Mr. Chairperson:** I have added extra, almost three minutes, to the presenter's time. Thank you very much.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Ken Guilford.

**Mr. DeJardin:** Are there no questions?

**Mr. Chairperson:** No, your presentation is finished, Mr. DeJardin. Thank you very much.

Mr. Ken Guilford to present at this time. Did you have a written presentation, Mr. Guilford?

**Mr. Ken Gullford (Private Citizen):** Yes, I do. I gave it to somebody. I do not know what happened to it, but I know it is here somewhere.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay, you may begin then, Mr. Guilford.

**Mr. Gullford:** Yes, while we are waiting on that to be delivered I was wondering if I could take a

minute and just look through the paper. In the last couple of days—I am speaking here tonight as a private citizen. I am very private in my life. I would like to make that fact known.

On Wednesday, June 23: "Hydro pulling the plug; Forecast profit fails to save jobs." I would like to take a minute just to read this. "Manitoba Hydro announced yesterday it will eliminate 480 positions by June 1994; 100 people will be laid off, the remainder will be phased out through early retirement and attrition.

\* (1940)

"Government restraint has meant lost jobs"—congratulations, guys, you did it again. Ay, boy! Keep up the good work. But we are failing; you guys are failing us. There are: "... lost jobs and wage rollbacks at almost every level, including:

Manitoba Telephone System

Announced in December it would eliminate a thousand jobs through attrition by 1995.

Manitoba Public Insurance Corp.

Eliminated 29 positions in December . . . ."

I had my car fixed at an inopportune time or opportune time, I am not sure which, but when I was there, they have right now, they have delays, delays, delays. I hope none of you have the displeasure of getting a car accident because you boys—I am sorry. You honourable members are doing a fine job of cutting jobs there. It is getting harder and harder to get in there to Autopac.

Bill 22, here we are, that is the one I was looking for a minute ago: "The Filmon government work-week reduction bill will affect 100,000 public sector employees, forcing them to take up to 15 days of unpaid leave or docking employees the equivalent of 4% in wages."

That is great. Ay, we got the economy going. Docking wages, how are you going to get the economy going if you are cutting down in wages? We do not want reduction in wages. You will never, never get the economy going at that rate.

At the end of March 1991 budget, the Filmon government, that is you guys, announced it will eliminate 1,000 civil service positions. Mr. Manness, you are grinning. It is a big joke. Sit up, take attention. The rest of you guys, sit up, listen. Here is what my prepared speech is.

I am sorry, Mr. Manness. I did not mean to lecture you. You are very comfortable. I know you

are in a comfortable job, so do not worry about it, okay? The Assiniboine River is going down by your way, I understand, if you have your way. I hope you do not. I understand next week, July 5, 6, 7, is when we are going to talk about it at the Convention Centre. I would like to congratulate you gentlemen for bringing the debate into Winnipeg. We did not have it over here for a while.

Now, can I get on with my speech?

**Floor Comment:** Carry on.

**Mr. Gullford:** Okay. I would like to first of all thank you for allowing me to speak to this committee. I am here tonight as a private concerned citizen in order to speak against Bill 22, which is the bill that deals with The Public Sector Reduced Work Week and Compensation Management Act, which is one of the many bills that I do not like.

I do not work as a government employee. I work for a private business company. I speak against this bill because, not only will it affect the government employees, it will also affect the whole economy. The people will have less money, and more time will be available to do what? There could be many spinoffs because of these problems.

I ask you to consider, who is this present government trying to please but their business cohorts? I would never want to be a Conservative in power because I know most of you people—and a lot of you people are fine gentlemen, but you are being controlled by business. Business is trying to explain and control you people.

I remember reading an article one time about the fact that businesses felt that Canada had such a low unemployment rate, 6.5 percent, and they also felt that it should be increased.

The present government, both provincially as well as federally, did a fine job of introducing such great bills as the Free Trade Agreement, unemployment insurance changes, the general sales tax and others. We have lost over 500,000 jobs in the last three years because of the Free Trade Agreement alone.

Now they want to pass the North American Free Trade Agreement with Mexico. Mexicans work for very low wages and have very little regard for their environment. They are trying to feed their families, as we are here. Canada will lose many more jobs if this bill is allowed to pass. The Liberals had an opportunity to defeat it in the House of Parliament, but not enough of them were interested enough to

show up for the vote. What can I tell my sons when they ask me—[interjection]

Whenever you guys are ready to listen to me—I believe I have the floor. The Liberals and Conservatives are laughing about different things. I know that. They are having it between themselves, and that is okay. Are you gentlemen ready—

**Floor Comment:** When you are.

**Mr. Gullford:** Good. Are there going to be any more interruptions? I hope not.

**Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne):** Depends on what you say.

**Mr. Gullford:** Thank you, Mr. Alcock. It depends on what I say whether I will be interrupted or not. I do not quite follow that.

**Floor Comment:** Think about it.

**Mr. Gullford:** Well, okay, I will take it as noted. Since you are running for Liberal, I will understand what side, because I believe that businesses have something to do with the Liberals too.

What can I tell my sons when they ask me about getting a job and how bright a future we may look forward to? I understand the government is preparing to pass a bill which will divert the waters of the Assiniboine River south past Emerson to the Red River. All waters flow north. Where has the environment committee been looking? What about the farmland you will be destroying while diverting the river? What about the many animals you may destroy? Man has never won in all the history of mankind by interfering with nature—

**Floor Comment:** Did you feed him this information?

**Mr. Gullford:** Mr. Penner, do you have a problem?

**Mr. Jack Penner (Emerson):** Yes, I do.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order, please. I will ask all members to—the member has—

**Mr. Gullford:** I am not a member.

**Mr. Chairperson:** No, you are not a member. The presenter—the presenter has the floor. You may continue, Mr. Gullford.

**Mr. Gullford:** God put the rivers the way he wanted them. We will be making a huge mistake if you interfere with God's work. What are the costs to do this? How much will it cost for a study to answer some of these questions? How will this diversion affect the farms along the present site of

the Assiniboine River which are now dependent upon the river waters? What about the people whose lives you will be drastically interfering with? Do they not count? No, my friends, there is a far better way to spend money. Get rid of Bill 22 for a start.

Another great and wonderful thing this government did is downsize the size of City Council. We used to have 29 city councillors in Winnipeg receiving approximately \$24,000 per year. The cost was approximately \$700,000. We now have 15 councillors making approximately \$45,000, each of which has an assistant who is making approximately \$30,000. The cost of this is approximately \$1,125,000. The difference is approximately \$450,000 a year. We were told we would save money. Give your head a shake. They made another big mistake. I used to be a resident adviser in my ward before you got rid of us. We had a good system before the 1992 election year. Sure, maybe there had to be some improvement, but this was a total waste of money. Now the government cries foul. We need more money; let us lay off more people. Let us reduce the workweek and pay the people less money as well.

No, my friends, there is a far better way to spend money. I say, throw out the bill, give the people jobs and keep us all working. Get rid of the North American Free Trade Agreement. Get rid of the Free Trade Agreement, we can still defeat that. We can still bring it to the House and get rid of it.

Get rid of the general sales tax. Get rid of Sunday shopping. Get together and strike up a much-needed policy and bills to encourage people to spend more money, get some faith in the economy, and let us get rolling.

Right now, I believe this government is going two steps forward and three backward. Let us get down to basics. Let us help each other and work together co-operatively. I understand you Conservatives have a hard time with co-op, but that is the way to go. There is a saying I particularly like which is as follows: United we stand, divided we fall.

Manitoba is a great province. We have shown how generous we can be through the efforts of the two recent telethons. The Variety Club raised close to \$1 million. The Children's Hospital raised just over \$1 million. We joined forces and did it together.

We are just coming out of a bad recession. Do not pass this bill.

In conclusion, I would like to say I am very much opposed to this bill. There are many great things we should be doing and ways we could work together to turn the economy around. Let us get together and do them, the sooner the better. I am proud to say I am a Canadian, and proud to say that I come from Manitoba. I hope you can say the same.

I know a lot of you here tonight, and I am pleased to know you. I know you all basically want the same thing. There is a time and place for everything. This is the time to rip up this bill and start over. I invite any questions that you may have. I will look forward to working with you in the future. Thank you.

What I would like to do is just read today's paper, a couple of headlines. How much time do I have left?

\* (1950)

**Mr. Chairperson:** You have approximately, just around six-and-a-half minutes, sir.

**Mr. Gullford:** Okay, thank you. What I would like to do is go through some of the things that are happening today and here is one I see here: "Province slashes home aid. Cleaning, laundry, meals cut; 560 personal-care beds planned."

This is hurting the people. The people need this. The people having these personal care beds require these beds. You people are trying to do away with them. You are trying to hurt us again. "Mentally handicapped students graduate into life's mainstream"—another bad thing to do.

"McCrae planning to overhaul judicial watchdog"—but lord, you guys, it is a massacre. You guys are making a shambles out of this thing. Let us get together and let us turn the economy around. Let us try and increase funding to the farmers, let us try and help out the people in cities. Let us do things to increase the economy, not cut wages. Not cut this, not cut that, like you guys are doing, you are going backward.

Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you very much, Mr. Gullford.

**Mr. Laurendeau:** Ken, as you and I have had many talks in that one room in the House, I did have one question for you, and that was on your area

where God has made a lot of decisions for us and we should not make mistakes. Where did you stand on some of the Hydro projects that we have throughout the province? Do you think they were economic development for our province? Do you think that was a proper investment for governments to take in the past?

**Mr. Gullford:** A lot of people were hurt, a lot of land was destroyed, a lot of animals were killed because of this.

**Mr. Laurendeau:** Do you believe this was a proper area for governments to go for economic development of this project, the area of hydro-electric power?

**Mr. Gullford:** As I said, I am not working for the Province of Manitoba. I am not working for the Manitoba Hydro. I would rather not comment on that.

**Mr. Ashton:** Mr. Chairperson, getting back to Bill 22. I note in your brief that you pointed out that you do not work for the governments, you are not directly affected by the bill. I am just wondering what the reaction has been from government workers, public sector workers that you have talked about, what is their reaction to Bill 22?

**Mr. Gullford:** I have talked to some government workers, but not only have I talked to government workers, I have also talked to people in my place of employment. I am not speaking on behalf of anybody else but myself. The people I have talked to feel the same way as I do. They want to get rid of it. They do not want to reduce their wages.

I mentioned before, I had my car fixed at Autopac. The way it is now—I was supposed to be there at 4:30, and they could not get in because there was too much damage to my car, so I had to come back at 8:30 next morning. I was in there from 8:30 until 11:30 in order to see somebody and to get an adjustment on my car.

I am told by the people in there that it is going to get worse. It will get a lot worse. Right now it is summertime. People are starting to go on holidays and everything else. This will increase, but the worst effect is one day a week. Do you know how many cars go through Autopac in a day? It is incredulous.

You know how much you people are going to increase? I would like to know that. I would like to know how much you people are going to increase Autopac next year? I know how your feelings are

on Autopac. I know you are for big business. I know you are for private industry and everything else, but I would like to know how much you plan to increase Autopac next year.

**Mr. Ashton:** I am just wondering, you mention in terms of reduced services and I think that is an important point, but I just want to ask, putting yourself in a position of you working in a private company and you have a union contract, I take it. I am just wondering what the reaction would be in your place of work if people found one day that the management could walk in, as is the government into the public sector unions, and say your collective agreement is no longer valid, you are going to be faced with what is in effect a 3.8 percent rollback. What would the reaction be with private sector workers if the employer tried to do the same thing?

**Mr. Gullford:** We had in 1985, when our union was put in effect at my place of employment a bargaining session going on, the government and the union were meeting on Wednesday morning. On Wednesday afternoon at one o'clock, the chairperson of the bargaining committee got a phone call. He was called out of meeting. He came back half an hour later. He told the bargaining committee, similar words—I was not on the bargaining committee—but he was told, the committee that was sitting there, that there was going to be a five percent decrease in salary, and if we did not accept this by Friday at four o'clock, we would all be locked out.

Mr. Ashton, when you asked me a question, I can say that the whole plant, all the workers, we called a fast meeting at the Grant Motor Inn and the whole—I have never seen a union meeting so filled up with people. I know one or two people working at Versatile, and there was one or two that did not show up, but I would say the vast majority did. There were people in the halls. The hall was not big enough for them.

Nobody wants to be told what to do. They want to be asked what to do, and nobody wants to be told today you will take a 3.8 percent cutback.

This is horrendous. You guys are trying to increase the economy. I would hope—I do not know, I am not in your minds, I do not know. There have been a lot of bills come up, a lot of things said, but I know you people. Mr. Laurendeau, I know you. I worked together with you at Versatile, and I

would hope that before you get locked in a car again that you would think about this and reject the bill now. Do not wait.

**Mr. Chalrperson:** Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Guilford. I will call on Dr. John Loxley. Did you have a written presentation?

**Dr. John Loxley (Private Citizen):** No, I do not.

**Mr. Chalrperson:** You may begin then, Mr. Loxley.

**Mr. Loxley:** My name is John Loxley. I am the head of the Economics Department at the University of Manitoba. I also chair the budget committee, both the provincial and civic budget committee, of the Choices social justice group. I would like to add my voice, by way of introduction, to that of Mr. Dejardin and say that I found the lunch time spectacle to be exactly that, and to add that I think this reflects very badly on the process and on many of the members here.

I could talk as a university administrator about the effect of Bill 22 on the university. I could talk about the fact that it is not going to save the university the amount of money it thinks it is going to save. I could talk about already the reactions which some staff have made which are going to cost the university money, for instance, withdrawing voluntary labour in a number of areas. I could talk about the effect on productivity at all levels of the university which will also cost the university and the government and, indirectly, the people of the province more money.

I could talk in particular about the effect on hiring, and I believe that this bill will have enormously negative impact on hiring the junior levels at the universities, all three universities. We are already offering salaries which are not competitive. We are committed to hiring young, female academics, the demand for which far outstrips the supply. We are not able to compete at the moment, and we are now offering them absolutely no prospect of any cost-of-living increase, any increment for competence, or, indeed, any future increase in their salaries.

\* (2000)

I think that the implications of that will be with us for a long time to come and much of the hard work that has gone into trying to attract good female academics will be undone. I think that needs to be looked at. I will not go into detail on any of this. What I would like to talk about instead, I would like

to argue that the bill is not necessary, that it is dangerous to democracy, and that it should be withdrawn and normal collective bargaining resumed.

Why is it not necessary? It is not necessary because I believe this government has contrived a budget crisis. I am not saying that we do not have fiscal problems. I am not saying that the province is not in a difficult situation or that options are necessarily easy. What I am saying is that we do not and have not had a fiscal crisis, but the government has set out systematically and deliberately, in my opinion, to create that impression in order to drive through an ideological agenda which was listed, and with which you are quite familiar I am sure, this morning by Professor Silver.

So how was the crisis contrived? First of all, you created, and I am addressing this to government members, a climate of fear by exaggerating the likely deficit. This was done in a number of ways. It was done in news releases which projected a deficit of \$700 million to \$800 million a year. It is not the first year that this has been done, of course, and this is not the only province in which this is done, but this was done. Basically, you do that by drawing straight lines, which anyone can do.

You can say, well, if this happened and if that happened, if expenditures increased by 5 percent or 6 percent and if revenue went down 2 percent, yes, we would have this kind of deficit.

This, of course, at one level can be an accurate kind of representation of what might happen. One could argue that is legitimate. On the other hand, on the same day, the very same day, the very same newspapers, the government issued two sets of figures, two sets of figures for government spending, last year's government spending as the base on which these projections were made, two sets of figures for the likely deficit and a variety of inconsistent figures concerning the components of these items.

So even at that level, the picture was not one that could be deemed credible. But it seems to me that nobody, nobody around the province was arguing for these increases that you were projecting and which you were, in your charts and bar diagrams, peddling around the province, including in university classrooms.

Secondly, in arriving at these numbers, and even in preparing this year's budget, you did not at any time make clear to taxpayers that the two hundred and odd million dollars that you had to find this year somehow, you had already given away since 1988 in tax reductions. That was never made clear.

So it seems to me that to a large degree, the fiscal problem was of your own making. Had you not given away that \$205 million, it is now \$213 million, \$214 million, you would not have had the crisis that you then portrayed to the electorate of Manitoba.

Sadly, you contrived a crisis by misleading the public into believing that public debt costs were spiraling out of control. Indeed, even in this year's budget there is a statement which only in the most trivial of senses is correct—page 3 of the budget—which argues that debt costs are the single most rapidly rising expenditure in the budget. I think the way it is put is, and I should actually quote this since I do not want to misrepresent you, "the largest dollar increase in any line of the spending Estimates" which are in only a very trivial sense. Is that correct?

It is trivial in the sense that the most rapidly growing item in the budget since 1990 has not been public debt costs; it has been welfare payments, social assistance payments. You can divide up those social assistance payments three or four ways so that any one component is less than the increase in the public debt cost, which is what you are referring to on page 3 of your budget presumably. So it is not a dishonest statement; it is simply a misleading statement.

Social assistance, or should I say the statutory debt costs since 1990-94, have increased by about \$50 million. Social assistance payments have increased by \$167 million. It seems to me that is where the real crisis lies. If there is a real budget crisis at all, that is where the real crisis lies, not in debt servicing. Then you compound that—let me rephrase that.

This climate that I am talking about is compounded when very close friends of both the party and the government in brokerage houses and the Faculty of Management then make statements to the effect that we are running the risk of losing our credit rating altogether. We have the wildest kind of statements coming from party friends, locally, who are considered fairly minor people in

the financial community anyway, but making the most wildest of statements to the effect that debt servicing costs will rise by \$50 million if we lose our credit rating.

Again, it is not absolutely, totally dishonest. It is just something that needs explaining more fully to be put into perspective.

Yes, if you lose enough points on your bond rating, the cost of borrowing will rise by 1 percentage point, and yes, over \$5 billion, yes, you will eventually pay \$50 million when all your loans have matured over the next 20 years, which is very different because that was never pointed out. So this to me was something that was very convenient for the government and the party to have these people say.

I should also point out that the spokesperson who did most of your ideological defending at the university comes from a faculty which has had special treatment from your government, and which was not cut back in the recent budget. So I would argue that there are factors which have led to this creation of a climate of crisis which have to be explored and looked at a bit more deeply.

There are many other ways, but one other way I would like to mention is that I think that your government has, in a very direct way, stifled debate over the deficit and the debt. I would like to point out one specific instance of this. When I was trying to make sense of these two sets of figures that were published by the government, I phoned your senior civil servants. I must say that in the past, they have been extremely co-operative. They have never, ever given anything away that ought not to have been given away, and I have never asked them for that.

I ended up talking to the source of one set of your figures, which was a set of charts that were circulated to the press and at least one university class. This was a secretary to your Treasury Board who refused to give me those figures, refused to explain how these had come about and would not provide me with a copy of it and, in fact, became quite rude and angry. When I asked him why he would react in this way, since this is not the way we civil servants normally react in my experience, he proclaimed that he knew why I wanted these—of course, he had never asked me in the first place why I wanted these; otherwise, I would have told him—that I wanted these to work on the alternative

budget, and I was not going to get them for that reason.

It seems to me this, I can understand—I am not totally naive and certainly not after his lunch time how politics works in this place. When you have a set of figures that are public and are made public and that have been pedalled around the province in various university classes, for a senior civil servant to decide who in the public is politically reliable with those figures and who is not, it seems to me to be a bit much. I wonder whether this reflects the politicization of the civil service, which has gone perhaps a bit too far, a lot too far.

So I believe that that was an attempt—of course, it did not bother us because we are used to managing without any co-operation at all from the government, and we get by without them, but it does seem to me that this is an attempt to stifle debate and to create this climate of crisis.

\* (2010)

So I think what you have done is, you have turned a tight budget situation into a justification for a very crass, ideological attack on seniors, on aboriginal people, on women and children in the province, the public health services, education, home care, the poor generally and their advocates, and of course, through this bill, on civil servants and public sector workers generally. So I believe that this climate that you created was no accident in that respect.

I think the bill is dangerous in a number of ways. I think it subverts what we have come to know as accepted democratic practices by effectively abolishing collective bargaining in some very significant areas right across the board in one sector, a broad sector. I think that is quite dangerous. Five years retroactive, I think, is offensive to democracy and also dangerous. I do not believe, by the way, that this bill is entirely aimed at the public sector. I think it does affect the private sector.

For instance, you do have, under Section 11, the power to declare any organization that has received a grant from you in the last little while a public agency under the terms of the bill and are therefore subject to the terms of the bill. I see in that some danger, and I wonder why—actually, I also see some hope. If this is drawn upon by the private sector, I wonder whether or not you would be prepared to consider extending the principle

when the economic recovery comes around and requesting a share in the profits of these private companies that you are enabling to suppress wages in. But more seriously, I think that what you are doing here is hoping to send a powerful message to the private sector as well, and the private sector settlements will be affected in the same way.

I do not agree with some of the comments that were made this morning. I do not believe the honourable member is here, but comments to the effect that you have a mandate to do all of this. I do not believe you do have a mandate to do this. I think that, for instance, had you gone out this morning, any one of you or all of you, to talk to the seniors that were gathered in the rotunda and reminded them, or at least suggested to them, that you had a mandate to withdraw their property tax or related credit—they must be feeling that, like today—or if you were to suggest to them that you had a mandate to withdraw their home care the way that you have done today, I think there would have been a riot out there. I do not believe you have any such mandate to do that. I think had you announced in your political platform the implications of your position on taxes in terms of expenditures, you might very well have had a very different electoral outcome.

But I believe that there are alternatives. You presented this as if there are no alternatives. There are many alternatives. We tried to put an alternative together. It is an effort that is purely voluntary, in our spare time, with no assistance, as I have said, from somebody from the civil service, and it seems to us that our efforts are as credible as yours, to be honest.

We believe that there is a pool of fairly well-to-do Manitobans who are able to pay a little more. The figures from Revenue Canada from 1988 to 1990 show that incomes after tax for those earning \$70,000 or more doubled. A lot of that, of course, is people entering that bracket. Some of it is reductions in taxes and some of it is increases in incomes. It is a huge pool of potential revenue. Secondly, if you put employment creation as your No. 1 priority, you would reduce expenditures on welfare, and you could then divert that expenditure to other purposes.

It seems to me that rather than doing that, you are doing quite the opposite. You are, in fact, taking out of the economy in your budget—it is not

only Bill 22, it is much more than this now—but you were taking at least 1 percent of GDP. I would ask you, in all seriousness, whether or not you believe that this province will grow at the rates which are mentioned in your budget. You have two rates in your budget. In the text, it is 5.8, in the tables which you send to the bond houses, it is 6.8.

I would ask you if in your wildest dreams you think that the economy can reach growth rates of 5.8 or 6.8 percent per a nominal GDP after you have withdrawn, of course, this 1 percent or more, which would be much more now. I mean, I think these figures are simply cloud cuckoo-land figures. You could, by creating jobs, raise taxes, reduce welfare payments, put people back to work.

Well, you say, what are we going to do? How are we going to raise these jobs? What kind of jobs? Well, I think the construction sector has given you some ideas in the last two days. I think that Manitoba Hydro has a whole slate of proposals which were put in by the Carpenters Union. I heard today, or was it yesterday, that Manitoba Hydro needs two years to think through these. I suggest to you that if that is the case, you might want to replace some senior people in Manitoba Hydro, get things moving a little faster. These are commercial projects, they are self-sustaining projects and they create jobs.

There are a lot of ideas out there if you are interested and if you ask.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Loxley, you have just about two minutes left.

**Mr. Loxley:** So it seems to me that a budget, any budget, is in a sense a political statement, an ideological statement. Your budget this year is the clearest statement we have had in my memory. It is extremely mean-spirited was the word used, and I agree with that. It is very class oriented; it is very gender specific; it is very age specific. You hit the kids, you hit the aged, and I wonder whether the seniors are fully aware of the combined impact of what you have done. I hope they are, and of course, the seniors are potentially very vocal. They are also a very talented and active group with lots of time on their hands, so if they ever do realize what has happened, I think you will be hearing from them.

In terms of budgeting, therefore, I think that your budget has got it wrong on the economy. It is not what is needed. Your budget has got it entirely

wrong in terms of its impact on people who can least afford to be hit. These are the ones you have singled out. It is very clear, it is very obvious, I guess you do not apologize for that. In terms of morality, I wonder how you sleep at night, but there we are.

So I would like to suggest that all of this has been made possible by your manufacturing this fiscal crisis. It is simply not good enough to keep trotting out the old argument about relative costs of borrowing. We know what they are. They are factored into this budget. They can be factored in; they were factored into our budget.

It is possible to be more proactive. In fact, the Choices budget comes in with a deficit which is about the same size as yours, a million-dollar difference, but we have a job creation program which is basically self-sustaining, and it seems to me that is the difference. Were you to adopt such a job-creation program—and we have people in this province who can do that, lots of skills and talent around, not all of it has emigrated or migrated—we could devise a program that would put people back to work, would reduce the fiscal deficit in terms of social welfare payments and allow us to grow to a strong and healthy fiscal climate without any of these cutbacks that we have seen in the last three years.

Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you very much for your presentation this evening, Dr. Loxley.

Now I would like to call on Tracy Libitka, Shauna MacKinnon and T. MacDonald. Did you have a written presentation?

**Ms. Tracy Libitka, Ms. Shauna MacKinnon, Ms. Twilla MacDonald (Private Citizens):** We do, but we do not have copies of it.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Well, you may proceed then. If we could have the name of T. MacDonald?

**Ms. Libitka, Ms. MacKinnon, Ms. MacDonald:** Twilla.

Okay, for those of you who may not have understood Dr. Loxley's presentation, we are going to be presenting pretty much the same thing in a more user-friendly way.

\* (2020)

Once upon a time, deep within the greens of the Sherwood Forest, lived a woman known simply as Robin Hood. Robin Hood was the champion of the



people. She saw how the people suffered at the greedy hands and the cold hearts of the rich and the ruling class, and so it was she made it her mission to take from the rich and give to the poor, to redistribute the wealth of the country in a more equitable fashion. Robin Hood and her merry folk took money from the hands of the rich and put it into the hands of the poor, but Robin Hood was wise, she knew that the rich enjoyed endless luxuries through the sufferings of the people. Robin Hood knew that a society based on social justice would ensure that the gold that the rich so vigilantly guarded would be shared by all, and that all could live in comfort.

Robin Hood ensured that all of the land's people had enough to feed, clothe and shelter their families. She refused to accept the status quo which would allow the rich to drink fine wine crushed from plump juicy grapes while the poor drank dirty water. The people of the land looked to Robin Hood and her merry folk as the only protection that they had against the self-motivated interests of the rich and against the tyrannical rulers of days gone by. For in the days of Robin Hood, there was no system which allowed the people to choose their rulers, and the people were left at the mercy of those born into the ruling casts.

Decades after Robin Hood's days had passed, the intellectuals and the scholars of the land began to whisper about a system which would protect—excuse me, could you please listen.

**Mr. Chairperson:** You may proceed with your presentation.

**Ms. Libltka, Ms. MacKinnon, Ms. MacDonald:**—people from the whims of tyrannical rulers. A system that would ensure that all citizens would participate in choosing their leaders. One that would ensure that those leaders would represent the interests of all people, and one that would ensure that the wealth of the land would be redistributed in a fair and equitable manner. This would be a government of the people for the people. This would be democracy.

Robin Hood would likely agree that in theory this democracy would carry on the mission that she began. Surely the people of the land would share her vision of society, a vision based on fundamental principles of caring, sharing and respect. Surely the masses would reject the greed and general disregard for the health and well-being

of the citizens that prevailed in her day. Ah, yes, this democracy would be a good thing.

It would ensure that all the people of the land would have enough money to purchase their own nutritious food to eat and that they would have adequate shelter and clothing. Adequate health care would be equally accessible to all. Paid work would be available for all. Child care would be available and accessible for all. Adequate education would be accessible to all. Corporations and the wealthy would pay their fair share of taxes, and everything humanly possible would be done to preserve the land for future generations.

Well, democracy is here—this government of the people. Our modern day Robin Hood is Sir Filmon Hood. His merry folk are Sir Gillehammer, Lady Vodrey, Maid Mitchelson, Little Don, Lord Manness, Brother Ernst, Sir McCrae and Friar Enns. Hurray, they have been elected to represent the interests of all citizens.

But wait, something is very wrong. Our leaders have been led astray. They have become confused. They have succumbed to the will of the wealthy and have forgotten the needs of the masses. How could this be? The needs of the majority being pushed aside and the interests of the wealthy being forced upon them. How could this be? Lord Manness says there is no room to increase the burden of taxpayers and there is no segment that will feel the pain anymore than any other segment.

But the fact is that the pain is overwhelmingly felt by the poor and by the middle class. Cuts in welfare itself will force the poor to dip into their food money to pay for essential purchases such as medication and dental work, forcing more and more people to the food banks.

Changes in health care will force the sick into paying for such essential items as colostomy bags. It has resulted in the closure of hospital beds, reduced service to the community through massive layoffs, and at the same time, the government chooses to throw away millions of dollars to a U.S. consultant, a consultant who has provided no evidence that she can save our province the \$45 million that she has spoken of.

Thousands of layoffs as a direct result of government policies have forced many more onto the welfare rolls. Cuts in daycare will force more women to stay at home, out of the workforce and

onto the welfare rolls. Cuts in Student Social Allowances, ACCESS programs, bursaries and student loans will make education inaccessible to those who are already struggling, out of school and onto the welfare rolls.

Bill 22 could be applied to as many as 100,000 public sector employees. This could mean as many as one million lost days of service to Manitobans, service that has never been as crucial as it is today and at the same time when so many Manitobans are feeling the impact of a poor economy, high unemployment and massive cuts in social spending at both the federal and provincial levels.

The list goes on and on and more and more become poorer and poorer, and what about the wealthy?

Sir Filmon and his business people have cut funding to agencies who represent the poor and the marginalized and have taken away the voices of many people.

We have an ever-increasing deficit. These are difficult times, and we have been forced to make difficult choices.

Bill 22 has forced agencies such as Child and Family Services and health and family services to withdraw critical supports. This is forcing individuals and families with no support to wait a minimum of three days for help from workers with already exploding caseloads. This affects the poor, the elderly and the sick, not the wealthy. How is this sharing the pain?

Well, they will just have to wait for the service until the worker can get to them or else they can get their families to help out.

But I need help now. I do not have a family.

Well, I cannot help you with the family bit, but we will have to make Manitoba attractive to business. That is our priority.

The broadening of sales tax and the reduction in tax credits will increase the cost of living for the average family of four by approximately \$420 per year. We cannot afford to pay this.

Everybody must share the pain. No part of society will feel the pain more strongly than any other.

About 5,000 Manitobans earning over \$50,000 paid no tax in 1988. They are not sharing the pain.

That was then. This is now.

You have admitted that since 1988, you have introduced tax breaks for the wealthy which now total some \$205 million per year. They are not sharing the pain.

Yes, well, we must have healthy business. You see, this is necessary to stimulate the economy to create jobs.

But it is not working. This has been your policy since you have been in office. The unemployment rate has risen steadily to its current high of over 11 percent.

We are dealing with the unemployment rate. We brought in lots of changes to show those unemployed people what is what, and even better, we are helping share the unemployment pain. Right now in Manitoba, right here, we are forcing civil servants to do their part by being unemployed, oh, one day a month or so.

A 1.5 percent surtax on those earning over \$70,000 would raise \$30 million a year. Why do you choose not to increase personal income taxes for the wealthy?

We have been forced to make difficult choices.

Corporate income taxes have plummeted since 1988 to '89. You have lost \$100 million because of it. Why not collect these debts?

We now come to the end of our tale only to realize that the tale has become our reality. What, you might ask, is the moral of this story? The moral of this story might perhaps be that the wealthy few have so much power that they can somehow make the majority, the poor and the middle class believe that what they do is in the best interests of all. Some of us try to make Sir Filmon Hood and his merry folk listen to us but we soon become painfully aware that they are not listening. Sir Filmon Hood seems to want us to passively sit by and watch as more and more people are put out of work and are added to the welfare rolls, as more and more youth live with little hope for their futures, as more and more sick and elderly are being financially drained, as more and more marginalized people are being silenced, and the list goes on.

\* (2030)

Yes, indeed, if the real Robin Hood were here today, instead of the imposter we know as Sir Filmon Hood, she would wonder how it would be possible in a so-called democratic system for the people to shoulder the burden that has been forced

upon us by the wealthy. The wealthy few, meanwhile, toast to this wonderful distortion of this democracy.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you very much for your presentation.

**Mr. Santos:** One question, Mr. Chairperson. What do you think the Tory government has to gain? What do they have to gain by facilitating the welfare roll increase by massive layoffs?

**Ms. MacKinnon:** I have no idea what they have to gain. I cannot see that they have anything—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Ms. MacKinnon, would you come to the mike please if you are called.

**Ms. MacKinnon:** I do not know what they have to gain. I do not see that there is anything to gain.

**Mr. Ashton:** I believe there is nothing to gain for the province by the government's actions. I am just wondering—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order.

**Mr. Ashton:** I found the analogies to be very, very interesting. I have always felt that Gary Filmon and Clayton Manness certainly have a lot in common with the Sheriff of Nottingham and I thought the analogies were quite appropriate. I just wanted to congratulate the—

**Mr. Manness:** . . . nothing in common with Stanley Knowles, that is for sure.

**Ms. MacKinnon:** Excuse me, Mr. Chair.

**Mr. Ashton:** Mr. Chairperson, I will ignore the comments from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) but I just wanted to say, I thought the analogies you used and the mechanism you used to come before the committee was very original. I certainly commend you, and while the minister is making comments from his seat about being out of order, he should know from his very comments this minute, I thought the presentation was probably a lot more relevant than some of the speeches I have heard in the Legislature. I think sometimes it takes a bit of a different approach, and I certainly commend you for the presentation. I would ask you some questions but I think you said it all.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you very much for your presentation this evening. I will call upon Michele Forrest. Mark Gabbert.

Mr. Gabbert, did I pronounce your last name properly?

**Mr. Mark Gabbert (Private Citizen):** Gabbert.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Did you have a written presentation, Mr. Gabbert?

**Mr. Gabbert:** No, I do not.

**Mr. Chairperson:** You may proceed then.

**Mr. Gabbert:** I teach at the University of Manitoba, but obviously I am not speaking for the university or for my union which is the University of Manitoba Faculty Association.

But I do want to make a few comments about Bill 22. When you think about a bill that affects trade union rights the way this one does, one of the things that comes to mind is the question, what about the restriction on property rights? When you think about the fiscal policy of this government and the fact that it has knocked \$200 million a year out of the tax revenues, importantly, from higher income groups and the employment tax, and when you—

#### Point of Order

**Mr. Manness:** Yes, in the first budget we brought down, \$50 million was reduced off of personal income tax, virtually every dollar of it in support of those families \$40,000 and under, and indeed, those families having two children, just to correct the record, Mr. Chairperson.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Gabbert:** I think it is fair to say that on balance, these tax reductions are much more beneficial to people with higher incomes, and of course, if you take them together with the assault on social services, which people have talked about at some length, I think that whatever people at the bottom have gained, they have certainly lost in other ways.

But I think that the point here is a different one, or it is a related one, and that is, of course, this government would never consider restricting the freedom of private property owners to do what they want with their profits and incomes. In other words, whatever is left after taxes, which ought to be the maximum, can be spent on speculation. It does not have to be invested in Manitoba. It can be put into everything and anything from junk bonds to real estate speculation. It could be taken out of the country. It could be spent on winter holidays. Any effort to do anything about that, of course, would be considered a brand of totalitarianism and an assault on individual liberty.

Of course, when it is a matter of the rights of trade unions, which are the organizations that

working people in both the public and private sector have struggled to create for decades, the sanctity of contract and questions about rights and freedoms do not seem to mean anything much at all.

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

I mean, after all, here are people who mostly do not have property, big property that they can derive an income from. Most of them do not have big incomes, and their only defence, really, is collective bargaining. That is how they assure they get something like the market value for their labour.

But, of course, it seems to be only allowed on sufferance, as long as it is convenient politically or perhaps fiscally, depending on whether one takes seriously the government's rhetoric about the deficit or facts of the sort that Professor Loxley pointed out to us earlier.

There is no question that Bill 22 is an absolutely draconian measure with respect to trade union rights. After all, people are supposed to be able to enter into a contract. Now, I dare say, if somebody entered into a contract with you over some matter of property and then the government decided in the middle of it all to say, well, I am sorry, but this contract is no longer valid, and what we are going to do here is basically confiscate some important percentage of it, you would be less than thrilled. But that is exactly what is happening in cases where there are collective agreements in force and people are having unpaid layoff days imposed upon them.

Quite apart from that, of course, there is the impact of all this on negotiations. Why would an employer want to negotiate in a situation where in any case he can solve the problem by whacking back 15 days one year, 15 days the next, if he sees fit? The state is being used here as a kind of a bludgeon to clobber the trade unions and to violate contracts that have been laid down and fairly negotiated.

The real fact of the matter is, you see, that you guys simply distinguish between your property on the one hand, as it is protected by contracts, and the wages and salaries of working people on the other. Their contracts do not matter.

Of course, this reflects a general hostility towards the public sector. It is no problem, you see, if you make your money from Great-West Life or Xerox or

IBM or some place like that. You have enjoyed the tax cuts that Mr. Manness has handed out. It is even better than that actually because in fact you know you need public services and even the government knows, does it not? I mean it is not for nothing, i.e. it is for something that the government has decided not to lay off great batches of civil servants permanently.

I suspect it knows it cannot do so and still deliver the minimum of services that it has to actually deliver to Manitobans without a full-scale rebellion. So it knows it needs these services just like it knows it needs university programs, and it is at the same time opposed to genuinely progressive taxation. So what is the answer? The answer is to use the power of the state to force people to work for less to maintain some modicum of services.

In the meantime, of course, the guy who makes his living from the private sector sends his kid to university or to school or to college or whatever, and that person is taught or served in some other way by people whose salaries had been rolled back and who have borne the burden both of taxation and of the pay cuts that the government has imposed.

Now it seems to me that the interesting thing about all this and the obvious thing about it all is the way in which this is part of a kind of class-based policy.

People have talked about this earlier this evening with respect to social services and so on, but I would just like to share with you briefly an example of a person that I happen to know. A person whose family are working people and who is partly involved in the maintenance of her family by working as a cleaning woman. She has one son in university. This is the first generation of university people that this family has had. The kid is a first-year student. He is doing extremely well. But, of course, she says, every year the tuition goes up and the cost of books goes up.

Of course, the disastrous thing about this is that tuition goes up and costs go up at an institution which is increasingly not competitive. In other words, these people struggle to pay tuition at institutions of post-secondary education that have been underfunded for so long that they are not competitive in the old way. I can tell you personally that the reality at the University of Manitoba, and I

am sure elsewhere as well, is that fewer and fewer of us are teaching more people all the time.

\* (2040)

The fact of the matter is that the priority that this government puts on post-secondary education is laughable. Saskatchewan pays more out, according to recent Statistics Canada figures, in post-secondary education than we do. In Alberta—I heard this at a recent board of governors meeting at the University of Manitoba talking about the difficulty of faculty at the University of Manitoba being able to compete nationally for grant money. A good deal of the problem is that there is not sufficient support from the provincial government to build the infrastructure necessary to make proper grant applications. The example was given of the University of Alberta medical schools which have several millions of dollars from the provincial government simply as infrastructural money to build the kind of technical basis necessary to make application for grants in a national way. Now, of course, Alberta has long been a wealthy province but the interesting thing is the priority here.

In any case, my friend worries about being able to find money for tuition. She worries about being able to keep this kid in university. She worries about it, and she worries even more because the kid is making straight A's and doing extremely well. She is enormously proud of him.

She happens to have a customer in a relatively posh sector of the city who the other day pointed out to the person, who cleans her house, that she had sent her own child out of province to university, and that it had cost about \$7,000 to move the necessary household goods out of province, which in fact the woman considered to be a bargain. A bargain, my friend said. Well, you know, that kind of money would go a long way.

So there is a kind of class consequence for this. I mean it used to be that the provincial government supported universities properly, or more properly than they do now at least, and tuition fees were relatively low.

(Mr. Chairperson in the Chair)

Now you may say, well, you are a great one to talk, because what drives tuition fees up is your bloody salary. The reality of it is that academic salaries are not made in Manitoba. They are not even made nationally. They are made internationally, and unless Manitoba is willing to

prioritize post-secondary education to be reasonably competitive with respect to salaries, then there is not going to be competitive post-secondary education here. There certainly will not be competitive post-secondary education here if when we set about to hire people we have to tell them, well, of course, this last year we have taken six days off without pay with no doubt more to come in the year following, and we cannot really say for sure whether the salary we are offering you is the one you are going to actually get a year down the road or not.

In any case, all of this would seem to me to be unjust and unfair and discriminatory against the poor and against working people who have marginal resources but who, up until now, might have been able to expect access to university education. I could tell you, you see it year in and year out now, a huge percentage of your students are working 10 hours a week, more of them 15 or 20 hours a week, and the consequences for the quality of work are obvious.

I think it is worthwhile pointing out that there is a real change here generally, that for 40 years, after all, people have had the illusion that things were more or less okay. Yes, there was great social inequality but there was also something like full employment. There were also social services, there was also the hope of some kind of upward mobility.

All of these things made it possible for working people to suppose that their children might do somewhat better than they had done, that made it possible for people who spent their whole lives at hard work for not very much pay at least to know that they would have adequate medical care and a range of social services—so that the social inequality which continued to exist because, of course, all during this period there was never a time when the top 20 percent of income recipients did not get more than 40 percent of the total income produced, and the bottom, the poorest 20 percent, did not get less than about 4 percent or 4.5 percent.

But all this is vanishing, of course. First, full employment began to go, and now, of course, there is the assault on social services. I think people recognize the burden is not being equally shared, that the state in fact favours the better off, that it is very often used as a battering ram against their unions and against social services, and I think people are obviously angrier about it now than they

have ever been before. Hopefully, they will be angry enough so that there will be a day of political reckoning eventually.

I think we have to be pessimistic about these hearings, and about what they are likely to produce for us. The government, after all, has been happy to proceed in quite a draconian way here. After all, at the University of Manitoba, there has already been a day of pay nicked from everybody's paycheque, without not only the bill not having been passed, but the hearings not even having begun. It is probably illegal, but it does not seem to bother anybody much.

Then, of course, there is the way in which we proceeded today, which the Manitoba Federation of Labour has protested against in a press release which I want to quote from: Manitoba Federation of Labour President Susan Hart-Kulbaba reacted angrily late this afternoon to the Filmon government's announcement that committee hearings on Bill 22, the government attack on public sector workers, will resume at 7 p.m. tonight. Hart-Kulbaba said, this surprise scheduling is an obvious attempt to speed through the witness list without the presence of those who wish to comment on the contents of Bill 22. Working people who wanted to exercise their rights as Manitobans to appear before the Legislative Committee will not have time to be notified by the Clerk's Office, as they drive home today, to show up at the Legislature to make their presentation. That is obviously what the Tories are hoping for. Some presenters who are from outside Winnipeg will obviously not be able to arrive by 7 p.m. If their names are called and they are absent, they could be dropped from the list.

It is ironic that at the committee hearings this morning the Tories walked out, unwilling to listen to two presenters who were there at the time. Now the government is hoping they will not be able to get back tonight and will lose their opportunity for input. The government's contempt for the democratic process was made apparent in the very first meeting of the committee when it attempted to limit presentations to 15 minutes. The Filmon government's abuse of Manitoba's democratic system is reprehensible.

I guess the point is here that it might be naive, it is of course naive, to suppose that anything that is suggested here will have a very profound effect on the government's thinking, but at least—and I

suggest to you that the rather draconian way in which all this has been handled and the draconian nature of this legislation justifies the comments that I gather others have made here at these hearings, comments that I gather the government members have not been too happy about with respect to the similarity between this kind of legislation and legislation passed in Italy and Germany in the 1930s. The fact of the matter is, you see, that in the 1930s, of course, the trade unions were simply abolished and turned into institutions of the state—

**Mr. Chalrperson:** Mr. Gabbert, you have approximately two minutes left.

**Mr. Gabbert:** Thank you.

I suppose if you can pass legislation that allows you to deprive people of their wages, even after they have been negotiated in legally binding collective agreements, why would you bother to add another government department which was basically state-controlled trade unions?

In any case, whether you agree to make any changes to this legislation or not, it gives us a great deal of satisfaction to be here and to say how thoroughly convinced we are that your policies are both unfair and morally bankrupt.

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

\* (2050)

**Mr. Ashton:** I share your frustration, but I just want to assure you that—I mean, this is for the public record. Regardless of some of the concerns that, certainly, I share about some of the proceedings in the committee, it is for the public record. I think there have been some very eloquent statements that have been made by yourself and others about the underlying principles of this bill. I just want to ask just one very brief question. I think that is all we have time for, unfortunately. I would much rather be able to continue it more directly. That is about the situation on campus.

You raised a very interesting point about the situation facing, sort of, the generational issues here that are involved, that hope for a better life is not necessarily there for a lot of people, for a lot of working people. Children who are going through, now—you have obviously seen a lot in terms of the university campus.

I am just wondering if you could give members of this committee some sense of the impact of the

economic recession and just the general trend in society, what that is having on today's group of undergraduates as compared to 10 or 20 years ago, whether you are seeing a marked impact at that level on a day-to-day basis.

**Mr. Gabbert:** Well, I think, as I suggested before, that one of the things that is most striking to us is the pressure that our students are under either to go to school part time and work or to try to go full time and work, because the rising cost of everything is digging very hard into their resources. There are not the same kind of bursaries and loans and so on available that were available.

I think the reality is this, that in the end, you will have to be much better off than the average working person to be able to afford to send your child to university. But, of course, you might end up like my friend's acquaintance in the posh section of Winnipeg and you might be in a position in fact to send your child out of province as the public institutions in Manitoba collapse actually from underfunding and become uncompetitive with those elsewhere. I think that is a matter for real concern.

What do we want this place to become, anyway? A kind of backwater in which you cannot get proper professional training, you cannot get proper undergraduate training, classes are huge, you cannot hire a new staff. It is basically disastrous.

I think that the young people of this province deserve an opportunity to get training here, because if you cannot get training here, then only the people who can afford to go out will get that training. I think my example of the cleaning lady struggling to get her kid through science by scrubbing floors—I mean, it is no joke. You would think this is some kind of joke your mother told you out of the 1930s, but it is a fact. I think an example is worth one heck of a lot of figures.

**Mr. Chalrperson:** Thank you very much for your presentation this evening, Mr. Gabbert.

### Committee Substitutions

**Mr. Ashton:** Just before you proceed, I would like to move a number of committee changes. I move, with the leave of the committee, that the honourable member for Broadway (Mr. Santos) replace the honourable member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) as a member of the Standing Committee on Economic Development effective 7 p.m. June 29,

with the understanding that the same substitution will also be moved in the House to be properly recorded in the official records of the House.

**Mr. Chalrperson:** Agreed? [agreed]

**Mr. Ashton:** I also have another committee substitution. I move, with the leave of the committee, that the honourable member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) replace the honourable member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar) as a member of the Standing Committee on Economic Development effective seven o'clock, June 29, with the understanding that the same substitution will also be moved in the House to be properly recorded in the official records of the House.

**Mr. Chalrperson:** Agreed? [agreed]

\* \* \*

**Mr. Chalrperson:** I will now call upon Mr. Michael Shaw. Do you have a written presentation, Mr. Shaw?

**Mr. Michael Shaw (Canadian Union of Educational Workers):** No, I am sorry, I do not.

**Mr. Chalrperson:** No, okay. Well, you may proceed with yours.

**Mr. Shaw:** I am here tonight representing the organization Canadian Union of Educational Workers. We are a union that has locals at universities from Alberta to the Maritimes. We represent primarily sessionals, people that do not have full-term faculty positions at university, as well as teaching assistants, grader-markers, demonstrators, the positions that are primarily associated with graduate students at universities. Those are people we represent.

We have a local here in Manitoba, Local 9, at the University of Manitoba which represents students who perform grader-marking, demonstrating, lecturing and that sort of work at the university.

I would like to talk to you tonight about the effect that this bill, Bill 22, will have on those people at the University of Manitoba. These people have two distinctions that we represent here in Manitoba. They all work at the university and they are all students at the university. These people tend to get hit by Tory policies in a double way. Their tuition goes up, but their wages as students do not. This sort of stuff has happened to them since the union Local 9 was formed in 1986-87. These sorts of things will continue to go on, and Bill 22 will make these conditions worse. All graduate students at

the University of Manitoba who are able to achieve positions within the bargaining unit are limited in the amount of time that they may spend working. It is usually 12 hours on average per week. This is how these people support themselves.

The statement that Bill 22 shares and spreads out the hurt and the pain evenly really is not true. When you have people who work during the summer at the university to achieve the financial resources they need to do another year of university, and yet during the summer months they are going to have three days of their wages cut, these cuts are really going to affect these people. It is not going to be even.

It is not three days for an annualized position. These are three days of potentially only the four months they will get to work, and they usually will not get to work four months. They will usually have limited term appointments that may last two weeks to six weeks, and if some of the university's days off without pay fall within that region, it is much higher in terms of percentage impact on their wages than say a percent out of what is a standard working year, 200-some-odd days, something like that. If you are only working 30 days, two days off without pay has a lot higher impact.

These people are hit in another way in that not only are their wages affected, but the quality of the education they are receiving, because all of our members in Manitoba are also students, are affected. They attend courses during the summer, the session that just ended, and those that happened to have lectures that should have occurred on Friday, May the—I cannot remember the exact date—the first one that the university initiated in May, these people have had their intercession courses significantly reduced in content.

Those of you who have attended university may understand, but intercession courses occur relatively quickly at the university. They are over—they are in May and June and then they are finished. A day of lectures of these courses that are removed with the university's day off without pay has a significant impact on the amount of content and the amount of knowledge that can be passed on to the student in these courses. So that is another way that this bill is affecting our members. It is affecting our status as wage earners, and it is affecting their status as students of the university.

There is another affect that this bill is going to have on our members and that is on their loyalty and commitment to the University of Manitoba. I have heard people from the faculty association and people who teach at the University of Manitoba in full-time faculty positions talk about competition and how crucial it is to attract good, qualified people to Manitoba for faculty positions at the University. This is equally true of graduate students.

Graduate students form a fundamental part of the scholastic atmosphere at the university. If these graduate students find out what happens at the University of Manitoba—and they do, because we communicate with one another. We have 10 locals spread across Canada, and we do communicate with one another the situation at Manitoba. They ask me, why are you doing grad studies at Manitoba? You can get paid two and three times as much in Thunder Bay, two or three times as much at Dalhousie University. Why are you doing this?

Well, I happened to have the advantage when I took my studies here at Manitoba that my supervisor had an NSERC. It does not happen to all of us. But this lack of loyalty that graduate students feel toward the University of Manitoba is something that, for the money saved on these grad students' wages in terms of docking them a single day's pay, that impact in terms of saving for the provincial budget and for the university budget is minuscule compared to the long-term damage it will have in these grad students' perception of the University of Manitoba and the provincial government's commitment to post-secondary education.

\* (2100)

When they save money on our wages, they are not saving that much. We do not get paid that much. When they go to all this work and all this legislative work to save a little bit of money off the grad student money—members of our bargaining unit at the University of Manitoba, just for a frame of reference, make around \$2,200 a year. Those that make it during the summer, we have talked to some of them. They have had \$165 of that docked for that previous day off without pay in May. That is a significant impact to those members, but that is only \$165. The amount of effort they have seen the university go to and the provincial government go to to achieve that savings really makes them wonder



about how this government and how that university feel about post-secondary education.

Is post-secondary education something that the government of Manitoba feels is important? The answers they get from the actions of this government are a consistent "no."

That is really all I would like to say for the first part about how this bill affects our members. What I now would just like to talk about briefly is how Bill 22 works in terms of these committee hearings.

I have not been involved in much politics, but I heard about Bill 22. It was presented to me, and I got a copy of the legislation. I read the legislation and then I said, this is legislation that I do not agree with. I phoned and I said, you know, this is legislation I do not agree with, what can I do about it?

They said, well, the only opportunity for organizations or private citizens is a system called the hearing system. I said, okay, that sounds like something where I can go and I can talk to the people that write this legislation, both as someone that represents a union and as a private citizen, and I can get my view across to those members.

Then, what I have heard today, I came here this afternoon, they did not get to my name, fine, I will come tomorrow morning. Then to hear that this is all of a sudden going to be seven o'clock tonight and get a phone call and say, you know, if you want to have a chance to speak you better come over here and miss your supper and all that sort of stuff. I know you are missing your supper, but you could have scheduled tomorrow, so do not give me that little smirk. [interjection] I automatically assumed that if you did not get finished today, you would start tomorrow. I am sorry, sir. I should not use the term "sir" with you.

It is disappointing to me that someone of my young age, seeing politics is somewhat less than an honourable position from the way the media portrays it and then wanting to get involved, wanting to come and say my piece about it and hearing about this, that they are going to shut down the hearings, they are going to speed things up, they are going to run through lists and hope that no one is here, it is really disappointing. I am disappointed in my government. I am disappointed in you, and you can say it is not true, but you know it is true. It is true. Is this what politics is like? It is true; it is not true; it is true.

Thank you very much.

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

**Ms. Barrett:** Your presentation was very interesting. You brought a very different perspective to the impact that Bill 22 will have on workers in the province and particularly the university. I had not thought in terms of the pivotal role that your graduate students, who are members of your union, play in both sides of this whole process.

What do you think, and I think you have implied it, but if you could be a little more specific about what you think are going to be some of the qualitative impacts that Bill 22 will have on post-secondary education in the province of Manitoba?

**Mr. Shaw:** Well, one thing I know that is already occurring is the number of applications for graduate studies at the University of Manitoba is declining—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Ashton.

**Mr. Shaw:** —and that is a qualitative, very measurable thing that is occurring now—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Through the Chair. I am sorry, I try to recognize the people as they speak. When there is a pause, I believe they are finished, but you can continue, Mr. Shaw. I am sorry.

**Mr. Shaw:** That is one of the qualitative changes. The other ones are less easy to measure. The chances that people who complete their undergraduate degrees will want to do their Master's here, people that complete their Master's here will want to do their Ph.Ds here, those are more hard to measure. I do not know how you can measure them, but just talking to people and communicating with people, we have a very strong sense that is in fact occurring here at the University of Manitoba.

People are going elsewhere. People are doing forestry programs and doing research into the North from Athabasca and from Edmonton and from Thunder Bay. They are not doing it from Manitoba. That not only hurts the province of Manitoba, but it hurts all of Canada, that a section of the country that stretches so far north is not doing research into the North. It is being done from Edmonton and done from Thunder Bay and done from Quebec.

**Ms. Barrett:** Mr. Chairperson, just one brief other question. I promise this will be my last.

You said there are 10 locals that stretch across the country, I gather, basically, the only exception being British Columbia.

**Floor Comment:** And Saskatchewan.

**Ms. Barrett:** How do the situations compare generally between Manitoba and the other sections? If we wanted to rank Manitoba at this point in time with Bill 22 in the mix, how do you think the University of Manitoba and the other universities in the province compare with your other locals?

**Mr. Shaw:** Well, the easiest way to compare it is, of course, wages, and we are the lowest paid local for this equal work. The other way is the—well, I mean, that is really the only easy way to compare, is with wages. Other locals in Ontario are being affected by other legislation currently, but any reduction in their wages and days off without pay that they see will still leave them much better paid than we are.

**Mr. Ashton:** I thought your comments were very interesting. I was president of the local for the Canadian Union of Educational Workers, actually, in Lakehead. In fact, the reason I had to take my graduate studies at Lakehead was largely because I could get a teaching assistantship there, and not only was it quite difficult to get a teaching assistantship here, it was also difficult to get student aid.

I would just like to let you know that I was also UMSU president when the Lyon government was in power, of which the Minister of Natural Resources Mr. Enns was a part of. Quite frankly, I was not too happy with some of the things I saw happen in those days, and I decided to do something about it. I ran in the next election and got elected, and I am still here. I hope you might consider the same, because we need your kind of input in the Manitoba Legislature. [interjection]

Well, Conservatives still have not learned, because we now have another Conservative government doing the same things to universities they did 10 years ago.

**Floor Comment:** Ten years of sliding back.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Ashton, I believe you are asking questions of Mr. Shaw.

**Mr. Ashton:** Mr. Chairperson, I think I have woken up the Conservative members of the committee. But I want to focus in because I thought you did a very good job of indicating the situation that teaching assistants are faced with and the unfairness. This is one of the most fundamentally unfair things about Bill 22: It does not discriminate based on income whatsoever.

Out of the 100,000 public sector workers that are affected, even the lowest paid—and I think you would be hard pressed to find anybody receiving less in the public sector than teaching assistants, particularly given the historically low levels you have in the University of Manitoba, but I am wondering if you can give some sense to members of this committee, those that might care to listen, what the living circumstances are like for many of the teaching assistants right now.

I think it is important members in the committee understand that when they vote for this bill, they are voting to decrease someone who is getting \$2,200 a year by the 3.8 percent in the same way they are with somebody earning \$70,000, \$80,000, \$90,000. What are the circumstances of those who are working as teaching assistants?

\* (2110)

**Mr. Shaw:** Of course, any percent reduction to people earning that low has a dramatic effect when you depend on every single dollar, and there is no discretionary dollar for a lot of graduate students. They do not have disposable income; they have food and rent and then they wait for the next paycheque. There is very little else that they have to spend. Any reduction in that will, of course, probably result in diet changes, more and more Kraft Dinner. People will think that is humorous but that is in fact the truth. A lot of graduate students and a lot of senior undergraduates that depend on the TA money at the University of Manitoba are living cheque to the food and then to their mouth and that is all they have.

Not only are you talking about the 3.8 percent but there is another effect that, because we only work on certain days and we only work part time during the year, if our work periods happen to coincide with—based on averages more or less of the university's announced days off without pay—it can have a much greater impact for people that teach summer courses at the University of Manitoba. They will do all of their work within two weeks in a

field course, and if a day off without pay falls during one of those 10 working days, that is, of course, a 10 percent reduction in their pay.

That is money that they really need to live and go to school for the next year, so the 3.8 percent is, of course, only calculable for those that are employed for the entire year. You have to calculate much more precisely for those people who do not work for the full year, for those people whose income falls in short gaps. If a number of days off without pay fall in those short gaps, then, of course, the percent that they are being cut by is going to be much greater than the government's alleged 3.8 percent.

**Mr. Ashton:** I could ask a number of additional questions. I know that my colleague the member for Broadway (Mr. Santos) has some questions, but I did want to thank the presenter again. I hope you will not give up on the political process. I think that is when we end up with Bill 22s, when people do give up on the political process. So I encourage you to continue to do what you are doing.

**Mr. Chairperson:** There is only approximately two minutes left, so, Mr. Santos, with a quick question.

**Mr. Santos:** Mr. Shaw, your presentation made me recall my student days when I was also a student assistant. I would like to ask on the first part of your presentation as well as the second part. On the first part of your presentation, do you feel this Bill 22 will really save money, or do you feel this is just another subtle tactic to destroy the free collective bargaining right, including that of the Canadian Union of Educational Workers?

**Floor Comment:** Not very subtle.

**Floor Comment:** We never pretended it was subtle.

**Mr. Shaw:** Is this the government saying that it is not a subtle attack on collective bargaining, it is an outright attack on collective bargaining?

If I can answer that question, I do not think it will save very much at all. A lot of us who T.A. will be given three-and-a-half hours of pay in a single week to T.A. a single lab. The university recognizes and often discusses with us that, in fact, it usually takes a lot more than that three-and-a-half hours, but our members know that it is in their collective agreement, that they only have to work for that three-and-a-half hours. But because they understand that sometimes they have to do a little bit extra, they do that little bit extra.

With this sort of attitude from the government and the university administration, student workers are saying no, I am going to work my three and a half and that is it. If they are going to give me a day off without pay and cut me back even further, I am going to do the work I am contracted to. There will be no extras, there will be no nothing.

So, in fact, it will not save the university much in terms of labour at all. They may pay less, but they will get less labour done.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Shaw. I will now call on Mr. Bob Clasper. Bob Clasper? Ken Emberley. Did you have a written presentation, Mr. Emberley?

**Mr. Kenneth Emberley (Private Citizen):** No, I do not have, Mr. Chairperson.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay, then, you may proceed with your presentation.

**Mr. Emberley:** Mr. Chairperson, I have 31 parts of a written presentation, and I am going to give you some documentation tomorrow when I get it properly numbered and enumerated.

My name is Kenneth Emberley. I thought you might just like to know my first 56-page paper I wrote, had typed up, in 1942 when I was a 19-year-old kid at the University of Manitoba. I have been taking part in this business now for 50 of my 70 years. I would like to tell you that I think the process is just as ineffective and slightly corrupt as it was 50 years ago.

I started in 1977 taking part in serious public hearings with Justice Tom Berger. I made a major presentation to him in 1970 on South Indian Lake, and I was able to convince Cass Beggs that he had to come and apologize to the meeting and to our wonderful head of natural resources for the dreadful way it treated him at the public hearings. So I do not think things have changed that much.

I want to talk about the politics of economics and the economics of politics. Too many people want to separate them, and they cannot be separated. I came across a little note about the 50 largest employers in Manitoba. It is in a magazine called Business People. It starts off listing the largest employers in Manitoba. Province of Manitoba, government, 17,000; Government of Canada, 15,000 in Ottawa head office; City of Winnipeg, 9,000; CNR, 4,900; MTS, 4,800; University of Manitoba, Health Sciences, school division. Then it jumps down and talks about Canada Post

Corporation, and it talks about Great-West Life, Seven Oaks school, schools, schools, hospitals, churches, hospitals, hospitals, schools.

When you talk about public service workers what you are actually trying to do is to nail the largest number of working people that are organized in unions so they get a little bit decent wages. It is an attack on the working class, and this is a thing that is very important to me. I do not know whether many will remember, but it has been discussed in about 40 books and 30 or 40 research documents and conferences I have attended since 1980, 1976.

When Ronnie Reagan started in power in 1980 there were 800,000 millionaires in the United States. It took 200 years to make 800,000 millionaires. Ronnie Reagan made 700,000 more in 10 years. Sodom and Gomorrah are the modern words for privatization and deregulation, and that is what you are doing here. You are privatizing our universities, the universities that gradually collapse. The ones that James Richardson and the giant multinational corporations want will be funded in the way they want and will be controlled the way they want. This is part of free trade and NAFTA.

The people that have been carrying on a war for 200 years on working people, either inside the factory wanting Workplace Safety and Health and living wages or the citizens outside the factory wanting not total pollution, a place to live, a slightly decent place to live—this war has been going on for 200 years and they have come to the final conclusion. The best way is just to close all the factories and move them to Third World countries. Then the best way to make things a little better here in Canada for the rich is to apply the International Monetary Fund and world bank policies here and bring Third World policies on a large scale to Canada and the United States through GATT, NAFTA and free trade.

It is nothing complicated. We have been studying it for 20 years, whether you are in the peace movement, the environment movement, the trade union movement. It does not matter what it is, the megaproject movement. It is all the same. We have come across it in five sectors. I have been at two world-class conferences, 1980, '86, '89, in Ottawa, in Nicaragua. We had 1,200 people from 60 countries in the world for eight days. You know, even if you are bit of a slow learner, you can learn something. We were all talking about the same government policies, the same business

policies, the same problems, and nothing is changing.

\* (2120)

Our idea that we developed over 23 years and tried to rationalize and develop under the conserver society and under sustainable development, government and business refused to take part in any hearing. They were our ardent opponents in every public hearing for every megaproject, including Garrison II at Portage la Prairie.

So this is nothing new. It is a total thing; this is a total concept. You have to understand that we are deeply involved in these things, and the information has come out. The information is out.

**Floor Comment:** Did I hear you correctly? Did you say Garrison II?

**Mr. Emberley:** I beg your pardon, could I wait till question period, sir?

It interrupts my train of thought. I have a little trouble with that, sir. Seventy years old now, and it is just wonderful to spend three or four hours every single day fighting the destruction and the sell-out of my country.

I wrote a brief to Susan Thompson on the intellectual, ethical, moral challenge—democracy for all is the first issue. I do not know whether you people heard of the Charlottetown referendum when the people became slightly disgusted with politicians. I do not know whether any of you are politicians here.

I came across a quote from a wild book, a old, old book. It said: The subjects of every state ought to contribute towards the support of the government as nearly as possible in proportion to their respective abilities, that is, in proportion to the revenue which they respectively enjoy under the protection of the laws of the state. Somebody called Adam Smith wrote that a long time ago about the wealth of nations.

You will notice, when they abandoned that principle and they created 700,000 new millionaires and 58 new billionaires in the U.S.A., personal wealth was transferred from government and business to wealthy individuals. Most of the countries, most of the States, North America, and most of the corporations are bankrupt, not only morally bankrupt but they are economically bankrupt. It is purely and simply a stripping and a

ripping off and a robbing. There is nothing complicated.

I read five books one week on the savings and loans industry. We have the same problem in Canada and the States, there is nothing different and that—you see, when we hear a gentleman say, here, I am a victim of circumstances, we have no tax revenue, I do not know what we are going to do. We have had 20 years of Liberal-Conservative policies of extensively large tax cuts for the wealthy and large tax cuts for corporations. We have high interest rates. We refuse to tax people. I cannot understand it, but we have a big debt and a deficit. All the money is going to the wealthy in interest payments on the debt. It is terrible, and some of them find it is just great.

Here is a little paper, Seymour Melman [phonetic], Profits Without Production, the story of the destruction of the infrastructure in the U.S.A. The government refused for 25 years to put any money into any areas where there was not enough military production and military factories in the area to make it worthwhile for votes.

It is very interesting to know they have had major bridges in the interstate highway system collapse, killing people pretty nearly every year for the last 20 years. Some of the things are 25 years behind in being replaced and rebuilt.

We just had a headline in the paper tonight by the corrupt—I do not know, there is a four-letter word they use for bad men that work with women to help women meet men—there is a four-letter word. Those people in the construction association said, we have cut our tax contribution so much in Canada that they cannot build the roads; we think people should pay a tariff to drive on the roads for the benefit of the trucking companies, because we shut down the railroads and we are using the roads for all our trucking.

You have to try to understand—you see we have gone—some of us are past Grade 8, Grade 9, some of us are past Grade 10. When I got to be 50 years of age I began to learn. It is pretty hard. I began to learn. I could not believe the lies that were in my history books.

Here is a cute little book called The Great Depression of 1990—it is pretty near as good as Pierre Berton's book—by Dr. Ravi Batra, and he says one little, tiny thing: There is a law of social cycles. There are four social cycles that have been

going on for 240 years. Except for the Civil War, every 30 to 60 years there is a depression or a recession, identically the same causes, practices carried on in the '20s created the '30s depression, practices in the '70s and '80s caused the 1990 depression. It was all predicted.

He said something here: Warriors, sometimes intellectuals, sometimes inquisitors dominated the social and political scene; the labourers never hold the reins.

But try and think of these words, write it down and say it to yourself carefully, that at times a ruling class becomes so self-centred and corrupt that a large majority of the people are reduced to poverty. I do not know what he means by that or if that could ever occur in a great democracy like Canada and that will not change. This depression will not end until the corrupt and stupid economists and governments that we have in power today are replaced by government.

Now there is a tiny quote here from a book called The War on Labour and the Less by Patricia Kayle Sexton, a professional analysis, a small paragraph that should be frightfully interesting to you: The facts from the economic ledger are no secret. The standard of living between 1972 and '88 increased only 8 percent, one-quarter of the average gain of West Germany, one-quarter of the gain of France, Italy, Britain and Canada, one-seventh as much of the gain of standard of living in Japan.

In 1988, the U.S.A. standard of living was below West Germany's, scarcely ahead of that of other major European countries and western Europe. The United States now is ninth in per capita gross national product, behind Austria, Switzerland, the Netherlands, West Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Japan. Total U.S.A. national assets rose from 31 trillion to 36 trillion between '85 and '87. That is 5 trillion they rose. Japan's assets rose from 20 trillion to 44 trillion. That is 24 trillion.

You know, Mr. Mulroney and Tom d'Aquino, the acting Prime Minister said, if we join the United States we can be an economic success like the U.S.A. If you people carry out the same policies as Ronnie Reagan and the Business Council on National Issues, we can be as great as the United States. It is as simple as that.

Thirty to 50 percent of the downtown office buildings in such cities as New York, L.A., Chicago, Boston are now under foreign ownership. By 1989,

Japan had funded a third of the corporate buyout boom in the U.S.A. Foreign banks control 23 percent of the U.S.A. banking assets and hold 29 percent of U.S.A. business loans. Now this is not a program for success. This is a program for failure.

There is a tiny little quote here that says: You know, of course, that unions are bad for the country, the economy and workers. Unions make us less competitive. They cause inflation, help destroy the work ethic, drive companies out of business.

Of course, if these things are true, the evidence should be widespread. It should be so widespread, in fact, that you should have no problem answering the question I am about to ask you. That is, name as many countries as you can where the people live well and the unions are either weak, nonexistent or government controlled. Think about that.

\* (2130)

Years ago I asked my 80-year-old grandmother what she thought about the unions. She went to school to the sixth grade; she had understood the real world. I think we have been talking about this today. She was separated from her husband, had to raise four children on the wages she made travelling around the state, packing oranges, tomatoes or anything else. She was a migratory worker.

I never belonged to a union, she said. But just about everything I ever got from my employer was the result of the unions. When they got raises, I got raises. When they got vacations and paid holidays, I got them. Not as much or as big, or as many as they got, but I knew I would not have gotten mine if they had not got theirs. Today many nonunion people have not figured that out.

I want you to remember something. Make a list of the 30 rules that the Chamber of Commerce has to follow to be able to form a branch of the Chamber of Commerce. You know, really, the Chamber of Commerce is a union of businessmen working for furthering the interests of business. Tell me the number of rules and regulations the government has put in place at the orders of business to make it possible to form a union easily. In the U.S.A. it takes up to four years of lawsuits to form most unions today. It is no surprise they have 10 percent unions in the States, we have 40 percent in Canada.

I want you to think about that, because we are talking about the economics of democracy and the democracy of economics. This is purely a class war. Now, the income of the wealthy rose greatly during the last 15 years. Ronald Reagan put in an absolute freeze, just like Lougheed in Alberta; for eight years, the minimum wage never rose; eight years inflation eroded the minimum wage.

We have done almost as well in most of Canada, except Manitoba. They had a crazy NDP government for a few years that put in a few raises for the lower class, but the upper classes made fortunes. There will be probably be 40,000 new millionaires in Canada—40,000 new millionaires, eight billionaires. Canada, for each 25 million people, has more billionaires than any other country in the whole world.

We have probably got 40,000 new millionaires, a 1,000 in Manitoba. Susan Thompson says: I have a solemn obligation not to have a tax raise in my budget. The 1,000 millionaires cannot afford it, and I am counting on them for political support.

I want you to think about the ethical and moral question. I heard a man say: We got a \$5 billion provincial debt. It is mostly Hydro debt, and it is killing us. I think if we can borrow another \$5 billion that will eliminate the problem. We will only owe a billion dollars a year in interest instead of \$500 million, and that will take off the stress and strain on our budget.

Now, they were not able to build Conawapa. Ontario Hydro, the most badly managed hydro in North America, built the biggest nuclear power plant, and in 1986, 50 percent of their generating capacity was excess generating capacity. Fifty percent of their generating capacity was nuclear, and then they finished building the biggest nuclear power plant in North America, and for 15 years they fought environmentalists who asked them to practise energy conservation.

My best friend works for Ontario Hydro, and he was one of 4,000 who had to be fired. You see, we do not have a record. We have a record of management, bad management, grossly incompetent management. I am giving you a paper here. The 234 energy megaprojects were Pierre Trudeau's only economic strategy in 1982.

**Mr. Chalrperson:** You have approximately two minutes, Mr. Emberley.

**Mr. Emberley:** Thank you. Two hundred and thirty-four energy megaprojects, \$400 billion. There are only two of them still going full steam without any subsidy, no fuss, Hibernia and Lloydminster. Now, think about it: two out of 234, and you think of the energy megaprojects that failed all through the States. A hundred nuclear power plants were cancelled. George Bush in his last year's budget tried to get subsidized building of 100 nuclear power plants. They never give up.

So I am giving you only a brief here. I want you to understand there is only one problem. You cut taxes. You are victims of circumstances, but your Conservative and Liberal colleagues for 25 years have cut taxes on the corporations. I have a little graph here. In 1950, corporations and private citizens paid \$950 million each in corporate taxes, and the graph shows a steady drop every single year for 40 years under Liberal and Conservative governments, including Diefenbaker, 40 years steady drop.

Private citizens now pay \$57 billion. Corporations pay \$2 billion to \$4 billion a year in corporate taxes on profits of close to \$100 billion a year. That is just for the 150 multinationals in Tom d'Aquino's Business Council on National Issues. Now the corporations paid another \$8 billion or \$10 billion a year on condition the government gives it all back in subsidies, grants and tax concessions. But the net payment the corporations of Canada pay, just the big ones, is \$2 billion to \$4 billion per year, and private citizens pay \$57 billion a year.

If corporations had paid \$20 billion a year for each of the last 20 years and the tax cuts had not been put in, 38 percent to 31 percent for the rich people and tax cuts for the corporations, you would have no national debt in Canada today and no deficit.

I do not like the lying in the media and the lying from government economists. I have nine papers here on propaganda, the fraud of propaganda that is used everywhere in government and business.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Emberley.

**Mr. Emberley:** Next time you hold a public hearing, why not make it democratic? Why not try making it democratic?

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

**Mr. Emberley:** Do you know, they invented cable television 20 years ago. We have had public hearings in this city—

**Mr. Chairperson:** I thank you for your presentation and your wisdom and your advice, Mr.—

**Mr. Emberley:** —and you do not allow the citizens in Winnipeg, and Manitoba and Canada to hear on cable television what we say. You silence our voices, and you put your propaganda and the corporations put their propaganda in the news media. This is all a—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Emberley, thank you very much for your presentation this evening.

Robert Chernomas. Did you have a written presentation, Mr. Chernomas?

**Mr. Robert Chernomas (President, University of Manitoba Faculty Association):** No, I do not. I am here as the president of the University of Manitoba Faculty Association, and I am also an economist at the University of Manitoba. So I will be saying some things reflecting both perspectives.

This government has cut funds to students subsidizing them to get through school. It has clawed back money from universities. It has reduced funding to universities as a percentage of provincial budgets. It does not keep pace with any price index that makes any sense whatsoever to try and make the universities competitive in this province. As people have said many times before here, none of this is inevitable. There has been \$205-million tax cut per year over the past five years. Choices are being made, and the kinds of choices that are being made do not serve the universities' purpose at all, and I am going to argue here, do not serve the economy of the province very well, either.

At the federal level, of course, we know that the Tories have cut the capital gains tax roughly \$20 billion, three-quarters, roughly, of which has gone to real estate speculation. There have been dramatic cuts in transfer payments to health and education. The same governments use zero inflation monetary policy which has cost the economy billions and billions in a large percentage of jobs, and of course it pursues the free trade perspective. I guess the question is, why does all this matter? The evidence suggested in the world, as an economist I would argue, that skills, knowledge and social consensus, not a

commitment to zero inflation and deficit reduction, will make the difference in the future.

Cutting health, education and welfare, cutting the taxes of the wealthy and hoping they will invest in your country or your province is not very competitive. High interest rates used to reduce inflation is not competitive. Free trade is not the answer.

I think the key revolves around a theory of the state. How do people perceive the state? It seems to me Conservatives view the state, the necessity of a state, as a slim state, because otherwise the state will be soft and corrupt. So what that means generally is, of course, that you cut budgets, you cut subsidies, you cut research and design, you cut rules, regulations and taxes.

It seems to me the message in the world these days is that it does not work—the U.S., the U.K., Canada. Look at investment in New Zealand, look at investment rates, look at unemployment rates, look at growth rates during the current economic downturn relative to countries that have a very different industrial policy. Competition in and of itself is a war against yourself. It simply does not make sense.

Individualism will not work, left to its own devices. Internal competition is not as useful, not as important as building some kind of unity. The strong state, the state that tries to build social consensus, here, privilege is pegged to performance. Business, most importantly here, is disciplined more by the state than occurs in the United States or Canada or Britain or New Zealand.

It may very well be that the skill and the temperament of the Canadian business community represented by the party in power may be at odds with this perspective, but something has to be done to change it because responding simply to what their immediate needs are is self-destructive for the economy, self-destructive for them as well, I would argue, except insofar as those that are able to set up shop somewhere else.

What has been done in Japan, Germany and the other countries whose per capita income we just heard has risen relatively dramatically in recent times? Well, what one finds in these economies is that capital or business is much more restricted than it is in the more free market economies. You cannot ship it overseas, if you choose to, in some cases. You cannot even use it to purchase other

enterprises in your own economy under many circumstances. Highly restricted. You have to get licences to do it. The effects of this kind of thing quite often are 10-year time horizons as opposed to six-month, one-year time horizons.

\* (2140)

Firms in these countries are quite often subsidized consortiums imposed on corporations; for example, semiconductors. The Americans tried to put one together and, of course, the companies would not get together, and the Bush administration would not support it. Who is going to dominate semiconductors over the next decade, an absolutely crucial core industry? Well, we know the answer to that because the Japanese, through METI [phonetic] have built a consortium around this.

Mergers are quite often imposed or prohibited by the state in ways that will maintain support for core industries. There is no free trade in many of these countries. Core sectors are subsidized, corporations co-operate, protectionism is an essential part of the mix. The key question is property rights. Do you simply accept free-market, blind property rights, or do you have a very different set of property rights? The answer is, in these countries, there are much more restricted property rights when it comes to business.

How about labour, if that is the business sector? Well, as just was said, quite often these economies are highly unionized. It is not the low-union countries that are more effective. It is the high-union countries that are more effective.

Health, education and welfare are a very important part of the social fabric of these countries, consistently across the board. Full employment and job security are part of how they build a social consensus, not through competitiveness, not through class warfare. Income distribution from the CEOs in the corporations down to the lowest worker is much, much smaller.

In Canada, CEOs' salaries, of course, are not even identified. They have the Securities and Exchange Commission in the U.S. to no longer identify Canadian CEO salaries. So how do you build a social consensus if you go out of your way to hide it, never mind, of course, the difference between them?



In these other countries, the difference between CEO salaries and workers' salaries is much, much lower, 15 times possibly, 95 times in the States. We do not know what it is in Canada because they refuse to tell us and the state accepts this.

Possibly most important, what goes on in these countries is what I would refer to as control over the labour process by the workers themselves. They have a commitment to the firm, based on the fact they have some control over what goes on in those factories. Certainly, not enough, what goes on, but certainly a lot more than what goes on in places where you have models like you have in North America and Britain, where on the shop floor, the perspective is class warfare and you struggle over every minute, every second of time.

In other countries, where workers are given some opportunity, in fact encouraged to give them an opportunity to help control that labour process, you find productivity is higher. It is an attempt to build social consensus. They build it by, first of all, controlling, constraining their own business class and then by offering their own workers a very different set of opportunities.

There is an institutionalized role for labour and policy formation in many of these countries. Training percentage spent in private and public enterprise is much, much higher, as is public expenditures on infrastructure. What we have in these places is state, a national strategy, and one that thinks about, very carefully, its class perspective, tries to build a consensus.

In core industries, as I suggested earlier, labour resources and finance are funnelled through core industries. They build an absolute advantage, not attempting to build a comparative advantage at the margin of their economies.

When free trade is accepted in these countries, they are armed to the teeth. More than anything else than technical and infrastructure, they are armed to the teeth, I would suggest, with a social consensus. They have an ability to adjust much more flexibly to shocks from outside. When you get competition coming from the outside of the country which is struggling with its own social consensus, quite often the response is hostility inside, rather than some kind of attempt to be flexible.

These national strategies create the basis for free trade and, as I suggested, when the economy

is dominated by national strategy, they have an advantage. Finance in many of these countries, of course, is not focused on zero-inflation, high-interest-rate monetary policy. Finance is focused in many of these countries on guaranteeing sufficient funds for these core sectors.

South Korea, which is a bad example in some ways, and a good example, had no private banking system, had no stock market. It did it all through, God forbid, a state bank. The idea that competition is generated by throwing money at the rich and hoping they will spend it in the right places because the free market works is an economic anachronism. It is a disaster. It simply does not work. Find me a place in the world where it is working, relative to the countries that have a very different model and a very different perspective.

I would like to read something from the University of Manitoba Faculty Association's Roblin commission submission, which is not unrelated to what I have been talking about here: Competitiveness, value-added, high-tech in the new world economy are the phrases that now dominate the economic debate in Canada.

The list of the industries of the future include microelectronics, biotechnology, robotics, machine tools, computers and their software, telecommunications and civilian aviation. These industries and the ability to compete in them will depend more than ever on brain power. Human-made comparative advantage will replace the comparative advantage generated by nature. Where these new industries will be located depends upon who can organize the brain power and the social consensus necessary to capture them.

Specific technical skills will be crucial to this process. Often such skills have a short half-life. Critical thinking, communication and social skills will provide society with the flexibility and adaptability necessary to co-operate and compete. Contributions from the humanities and the social sciences, as well as science and engineering, will be necessary.

This has not precluded changing emphasis at the university in order to respond to the needs of the economy, the environment and social conditions. In present circumstances, however, the University of Manitoba is finding it increasingly difficult to fill

properly either its cultural or its economic role in the province.

It is not, in fact, unduly alarmist to describe the university as currently approaching a state of crisis. The indicators of this crisis can be listed without difficulty. They include increasingly large classes and in some first-year courses, unacceptably large classes, which inevitably lead to a deterioration in the quality of teaching and learning and make it even more difficult for students and their professors to meet on any kind of personal basis.

From the professors' viewpoint, these large classes make it next to impossible to use their alternative or innovative teaching methods or to assign exercises which call for anything in the nature of extended marking. They also mean that, though actual contact hours with classes may not have increased, teaching loads effectively have, since more students are now to be found in many classes.

But also is the case that in some departments, actual contact hours have also been increased. All this has to be seen in the context of the staff reductions which have been taking place over recent years. Both academic and support staff numbers have shrunk. The obvious consequences are that remaining staff find themselves facing increasing workloads. It also means that highly-skilled and educated academics must often spend their time performing clerical and other functions, typing, photocopying, filing and so on, thus increasing their frustration and decreasing the time available for thought, reading, teaching and research.

\* (2150)

From the academic viewpoint, the increased demands of teaching and related services inevitably mean there is less time for research. Beyond this, however, research suffers in other ways. Problems of funding have meant that over the years the quality of the university's libraries and laboratories have suffered markedly. Compared to equivalent universities, it seems clear that our university libraries and laboratories are not what they should be, and certainly not what they should be in a major research university.

There is good evidence that we cannot compete for graduate students, and there is good evidence that we cannot compete for grants. Other provinces that have made investments in the

infrastructure have followed with increased improved quality in grant access. It has paid off, in other words.

Not only are books, supplies and equipment either outdated, inadequate or simply lacking, but they are often housed in facilities where even basic services are under increasing pressure. You all know one of our libraries is no longer possible to enter. It has been closed.

Heating, lighting, ventilation, even the buildings themselves are inadequate in various parts of the campus. The president and the senior administration of the university have repeatedly drawn attention to these problems and the Faculty Association endorses their efforts and vigorously supports their demonstration that the university is very close to the breaking point in these areas.

In my wife's office, you can see through the walls—she works in a different faculty than I do—to the outside. From the viewpoint of the faculty and academic librarians, all of this means that frustration is increasing and morale is under some threat.

We believe we have coped as well as anyone could be expected to cope under very difficult circumstances. We are convinced we are all doing all that is possible for our students. We are performing a valuable service for the province, and, indeed, for the country and for parts of the world outside Canada, as well.

We simply cannot accept the criticism that the university is somehow not pulling its weight. We know what we do and we are proud of it. However, we are only too aware of the problems with which we, our students and our administrations have to contend. We genuinely believe that the university can fairly be described as approaching a state of crisis.

We are convinced that if things go on as they have for the past several years, the quality of our teaching and research must suffer. Responding to short-run financial deficits with parsimony with respect to education will contribute to the long-run decline of the economy. More than ever before, the university must be seen not as a consumer of public resources, but as an investment.

Bill 22 is not merely a symptom of an attack on the university, but an attack on the long-run viability of this small, vulnerable province. What we really

need here is a Bill 23 that builds social consensus, not social divisiveness.

Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you very much for your presentation.

**Mr. Alcock:** Thank you very much. I want to just ask you to focus on a couple of things. We heard a statement today from the Finance minister (Mr. Manness) that in a sense, and I think the exact quote is, that the universities have been held harmless over the past few years. They have not—[interjection] Saved harmless? Saved harmless—that they have not suffered any of the cutbacks, reductions, et cetera, over the past five budgets, and this is the first time that government has acted to reduce the resources available to the universities and to the education system.

Yet what you just said in the last part of your presentation was that this is not the case, that in fact, the universities have been suffering a series of cutbacks over some period of time. Can you expand upon that a little bit? I mean, can you help members opposite here understand that, in fact, the reductions, the lowering of the quality that other members have talked about, the more difficult competitive position that it places researchers in—we had a researcher in this morning talking about how difficult it was to maintain quality work and that some of the cutbacks were coming directly out of grants he was bringing in from out of province.

I am assuming from your last bit that it is not the position of the association, and I do not want to suggest that, but can you just help people understand a little bit how difficult it has been over the last five, six, seven years?

**Mr. Chernomas:** Yes, I was drinking water.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Oh, I am sorry. Mr. Alcock to repeat his question then.

**Mr. Chernomas:** No, I heard the question. There was about a 30-second gap, and you were concerned about it, and I was just telling you I was drinking water during the gap.

I got here in 1980. The largest class I faced, Principles, the limit, because our department thought it was the maximum you could have and actually give papers to students you could mark carefully—you had contact with students—was 80. My department now has classes of 300 to teach

Principles. That is not unusual. In fact, they might even make it larger if they had the physical structure in the place to have larger classes.

When I got to the University of Manitoba in 1980, there were something like 33 full-time members in my department. There are about 26 now. John Loxley may be able to help me more on this. There were another eight or nine that were there on a sessional basis, on a yearly basis. There were something like 40 members in my department. There are now 25. At the same time, the number of students we serve has grown dramatically during this period. I suggested, as I said, 80 maximum students, now 300.

That says something about the quality of, the kind of education when you have 300 students. In 1980 when I had a classroom of Principles students, I had some engineers in it, some potential economists, a number of others. Every single student had an essay 20 pages long. I would not give an essay to 300 students and expect to get anything done for the rest of the year. It suggests something about the quality of education from that very narrow perspective of one department and one individual.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Alcock, with a very short question. The presenter's time has just about expired.

**Mr. Alcock:** Okay, a very quick response then. Specifically on the cuts that will take place under Bill 22, in speaking to Mrs. Vodrey in Estimates, she said that according to university officials, sufficient adjustments can be made so the six-day reduction will not affect the integrity of the academic program.

Yet my experience with students on the campus and with other faculty members is that, particularly in the summer session where the educational experience is compressed, the loss of a day of lab time or the loss of access to—

**Mr. Chernomas:** Very briefly, closing a lab day, for example in chemistry, means a week of labs gone. The whole week is gone. That is what our chemists tell us.

Researchers will be less competitive, six days less. As one of them said to me recently, their bugs are still alive during those six days, and the faculty in other universities who are competing with them for the same grants are working when they are shut

out—less classroom time, less exam time, less library time.

Junior faculty will be those who are in the most competitive positions. The ones most able to leave are the ones who will leave because it will be six days less pay, six days less opportunity to do their research. It is another twig, I should not say twig, it is another rock on the scale.

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

I will now call upon Mr. Barry Wadsworth.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Ashton:** Mr. Chairperson, just on a matter of procedure, I know staff have been here waiting most of the night. I do not believe we will finish tonight. If we do finish, we will not be finishing, by the looks of it, until very close to our adjournment time.

I just want to indicate that perhaps we might want to decide at this point that if we do finish, we not go into clause by clause tonight. We probably would not have time anyway, but I just think it might be wise to send staff home, rather than tie up three or four people for any longer than is necessary. So I would just suggest, all we really need to do is decide that we will not get into clause by clause, even if we do finish, and they can be sent home.

I am not sure, Mr. Chairperson, we will actually even finish, but I do feel it would be better use of staff time if we could send them off for the rest of the night.

**Mr. Manness:** Mr. Chairperson, let us call the next presenter, and Mr. Ashton and I will talk about that during his presentation.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Wadsworth. Diane O'Neil.

Ms. O'Neil, do you have a written presentation?

**Ms. Diane O'Neil (Private Citizen):** No.

**Mr. Chairperson:** That is okay. You may proceed with what you have.

**Ms. O'Neil:** Good evening. My name is Diane O'Neil, and I am here tonight as a member of the Canadian Union of Education Workers at the University of Manitoba. I am a working student and a single parent, and as such, I fall into a number of categories of people who are going to be negatively affected by this particular piece of legislation.

I am going to address my greatest concern with Bill 22, and that is the way in which our thinking about society and social support will be radically altered. This bill creates a new category of working people. That is the category of people working full time yet compelled to stay home without pay, the Bill 22 people. Contrast this with the existing category of working people, full-time—

**Mr. Chairperson:** You may proceed, Ms. O'Neil.

**Ms. O'Neil:** I will when everyone is seated, thank you.

—working people, full-time working people, and those who are receiving social support such as UIC, welfare, welfare supplements, pensions and other income supplements. These are the social supported people. Bill 22 also highlights the contrast between the working people who will now be staying at home without pay with the people who are not working who are staying at home with pay.

Bill 22 creates this category of working people who are staying home without pay, and then it attacks these very same people by depriving them of work and pay. It is the nature of the work that is particularly troubling. By reducing the delivery of service to clients consisting of children, dependants, sick, elderly, unemployed, our teachers, our social workers, doctors, nurses and civil servants are forced to turn their back on needs and suffering in society. Bill 22, then, becomes an assault on the mind and the body of society.

\* (2200)

By attacking our middle class, our educated people, the very foundation of social support they represent is undermined. The professional, educated middle class is forced to consolidate its resources and energy, such as being here today and tonight making these presentations, and because we are here tonight, those people who are the weakest in society are being left vulnerable and undefended.

Bill 22 is a direct hit into the line of defence between the right of social support versus privilege. By attacking the defenders of this right, recipients become the casualties, and support is dangerously undermined.

Strategically, this is a brilliant tactic. Just think about the possibilities from this bill. As highly trained, well-educated professional people are restricted in their profession and in their paycheque, as we are continually bombarded with

the message that we cannot support the luxury of social programs, as neighbours begin to see their tax dollar supporting their neighbour's UIC or welfare or disability pension, as increasing numbers of people come to accept these cutbacks to education, health and social welfare as inevitable, as more and more people become vulnerable and undefended, anger and bitter frustration will be increasingly directed at the weakest, rather than at the people who have introduced this very nasty piece of legislation.

Morally and ethically, this is reprehensible. So my biggest concern with Bill 22 is the way in which it messes with our minds as well as with our lives. Questions?

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you very much for your presentation, Ms. O'Neil.

**Mr. Alcock:** I thank you, Ms. O'Neil. You have been, and I think you indicated that you maybe still are, a student, but I know from some contact I had with you before that you are a student there as well as a single parent.

Can you speak a little bit about some of the experiences that you have had attempting to go to school, attempting to raise a child, attempting to get an education and get yourself into productive employment over the last few years? Have you been saved harmless from some of the policy decisions of this government?

**Ms. O'Neil:** As a single parent, someone who wholly supports three children, I have had to borrow \$40,000 to fund my education and to fund my family. Because of federal changes to the Student Loan Program two years ago, my funding was cut off, even though the federal government had assured me that people like myself, people who are progressing satisfactorily, would be seen to the end of our program.

Since that have time I have held, and hold, five different part-time jobs at university, am currently working on my thesis, raising a family, and I have just had to get a two-year extension from my department and from grad studies so that I can finish my program. Now, to me, it is necessary for our graduate students and all our students to graduate because how else are we ever going to pay back these student loans?

**Mr. Alcock:** Mr. Chairperson, so rather than, as other members at this table might have the public believe, sort of sitting around and consuming social

resources, you have been working very hard to get yourself into a position where you can add to the knowledge base that the President of the University of Manitoba Faculty Association was talking about.

**Ms. O'Neil:** Increasingly, it is clear that our social programs are becoming an income subsidy to business. There are many people who are receiving welfare who are, in fact, working full time. They simply do not earn enough money, and they have to receive subsidies.

**Mr. Alcock:** As a student attending classes and dealing with the professors, et cetera, do you feel the university has been saved harmless from the impact of policy decisions over past years? Is this the first year the university has been cut or suffered a reduction in its support?

**Ms. O'Neil:** No, I would say the university is suffering. You only have to go out there and look at it to see that it is suffering.

In terms of the staff, they are doing everything they can, but there are limits, and these limits are being imposed by the government who is making it, in a sense, illegal to work, with Bill 22.

**Ms. Barrett:** Thank you, Ms. O'Neil. This was a very interesting presentation, and I look forward to reading it in Hansard. I was trying to scribble down as much of what you said as I could.

The analysis that you have made about what is happening here—who is benefiting and what reasons do you see for Bill 22 and the other items you have talked quite eloquently about in your presentation? Who is benefiting from this, and what reasons can you see for their following through on this?

**Ms. O'Neil:** There are two things about that question I would like to answer. I see Bill 22 as this invisible hand that is reaching into our minds and twisting it. In twisting it, it will make us look at people in a different way.

The other aspect of Bill 22 is you can draw an analogy to monopoly. You all know that when you play monopoly, if you have the skill, and you land on Boardwalk, and you have certain key properties, you will always win. The only way you can keep the game going is to subsidize other people. Bill 22 is like a game of monopoly.

**Ms. Barrett:** So who is winning here?

**Ms. O'Neil:** I could say who is losing more than who is winning. Again, in the same way you can go

out to the university, just go downtown and look at the number of people who are coming up asking for a quarter. They were not there eight years ago.

So the people who are losing are, again, those who are the weakest and the vulnerable and those with less power, fewer resources and the least money. Bill 22 is going to reduce that even more and increase the number of people who are going to be negatively affected.

**Ms. Barrett:** You talked about the impact Bill 22 is having as it filters through the system and the negative impact it is having on social services and health and education and all of our entire society.

Do you have some personal experiences or stories or examples of this you would be willing to share with the committee?

**Ms. O'Neill:** Rather than share personal experiences, again, you only have to look in the paper. You only have to use your common sense to realize that if people cannot do their jobs, if nurses cannot nurse and teachers cannot teach because they are legislated not to, the people who receive these services are the ones who are going to suffer directly. Ultimately, of course, we all suffer.

**Mr. Santos:** Ms. O'Neil, when we were a material resource-based society, the corporate people, the multinationals all wanted control of our natural mineral resources. Now that we are entering into a new type of society, what they call a technologically based, knowledge-based society, the corporate multinationals would now want to control our educational institutions. We have witnessed the privatization attempt of the public school system, and this is seeping up into the higher post-secondary educational system. This they are doing by this privatization. What do you think about this trend?

**Ms. O'Neill:** I think it would be dangerous of us to assume that we here in Manitoba in our university are the people who are going to provide these highly educated people. If that were the case, you would not have students who can afford it going out of province to get their education.

So there will be a demand for highly educated people. I think we are sadly mistaken to think we are going to meet that demand.

**Mr. Santos:** Did you know that the children of former Prime Minister Mulroney were all studying outside of the country, outside of Canada? Does

that mean anything to you about the educational deterioration of our system here?

**Ms. O'Neill:** I would provide my child with the very best education I could and if that were out of the country, that is where she would be educated.

\* (2210)

**Mr. Santos:** Do you feel now that there is this class distinction between the poor and the rich, whereas the rich can send their children abroad because they have the money, the poor cannot? At the same time, we are deteriorating our economic base, as well as our educational base and the future of our children.

**Ms. O'Neill:** There are some people who would say that. I take a different view, and the truth of the matter is, no one really cares about the poor. So it is not an issue of class for them or access to resources, because increasingly in Manitoba we just do not care.

**Mr. Santos:** Do you feel that there are people who perceive themselves as middle class, and yet they do not know, in reality, they have already joined the ranks of the poor?

**Ms. O'Neill:** Yes.

**Mr. Santos:** Why do you say that?

**Ms. O'Neill:** I say that because many people are really not aware of what it means to be middle class, lower class or upper class. They think because they are working and they have a home and a car that maybe they are middle class, and that is just not the case.

**Ms. Barrett:** In one of your answers to Mr. Santos' comments, and I did not quite get it all, but the impact if children in Manitoba cannot attend the University of Manitoba and have to go out or they just will not have access because they will not be able to afford to attend it, what impact do you see that having on society or on our economy or on education?

**Ms. O'Neill:** I believe the way I answered it was to say that for my daughter, and I am sure for everybody else's daughters and sons, we want the very best education for our children. If the way that I could get the best education for my child was to send her out of Manitoba, I would do that. I would not want to do that, though. I would want to think that my province where I live and I raise a family provides the very best education for my child.

**Mr. Laurendeau:** Hi, Diane. I guess we have known each other for just a few years. We have not always agreed on quite everything. I guess a few times we have disagreed on political ends, but I have always enjoyed our debates that we have had over the years. I guess it goes back about 15 years.

What do you think of the quality of education at the university today? You have been attending it for quite some time. What do you think of the quality of education as far as the professors go, as far as the course options that are available today within our university?

**Ms. O'Neill:** I am working on my Master's thesis, so I am not taking courses. However, I do grade and mark, and I teach in a number of different departments.

The professors I work with and the professors whose courses I have taken provide, I would think, the highest quality in calibre of education. It is increasingly evident, though, and I know as a grader-marker, that it is becoming impossible to provide the quality of education on an individual basis that you really want to provide.

So, in terms of the University of Manitoba, I would say, they are doing the very best they can under the circumstances. I honestly do not know how long that would continue for, though.

**Mr. Laurendeau:** So, Diane, would you tie the quality of education into the dollars allocated towards paying staff within a university?

**Ms. O'Neill:** I think there are many people, Conservatives perhaps, who do tie dollars into delivery of service, the types of people for particular jobs. In terms of the budgeting, there have been enough other people who have presented who, I think, have made that relationship. I think in today's society that there is a relationship between the amount of money available and the amount and quality of education you get for that money. That is why we have private versus public schools.

**Ms. Barrett:** I know your time is almost up, but you just ended with a very interesting comment. Could you expand a little more on your statement, that is why we have private versus public schools, please?

**Ms. O'Neill:** We recognize, in Manitoba at least, that education is important, that for some it is more important than for others, and that is why we have private versus public schools. There are certain

people who prefer to control the education, prefer to invest their money so that their children can get the very best education possible to increase the chances that they can go to the very best university possible.

**Mr. Chalrperson:** Mr. Santos, for one quick question.

**Mr. Santos:** How do you perceive the difference in quality between public and private schools?

**Ms. O'Neill:** I think it is more in the opportunities that you can provide your children if they go to a public school or if they go to a private school. There is an assumption and a belief that if your children are educated in a particular university or in a particular school, somehow they are better equipped, better able, better educated and better suited for particular positions within society.

**Mr. Chalrperson:** Thank you very much for your presentation, Ms. O'Neil, very interesting. Thank you very much.

I call on Bernie Lopko. Jettie Zwiep. Peter Hudson. Oh, pardon me. Jettie Zwiep.

Did you have a written presentation?

**Ms. Jettie Zwiep (Private Citizen):** Only parts of one, sorry.

**Mr. Chalrperson:** Okay, then you may proceed with your presentation, Ms. Zwiep.

**Ms. Zwiep:** I am also employed as an educational support worker at the University of Manitoba. I am registered as a graduate student at the same university, and I am an executive member of the Canadian Union of Educational Workers Local 9 from that same university.

Like everybody else, I am here to register my complete objection to the passage of Bill 22 on the grounds that Bill 22 unfairly penalizes myself and every one of 11,000 educational support workers at the University of Manitoba. I object to it on the grounds that Bill 22 threatens my, as well as the other approximately 30,000 students registered at the university, their contractual rights to a competitive and quality education, and finally on the grounds that Bill 22 blatantly violates my own and every other member of my union's right to free association and to organize.

As an educational support worker, we provide a variety of services that are crucial to the university in performing their job. We work as people who grade and mark term papers and exams. We

invigilate exams. We teach seminars. We supervise lab experience. We tutor individual students, and many of us teach full courses on a sessional basis. For that we are, by the way, one of the lowest educational working groups in the whole country.

The service we provide is not a discrete product. It is not something that can be measured or calculated in terms of units, hours or days in when it is produced. As such, taking a day off cannot be accurately calculated in how it will affect over the long term. Two-thirds of the work that we do normally consists of research and preparation, and again cannot be calculated for in any way, shape or form by Bill 22.

Bill 22 does not include any mechanism for accounting for it; moreover, the quality and content that we provide as teachers has to be met, regardless of whether we have days off. The only other way for Bill 22 to be implemented is to seriously threaten and undermine the very education that we get. There is no other way to do it. You either end up having teachers working for nothing, or you end up having students whose education seriously suffers.

We have paid for that education. Public school people, students in public schools, parents, pay for that education through their tax dollars. As university students, we pay for that education through our tuition fees, and we are seeing that education undermined at the same time that we have seen our tuition fees go up 36 percent.

Most of our employees within our union, and most of the educational workers on campus, work anywhere from three to 10 hours a week and for as long, or a minimum of six weeks to 29 weeks. As a result, we are strictly short-term, part-time workers. The average salary for a member from my union is \$2,750 a year. Now, I am sure that it does not seem more than a drop in the bucket for most of you here, but for most of my people, it makes up a component of either their rent or their groceries or their books or their tuition. None of those things can be cut back.

\* (2220)

Because of the part-time hours and the short duration of the contracts we have, the annualization of the bill and the way it works, we are unfairly penalized in terms of lost wages through this bill. We pay a higher price than any full-time worker or

permanent part-time worker at the University of Manitoba. Our union, in fact, has already had to deal with members who have been already deducted a full day's pay, but who, due to the nature of their short-term contract, have never been compensated with an alternate day off.

Now as far as I know, there is nothing in Bill 22 that covers for it, that allows us to appeal it or that allows it to be corrected. So in other words, right now, what we have are members who are working for nothing, not days off with no pay, but members who are working, who are being forced to work and who are not being remunerated for the work they have already done.

It is evident that for myself and for the 1,100 educational support workers then, the implementation of this bill will, in many of our cases, not mean no work without pay. It will, in fact, mean legislated work without any remuneration whatsoever. We highly object to those kinds of tactics.

Bill 22 has no allowance, as I have said, and no mechanism that allows us to appeal unfair wage loss. There is the possibility of employer's abuse in its implementation or pure negligence in the implementation that results in abuses, and we have absolutely no recourse whatsoever to get these things rectified.

Bill 22 gives the employer arbitrary, unilateral and potentially abusive power, and at that same time, it forces us, as educational workers, to work with our hands tied behind our backs.

Bill 22 also violates my contracted-for and paid-for rights to quality education at the University of Manitoba. Bill 22 cannot be fairly implemented without a serious loss in educational content. For example, for graduate students, the loss is anywhere from nine to 27 hours of available class or lab time. For graduate students, the cost is worse. Because most graduate courses consist of three-hour seminars, they, like myself, can stand to lose anywhere from 18 to 36 hours of crucial class time or lab time.

In terms of actual content, what this means to students' education, the loss is anywhere from six to 10 chapters per course per year, to as much as five to 12 books being slashed from your load in one course one year. Now that is an awful lot of material for us to lose.



There is simply no way, as I have said, that Bill 22 can be fairly implemented either as nonworking, nonpaid days without seriously threatening or undermining the quality of my education. The implementation of Bill 22, moreover, comes in the face of a 36 percent increase in tuition fees that we have had to come up with, the complete elimination of student bursaries, the further restriction of students loans and a serious reduction in the amount of competitive grants being offered at the University of Manitoba.

I do not know if any of you have any idea what it means for students. My basic four-year B.A. program cost me over \$12,000 in student loans. For any student entering now who is a single parent like myself and must rely on student loans and bursaries to get an education, that cost is automatically going to be doubled to \$24,000.

Now, maybe for a single person that is not a problem, but for a lot of other people who either come from a working-class background or a poor background, \$25,000 for a basic B.A. is a lot of money to have to try and pay back. If nothing else, the programs this government has implemented throughout the year ensure that professional degrees like law, engineering, medicine or a Ph.D that takes anywhere from seven to nine years to achieve are automatically going to exclude those who do not have the economic ability.

It is going to exclude the poor. It is going to exclude women. It is going to exclude single parents. It ensures that the best-paid professions in this country remain within the white middle class whose parents can afford to pay for it, because to get eight years of education at double the cost with the elimination of bursaries is going to cost between \$55,000 and \$65,000.

In other words, from my point of view, Bill 22—oh, one more thing. At the University of Manitoba in the last year, because of exactly all the measures implemented by this government, we have had to open up a full-time food bank. We have a food bank on our campus, and half of its donations are needed baby food, and the majority users of this food bank are graduate students.

I, personally, find it reprehensible that you are eliminating our bursaries, you are increasing our tuition fees and at the same time, you are trying to pass a bill that is going to offer me less education. [interjection] Pardon? There still, already, has

been a 36 percent increase. [interjection] I beg your pardon?

**Mr. Chairperson:** I believe we will have time for questions at the end.

**Ms. Zwlep:** I am not quite finished.

**Mr. Chairperson:** No. You may continue.

**Ms. Zwlep:** Increasing my educational costs anywhere from 36 percent, and for those of us on student loans and bursaries, now an increase of 50 percent, while at the same time destroying the quality of our education is totally unacceptable, and no doubt it is going to be unacceptable to the approximately 30,000 students who come to university in September.

As I have stated, there is no way this bill can be implemented without either making teachers work for nothing or making students suffer a loss in education.

Bill 22, the final point, is a blatant violation of my rights as a union member. It is a bill that completely overrides the collective agreement our union has reached through bargaining in good faith. We worked for six months presenting a contract, and we negotiated a contract. We did so fairly and we had a result. Shortly, a few months after reaching a contract, we have been informed that our contract is meaningless. We are going to take losses anyway.

It overrides the collective agreement. It violates all recognized and accepted Canadian and international labour standards. To my knowledge, such a complete and unacceptable violation of workers' rights as Bill 22 proposes has in Canadian history, as far as I am concerned, only occurred in the context of a wartime emergency measure. I am sorry, but as far as I know, this country is not at war now. As far as I know, there is no war going to be declared that I know of.

On the long-standing historical precedent alone, there is absolutely no excuse for implementing such a total violation of workers' rights. The government of Manitoba has consistently refused to engage with workers in any kind of real consultative process. It has refused to provide verifiable evidence that maintains this bill is absolutely necessary, and the passage of Bill 22 will eventually destroy whatever possibility of a co-operative relationship existing between workers and employers. It can only ensure further

damaging disruptions in the workplace. Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

**Mr. Ashton:** I find your comments on the cumulative impact to be particularly interesting, because I really share the concern that you have about the cumulative impact of cuts to bursaries to shift to strictly student loans, the impact of Bill 22 on teaching assistants, the whole variety of things. We are seeing cuts to ACCESS programs which have provided an alternative way of getting people into the system who have previously been denied access to it.

I just want to clarify for the committee, because I thought your comment was very instructive. As I understand it, you are suggesting that, really, this is almost a deliberate plan that is attempting to continue perhaps some of the kind of, exclusiveness that used to exist with a university education perhaps a few years ago that had, to a certain extent, been eroded. I say "to a certain extent" because there still is a certain degree of exclusivity.

But you are suggesting this is going to move it towards a more restrictive environment in which only those, or largely those, who can afford it will be able to go to university. Many other people of modest means who have the ability to complete a university education will be denied access, because they simply cannot afford the massive amount of loans they would be faced with.

\* (2230)

**Ms. Zwlep:** The total impact of all the legislation that has been enacted by this government in the last year is definitely regressive. It automatically excludes those who are least capable of paying for their university ahead of time on a cash basis.

It excludes, overwhelmingly, single-parent women and married women from the process. We have a situation where student loans have now been made even more strict, where you have to have 80 percent of your courseload in order to qualify for a student loan and bursary. However, many of the members, both within my union and other students at the university, are single parents who have children to raise, part-time jobs to do, and as such, have no way that they can actually meet the full courseload required. Yet, if they do not get

a student loan, they simply do not go because there is no other way to do it.

**Mr. Ashton:** Mr. Chairperson, how much time is available, so I do not take all of the time?

**Mr. Chairperson:** The presenter has approximately five minutes.

**Mr. Ashton:** Okay, I just want to ask a further question, because I found your comments on the impact it is going to have on women in particular to be significant, because one of the significant changes in post-secondary education since the early 1970s has been the dramatic increase in the number of women enrolled in post-secondary institutions.

It has gone from a point I believe of not even 40 percent, 20 years ago, to the point where women actually now make up the majority of enrollments at post-secondary institutions, in fact, reflect pretty close to the actual population. To a certain extent, there are probably now more women, a dramatic change from 20 years ago in which there were fewer women, either in the population or on average.

I just want to make it very clear to the committee, because this is something that has been reflected in other areas, other sectors. People have talked about the impact on women. But you are saying that this, in conjunction with the rest of the government's agenda on education, is going to roll back the clock for women in terms of post-secondary education.

**Ms. Zwlep:** It is going to roll back the clock for a lot of women because, increasingly, the number of—in terms of the number of people who are entering graduate studies, there is evidence to suggest that the kinds of people who are entering graduate studies are increasingly older people.

They happen to be men and women who are married, who have children responsibilities to look after, other than simply meeting their educational needs. The way the system is structured, it becomes increasingly difficult for them to meet their academic needs and still maintain their families, and the choice becomes one of saying, put your family on hold to get your education or do not get your education.

**Mr. Santos:** Ms. Zwlep, your perception that this Bill 22 unduly penalizes yourself as a single parent and a working student, how does that change or

alter your perception of respect for government and for politicians?

**Ms. Zwiép:** How does it alter my perception of government? In terms of the process I see happening in this province? It is a major change. I mean, Manitoba as far as I can see, has spent many, many years trying to pass legislation and introduce an educational process that was open and accessible to everybody who had the academic ability to go, and what I am seeing is academic ability being sacrificed for money.

I mean, it does not matter if you are bright or you are capable or you have a straight A average. What counts is if you have the money. If you have the money, you can go. If you do not have it, tough luck.

**Mr. Santos:** Do you think that in the long run this materialistic view of priorities will be beneficial to our future, to our children?

**Ms. Zwiép:** In the long run, to our future? It certainly is not of any benefit to my future. It certainly is not of any benefit whatsoever to the 1,100 people who are part of my union and who work as educational support workers, and I cannot see it being of any benefit to the province of Manitoba. If the cost of having an education becomes so unbearable that graduate students—[interjection] Do you mind?

**Mr. Chalrperson:** Order, please. The presenter is trying to answer the question. Ms. Zwiép, to continue.

**Ms. Zwiép:** If the cost of getting an education and hopefully entering some form of profession that allows you to support your family properly becomes so prohibitive that students have to go to food banks to survive, what you are going to find is your graduate students are going to pick up, and they are going to go to other provinces, other provinces that have much better bursary systems, much better loan systems and that pay TAs and grader/markers a half-assed decent salary.

We are already seeing students leaving. Within my union, when I go to the national convention and meet with other locals, I have no difficulty telling other universities, do not bother coming here because there is nothing here in Manitoba.

**Mr. Chalrperson:** Mr. Santos, one quick question.

**Mr. Santos:** Even with your perception of this deteriorating educational environment, do you feel

optimistic or pessimistic that you will want to complete your educational pursuit?

**Ms. Zwiép:** It has already become evident that I will not complete my educational pursuit. I was cut off student loans and bursaries two years ago. I lost one whole year of my education because I had no income, and I had to go out and find a full-time job in order to survive. The job I finally got did not come in time for me to be able to pay my tuition fees or my books or registration.

At present, the last year I went to university, I was attempting to meet my academic obligations at the same time that I was holding down three part-time jobs and trying to cope with raising a teenage daughter.

Now, I do not know what your lives are like, but you can only stretch it so thin, you know, and then something has to go. I do not think it is fair to have students who do well and would have the academic credentials end up leaving university because they do not have the money and because the few jobs they can get are being undermined and clawed back.

**Mr. Chalrperson:** Thank you very much for your presentation, Ms. Zwiép.

**Ms. Zwiép:** Thank you.

**Mr. Chalrperson:** I will now call on Peter Hudson. Rick Burns. Tony Steele. Barry Wolfe.

Do you have a written presentation, Mr. Wolfe?

**Mr. Barry Wolfe (River East Teachers' Association):** Yes, I do.

**Mr. Chalrperson:** The Clerk will come and pick it up from you and pass it around. You can begin, Mr. Wolfe.

**Mr. Wolfe:** Thank you very much. I want to introduce myself. I am Barry Wolfe. I am the president of the River East Teachers' Association, and I am doing this brief on behalf of the teachers of the River East Teachers' Association.

I just wanted to make maybe a personal comment here. There is one thing that happened to me when I became president of the River East Teachers' Association. Immediately, you become stupid. People always want to give you advice, even when you do not want it. I see a little bit of that going on here tonight. I do sympathize with some of the bombardment you have been taking here. Certainly, in comparison to what has been happening here earlier on tonight, I am a pussy cat.

I am certainly not here to ridicule you, to attack you or to patronize you, but I do have some concerns on behalf of the teachers of the River East Teachers' Association.

I think perhaps maybe I should establish my credentials, so you know who I am and where I am coming from and so forth. I am a teacher, as I stated earlier. I have been teaching now for approximately 20 years. I am university educated, and I have been teaching under many conditions and situations. When I am not president of River East Teachers' Association, I am a guidance counsellor at Kildonan East Collegiate in the River East School Division which is approximately 1,200 students.

Tonight, I felt it was important enough that I come out here. I missed my convocation at Kildonan East Collegiate, but I felt it was important that I come out here and talk to you and try and present the teachers' viewpoints.

I was a little disconcerted when I heard one of the earlier speakers not imply but come right out, because they felt what they were saying did not have any weight at all, and I would not like to believe that. Hopefully, what we are saying to you people is treated with respect and sincerity. I am here tonight presenting with that vein in view.

I just want to say good evening to Mr. Derkach. I remember when he was Minister of Education.

Anyway, good evening. I wish to speak here on behalf of the 890 teachers of the River East Teachers' Association with respect to our serious concerns about Bill 22.

Combined with the recent substantial reduction in funding of the public school divisions and Bill 16, limiting the taxation power of local school divisions, Bill 22 cannot have anything other than a negative impact on the integrity of the collective bargaining process, the morale of teachers, the trust of teachers, parents and students, the continuing effort of teachers to upgrade their skills to meet the frequently changing educational needs of students, parents, their community and business, the ability of our schools as institutions to plan for school climate, program and curricular changes and adapt when specific programs or problems emerge, such as shifting attendance patterns or outbreaks of violence, and, finally, perhaps most importantly ultimately, on the quality of education, and I should say public education for our students.

There are two areas in which I would like to comment specifically: No. 1, those enabling sections of the bill which encourage school divisions to close their doors for up to 10 days, and No. 2, those sections of the bill, such as Sections 5 and 6 which undermine the collective bargaining process.

\* (2240)

Since these two issues are the essence of the bill itself, it is not the details of the bill that must be criticized and critiqued and fine-tuned, but its central premises. The first premise seems to be that professional development and administration days are nonessential, that the teachers and administrators can somehow, with no common time within their school day to do it, plan for ever-changing needs of our school population, plan collectively to implement curriculum changes, engage in dialogue with each other, the community, our parents and business to ensure that we have a positive school climate and modify and deliver programs that will meet the needs of our students now and into the next century.

We know our teachers are good, but they are not superhuman. Professional development and administration days are not perks. They are opportunities to do our job. Our teachers are dedicated, hard-working professionals who give and have given time and time again to the very best they can be within the classroom, despite ever-increasing pressure associated with significant changes in the family and the economy, resulting in increasing numbers of hurting and stressed children who are less able and sometimes less willing to learn, plus collectively working at developing and maintaining school-wide programs to respond to those needs.

Teachers are dedicated and hard working, and I believe that sincerely, but we are not and should not be expected to be miracle workers. A change in demographics, a worsening economy and cutbacks in funding for a whole host of social programs have left the schools to deal with an ever-widening range of social problems that were traditionally cared for by the community-at-large and the family. Ironically, this is occurring precisely in conjunction with the decline in resources to the schools to deal with this increased mandate.

A hungry child, an abused child, a stressed child cannot learn unless these primary needs are met.

An alienated child, a child whose language or cultural sense of comfort and belonging is affronted by the ability of an institution to adapt faces tremendous hurdles, sometimes insurmountable. One must also be aware of the tremendous amount of collective energy that has gone into mainstreaming and the High School Review.

We do not wish to say that these things should not be done. We do, however, wish to emphasize that they do not happen by wish, nor do they happen in a vacuum. Retooling takes time and energy. Institutional retooling takes the collective time of all those involved to plan.

Let me note some of the new program initiatives that have occurred at Kildonan East Collegiate alone within the last two to three years as an example of how well this time is spent. These are things that occurred because initially teachers and administrators got together on administration and/or professional development days, often with a speaker or facilitator brought in to try to problem-solve around a particular issue or set of issues. Later, committees worked on their own time, reported, and programs were evolved and maintained, most without any additional staffing and most on out-of-classroom volunteer time.

Number 1: Students at risk. At risk either because of attitude, behaviour, attendance or learning problems. Evolved into the two new program initiatives, one focused on meeting the needs of those facing significant learning hurdles, the second focusing on students at risk because of either poor attendance or an inability to adapt to a school setting.

Number 2: Peer tutoring programs—this benefits both the tutor and the person tutored.

Number 3: Peer counselling programs—this requires a lot of time to train and collaborate with the students involved.

Number 4: Conflict resolution training which has also evolved a peer conflict resolution component—not soon, it is already done.

Number 5: Problem-solving models and policies evolved to deal with the individual student facing significant difficulties in their course work.

Number 6: A drug and alcohol abuse policy and support system.

Number 7: An aboriginal advisory committee and support group.

Number 8: A student-parent support system.

Number 9: A long-term planning committee and reporting protocol.

Earlier, those same days were utilized to develop such things as an abuse-disclosure protocol, before it was mandated by law, and to develop new procedures for supervision and new attendance policies in response to identified problems to be resolved to keep an institution running smoothly and to keep students functioning as effectively as possible within it toward the divisional educational goals.

I do not believe that Kildonan East Collegiate, although very professional and good, is unique. Our entire membership is constantly working in a caring way to improve our schools and our school climate.

Not all learning occurs within the classroom, but learning, of course, also occurs within the traditional classroom. Competent teachers constantly update their methods, adopt appropriate methods and garner new ideas and materials from every legitimate available source and spend time evaluating and adapting those which seem useful. Significant budget cuts on material and supplies and texts measurably add to their workload. The single most timely and cost-effective way to remain current, fresh and responsive is through continuing collaboration. That means common time. That means professional development days.

Professional development days are also an irreplaceable mechanism through which teachers can be made aware of any number of new situations to which we must be sensitized, adapt and respond. Professional development days are the one time when teachers can learn simultaneously, as we did in the '70s and '80s, of the implication of the changing structure of the family on education, of the particular culture needs of new groups within our communities or of the impact of new technologies and the need to adapt and respond, and in the nineties, of the need to develop and maintain programs to contain and reverse trends toward violence and alienation, drug and alcohol abuse, sexism and racism. We need this time to continue to allow our schools to adapt, not stagnate, in the face of whatever changes the next decade brings.

Professional development days allow an irreplaceable opportunity to meet with other

professionals, exchange ideas and share our knowledge. We are a great deal more self and peer taught than most people recognize. Formal training is important but not a substitute for an ongoing process.

Only rarely is formal training, example, university courses, specifically focused on what is happening with and to the student within a class today. It can provide the basic tools, some competencies, some philosophies and goals. The ongoing adaptation to particular situations with particular communities and schools requires an ongoing consultative process with others experiencing the same situations. That time together, that invaluable time is, as I might add, the training for which there are no salary increases on the salary grid and for which none are sought.

Would I take my children to a doctor or refer a problem to a lawyer or accountant or have a tradesperson install a complex new system in my house who has not been in the constant process of upgrading and consultation with peers to familiarize him or herself with the newest research and methods? Of course, I would not. Nor would you. Progressive management in dynamic industries recognize the need for this consultative time and encourage it as very cost-effective training and problem solving.

Learning, itself, is one of the most complex processes known. Our children are one of our most valuable resources. Should we sell them and those teachers who are entrusted to their care, nurture, socialization and learning short?

The second premise of this bill is, we believe, that there are serious financial problems, and we must all share the tightened belt. This, I would submit, is fallacious. All are not being asked to equally share the tightened belt. Public sector services and public sector workers are being targeted.

Public education budgets are being targeted while private schools have had their funding increased every year for the past five years. For public schools that translates into fewer support services, fewer texts and more workload for teachers who have, until now, attempted to deliver the same services with declining resources.

In the River East School Division, high schools have been assigned an additional credit for each teacher to teach, an additional workload some

have argued equates to the equivalent of an extra 35 unpaid workdays per annum. Schools have reached a critical point beyond which there is not much more flex without there being serious repercussions in the quality of education.

If we, as a province, want to remain competitive in world markets, one essential factor is an educated workforce and a buoyant, hopeful youth. A quality education is an essential component in that scenario.

The third premise of this bill that must be addressed is one of fairness. Is there an assumption that teachers are overpaid? Teachers, as a group in this province, have had their salaries steadily eroded since the early '80s. In real constant dollars—inflation accounted for—salaries are approximately 20 percent lower than they were a decade ago.

Workloads are incredibly heavier as we have stretched first to meet the needs of increasing complex situations on our doorsteps and secondly to do the job with declining resources.

Eventually, there comes a breaking point, a point where individuals can no longer commit more and more of themselves for less and less without something else giving. Do we really want our children taught by overstressed, overworked, underappreciated teachers coping with fewer supports? Do we really want to penalize our hard working dedicated teachers for problems that are not of their own making? Do we wish to decrease their ability to be effective teachers for our youth?

Teachers are dedicated, but we are not invulnerable. We need time to reflect and to consult in order to continue to be effective. We, too, must feed our families and pay our mortgages. We, too, must plan our pensions for our retirement. This bill undermines not only our current salary base but our pensionable years as well. This is an additional burden that teachers must carry. In many ways, our teachers are aging and beginning to plan for retirement.

\* (2250)

The final premise of the bill appears to be that the sanctity of the collective bargaining process is violated. Section 5(1)(b) does specify that consultation must take place between employer and employee. However, Section 5.4 requires a bargaining unit to attend and allows the employer to impose if no agreement is reached within 30 days.

This is not open and equal bargaining. It is quibbling over maybe which one will have to swallow the bitter pill.

In summation, we believe this bill, combined with reduction in budgets and the limitations imposed on local taxation by Bill 16, will have and is having a very negative impact on the membership on our public schools. It does not meet the test of fairness, it undermines the collective bargaining process and impacts very negatively on school climate and ultimately on a quality public education.

We believe our teachers have worked long and hard to ensure a quality product to deliver to our community. We believe we have done our part. We ask that public policy makers share that responsibility with us and do theirs. Reverse Bill 22.

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

**Mr. Alcock:** Thank you, Mr. Wolfe. There are two questions I have. You referenced the issue of fairness and you touched on the question of pensions. It strikes me from other presentations that that very principle of fairness is violated by the fact that older teachers, teachers who are preparing for retirement, will pay a larger price as a result of Bill 22 than will younger teachers who are still some distance away.

The second question though is, you mention here the nature of the bargaining process. What happened in your division? What was the nature of the discussions between you and the division? Did they look for other solutions to this, as the minister suggested they could have, or did they simply come in and implement the powers that were given to them under Bill 22?

**Mr. Wolfe:** The teachers association, the division did not take all the means that they had to resolve this issue. Of course, they were limited by, it was Bill 16, to the amount of levy they could raise. They chose not to go to the maximum.

Now, I realize that they have a duty to the taxpayers, but as teachers we felt that they could have gone to the maximum to ensure that the cutbacks did not have to happen.

**Mr. Alcock:** In a sense, having 22 as a weapon, they did not need to sit down and negotiate alternative methods, and they did not need to exercise their option under 16.

**Mr. Wolfe:** The short answer to that is yes. You are quite right.

**Mr. Alcock:** So in a sense, despite the protestations of the government that 22 does not violate collective bargaining at all, that it is simply "a tool," that would not seem to have been the way that it was used in your division.

**Mr. Wolfe:** I think Bill 22 does violate the collective bargaining process and very undemocratically and very unfairly. It certainly throws into question any collective agreement, anything that has been negotiated. It also, as I mentioned in my brief here, has a very negative impact on the pension.

**Mr. Alcock:** Yes. That pension issue strikes to, I guess, the issue of fairness here. Do you have any sense of the number of teachers that will be affected by the changes in pension entitlements?

**Mr. Wolfe:** My understanding is, every teacher is affected by Bill 22. Part of their problem is of course that every school division has reacted differently to Bill 22. Winnipeg No. 1 has not taken any PD, administration days from their teachers, and there are some school divisions which, I think, like Evergreen, have taken a total of six days, so all those affect on pensions. That is a real issue I have with Bill 22 because you are right, it takes away that whole fairness issue.

**Mr. Alcock:** Of course, it also adds to some competitive pressures between divisions, if one is not taking any PD days and your division is. Over time it creates a more attractive employment opportunity in one and one that may make it more difficult for you to recruit.

**Mr. Chalrperson:** Mr. Santos, with a very quick question. The presenter's time is just about up.

**Mr. Santos:** Do you think that, with the elimination of professional development days in your school, there will be a corresponding decline in the level of teaching, teachers' morale, teachers' initiative and teachers' creativity?

**Mr. Wolfe:** Yes, very much so. Those PD days, those administration days are vital to our profession. It allows us to learn new techniques, new methods. Schools are, I am sure you all know, quite different from back in the '60s, '70s, when we were going to them. The whole issue of mainstreaming and the whole issue of violence, all those many, many issues that we are dealing with in public schools nowadays, we need time to upgrade, we need time to learn how to deal with

those issues. Taking those away harms students; it harms kids.

Of course, you cope as best as you can, but the bottom line is that it harms our kids because we are not learning those techniques. The thing is, nothing is static; it is always changing; there are always new things. What we are learning now as teachers is how to deal with violent students, learning mediation skills. We are learning techniques to deal with them, some of them physical, some of them not physical. Up to two years ago that was unheard of in a public school.

So I am just saying that we constantly need upgrading to deal with new issues.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Wolfe. Thank you for your time.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Manness:** Mr. Chairperson, it has come to my attention in the case of Mr. Wolfe that, in essence, was the third time his name was called, and I understand why that has happened.

Thank you, Mr. Wolfe, it has nothing to do with your presentation.

**Mr. Chairperson:** It is on procedure.

**Mr. Manness:** It is on procedure.

**Mr. Wolfe:** Can I just say, I wanted to thank—could I just say something?

**Mr. Chairperson:** Sure.

**Mr. Wolfe:** I was going to make mention of that. I am not sure if I should be thanking you or the Clerk in the office for being allowed to put my name on for a third time. I thought that was quite commendable, and I wanted to, since you brought it up, thank you.

**Mr. Manness:** As magnanimous as that may seem, that is potentially very problematic, of course, because there are many, many people that have been disenfranchised because their name has been called twice. Of course, there have to be rules in place, and that is why, Mr. Chairperson, in fairness to process, I move

THAT from this point forward for the consideration of Bill 22 no person who has indicated their desire to present to this committee shall have their name, their organization's name, or a combination of the above, called more than twice.

**Motion presented.**

\* (2300)

**Mr. Alcock:** I appreciate your supplying the copy of the motion. I think we indeed have a problem now in that we have established a precedent that allows anyone who has been called more than twice to be called a third time. I am wondering, on what basis do we disenfranchise those other people who are in the same position that Mr. Wolfe was? I would simply suggest that, if the minister wants to change this and make it three times and allow those people to have the same opportunity that Mr. Wolfe was allowed, I would have no difficulty supporting this motion. But I think to change the rules midstream does not add to this issue of fairness that the minister keeps coming back to in all his discussions about the changes that he is attempting to introduce.

We do have a number of people, people whom I know I would be interested in hearing from, who, because of the way in which the minister has moved the timing of these meetings around, have been disenfranchised. If we are extending that now, if we are allowing people to be three times on the list, we should allow all the people who wish to present to be three times on the list.

**Mr. Manness:** Again, it is evident that some people have waited a long time, many hours. I can think of Dr. Goldstine who waited countless numbers of hours, so he would not lose his second call, and I think of many others. In fairness to those who have put in so many hours to wait, I think it is a total loss of fairness if now the easy way to make a presentation is not having to sit through all this period, but ultimately wait until the list shortens and then reregister, after the long-standing practice of these committees for years has been two calls. I say to the Chairperson that that is the degree of fairness we have always offered, and we should maintain that.

**Mr. Laurendeau:** I move that the question be put.

**Floor Comment:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order, please. On the motion put forth by Mr. Laurendeau, I move that the question be put.

All those in favour, please say yea.

**Some Honourable Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Chairperson:** All opposed, please say nay.

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Chairperson:** In my opinion, the Yeas have it.



**Mr. Ashton:** Mr. Chairperson, I know this may offend members of the committee. I am going to ask for a recorded vote.

I may not be able to speak on this motion, but at least I can call for a recorded vote.

**A COUNTED VOTE** was taken, the result being as follows:

Yeas 5, Nays 4.

**Mr. Chairperson:** The motion is carried.

**Mr. Ashton:** Mr. Chairperson, just on a point of procedure, since I did not have the chance to speak on this, I did not make this point previously, I am trying to get some indication of the interpretation of this particular motion, because I note that it says, shall have their name, their organization's name or a combination of the above called more than twice.

I am just trying to determine what the government's intent from that was, because as I read it, it could have a wide variety of interpretations that would, for example, potentially prevent someone that is from The Manitoba Teachers' Society, the Manitoba Federation of Labour from speaking. What is the intent of that? What is the interpretation of this new policy that has been adopted by this committee by motion? It is a new policy, Mr. Chairperson. I am wondering, at least, if the minister could tell me what the interpretation of this particular motion is.

**Mr. Manness:** Mr. Chairperson, any individual citizen has a right to speak. I see Mr. Hilliard in the audience, for instance. Certainly, the Manitoba Federation of Labour has spoken, but there is absolutely nothing in this motion that would prevent Mr. Hilliard from speaking. That is not the intent, but individuals that have missed two callings of their name and now are reregistering, as has been the case, this will now prohibit that, in fairness to all those who have been disenfranchised.

**Mr. Ashton:** Mr. Chairperson, I asked an interpretation. The minister threw in some editorial comments. This has not been the procedure. I have been in many committees where people have registered right up until the last minute, including people who have been missed previously, and usually the process we followed in the committees, they gave some sort of notice, and I would suggest that we might want to try and deal with those committees in that way. Committees usually work far better by consensus, where there is some flexibility in terms of the rules, in comparison to

when the government at this late hour in the committee sittings starts bringing in a motion. So I raise that point to respond to the editorial comment brought in by the Minister of Finance, because this is not normal procedure. Most committees operate by consensus.

This committee has, from the beginning, been dealt with in a totally arbitrary fashion by the government by using its majority, and when it gets to the point where members of the committee cannot even participate in debate on motions that government members have moved, let alone motions they have moved themselves, Mr. Chairperson, I find that highly unusual. I find it interesting, we have seen the question put tonight on more occasions in one committee sitting than we have probably seen in the last 10 years in this House.

So if that is the way the government intends to proceed, let it be known on the record that this government does not wish to proceed in any way, shape or form by consensus, and let not the minister put on the record the false statement that he is trying to be fair to members of the public who have sat during the committee hearings. The intent was to shut off the list, period, and that is what the minister has done.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order, please. The question has been put on the motion put forth by the honourable Minister of Finance. From this point forward, for the consideration of Bill 22, no person who has indicated their desire to present to this committee shall have their name, their organization's name, or a combination of the above called more than twice.

All in favour, please say yea.

**Some Honourable Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Chairperson:** All opposed, please say nay.

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Chairperson:** In my opinion, the Yeas have it. Recorded vote.

**A COUNTED VOTE** was taken, the result being as follows:

Yeas 5, Nays 4

**Mr. Chairperson:** In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Chairperson:** The next person to be called is Mr. Chris Christensen. Ms. Mary Wallace.

Ms. Wallace, did you have a written presentation?

\* (2310)

**Ms. Mary Wallace (President, CUPE Local 500):**

No, I am sorry, I did not decide until 4:30 this afternoon that I would be here.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay, well, you may proceed.

**Ms. Wallace:** So I have very rough notes.

**Mr. Chairperson:** You may proceed with your notes then.

**Ms. Wallace:** Good evening, everybody.

My name is Mary Wallace. I am president of CUPE Local 500, Municipal Hospital Unit. I am also a very angry and frustrated health care worker. I have just spent the most horrendous seven days of my career at the Municipal Hospital, being with staff who have been told of layoffs, redeployment in other departments and units or having their hours reduced.

The administration tells us we have to reduce our budget this year, '93-94, by \$900,000; '94-95, \$838,000; in the year '95-96, \$1,097,000. All I hear are cuts, cuts, cuts. Frankly, they are getting too close to the bone. Pretty soon we are going to have dangerous staffing levels at the hospital and one day we are going to have a serious problem. You are going to be ending up with lawsuits because patients are not being looked after properly and all kinds of things. Staff are going to be overworked, they are going to make drug errors, medication, all kinds of mistakes because their workload is so great.

I pick up the paper and all I hear is, health care reforms, health care reforms. I am fed up with it. You cut, we bleed.

At the hospital we are faced with a reduction of staff by 30 percent in administration and support staff and 20 percent in social service. This is a mandate from MHO which has been filtered down from the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard).

Where does the government get these ideas and figures from? Connie Curran. Of course, we all know her. She is an American. They cannot even look at managing their own health care system, and as you know they wanted to look at our health care. At our hospital we had the Doreen Brigg staffing study. They were at our hospital a day and a half looking at three hospitals. Now, you tell me, did they spread themselves thin or what?

The report that they presented was filled with inaccurate data, and they based their staffing cuts and redeployment of departments on this erroneous report. After I read the report—I managed to get my hands on it—I could not believe the facts.

They had the doctors wrong that were indicated, they had the bed count wrong. They had all kinds of things—if the report had gone back to the nursing staff and to the departments that they looked at, to have it reviewed before it went into print, some of these things could have been checked out, but as far as I know it was not.

I will tell you, a Grade 9 student would have done a better report. They would have gone into better research and presented the true facts in a better format. I call that report a piece of boondoggle, as I call this Bill 22, for which I am here to add my voice to the rising crescendo of protest.

For the MLAs who do not know the meaning of boondoggle, I looked it up in the Webster Dictionary. It is a trivial, useless or wasteful project or activity. It is pointless, useless work to waste time or money. That is exactly what I think Bill 22 is—boondoggle. You are all sitting here listening, as all of us presenters are, and I hope you are really listening to us.

Are you aware of the true impact of the 10-day unpaid leaves of absence this year and 15 next year, with the already depleted staffing accompaniment at the hospital? Direct patient care is going to go down. We are going to have less time spending with our patients.

I work as a ward clerk. For myself, I get on the ward at 8:30, and I do not stop until I leave at 4:30, which I am being paid for. I get paid for the hours, but sometimes the work is overwhelming. It really is. Some of the wards are having their ward clerks cut down in half. I know in the PCH course they do not have maybe as much work to do because of the long-term patients, but it is going to ripple over, I am sure—I can see it happening—into the other parts of the hospital where we have our long-term care and our palliative and all that. It is ridiculous.

Staff health problems are going to escalate due to the shortages of work and workload demand. Stress levels are going to be way out of sight. Can you imagine the costs of the sick time that is going to cost the administration for these employees who are going to be off? You know what stress does to

the body. Have you really thought—I can hardly read my notes—through the eroding of our health care system? Have you thought what will happen to you when you and your loved ones get into the health care system? You are cutting us by 30 and 20 percent in some departments, and you still want us to be cut more in hours with Bill 22. Like really, get real; wake up and smell the flowers.

Health care workers are leaving the province in droves. They are going to the States. Young people see no future in going into nursing or other support systems within the hospital environment. I read in the paper, you know, nursing homes, health care. You know we send people out from our hospital, from my ward—mine is general medicine—we send out patients back into the community. They are in our hospital longer because they cannot get support systems out. They cannot get them in place because of the cutbacks. That is time costing. That is costing in time and bed space.

I have this document here. This was presented to me last Wednesday at our hospital. This is a list of all the cutbacks. I had to sit with each and every one of these people when they were told. Do you know what the emotional and the stress level is at our hospital? Like, it is past my sock level. These people do not know whether they are coming or going, and you still want to give us more time off.

I do not know. I am not that well-educated in all the high finance and all the figures and everything, but I sure can see the quality of health care going down. I have been in the health care field 26 years, and I have never seen it so bad, never, ever. Sure, we have had our little cuts.

Frankly, we, at the Municipal Hospital, have not had a lot of cutbacks like the Misericordia, the Health Sciences and St. Boniface, but now we are. We are not living in la-la land anymore, we are getting the hard facts. The staffing is just terrible down there. I have never seen it worse, as I said.

When you are cutting down the staff and the levels, people are going first—they are not going to be making enough money. I do not know exactly the figures, but a lot of our staff are single parents. They are going to end up on part social assistance, they are going to end up on UIC and then welfare.

I am sure you are aware of the figures in Winnipeg alone. In Winnipeg, alone, UIC and welfare, oh gosh, I know it was in the billions of

dollars. Across Canada, social service and UIC was \$35.6 billion. I think a lot of that money should be redeployed into this health care system in keeping it healthier. I think what you are creating are masses of people who are on UIC and welfare.

I hope you realize that the quality of care in Manitoba is going to go down. At one time, we were very proud of our health care system and the quality of care. At our hospital, we were known for our quality of care.

Of course, everybody thought it was a place to die. It is not, it never has been, but because of our palliative care, that was the reputation we got. But people in the know, really knew what kind of good hospital it was and the patient care that we gave. It is going down the tubes.

I think we should look at it in a better perspective, raise up our quality and be proud once again and not tear it apart like we are doing.

\* (2320)

I think that is about all I really have to say. Speaking from the personal point, like I said, I have been there 26 years and it is horrible. Staff are giving up, they are starting not to care anymore. You cannot have that; you cannot have people like that.

Our hospital has been noted for being really family orientated. We work together as a team, and that is all disintegrating in front of us.

Thank you very much.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you very much for your presentation, Ms. Wallace.

**Mr. Alcock:** Yes, thank you, Ms. Wallace. It is interesting, you have been there 26 years. I think it was about 30 years ago, certainly in the early '60s, when the King George and the Princess Elizabeth, two of the hospitals there on the grounds, were considered, I believe the word was used, "time-expired." They were no longer considered adequate physical plants. It has taken us some three decades to get to the point of actually agreeing to build a new hospital out there.

I think it is important for you, that the hospital has suffered two blows. One of the cases that is put forward by the minister when he talks about Bill 22 is that this is the way to prevent layoffs. But not only are you experiencing the layoffs, you are also experiencing the cutbacks of Bill 22.

I think it would be interesting for you to detail for members of the committee just the extent of the layoffs that you are experiencing and how much more difficult it is going to make to deliver quality services in what is a clearly inadequate physical plant.

**Ms. Wallace:** Do you want me to state some of them? These are confidential figures, I am not too sure if I can release them, but in the King Edward Hospital they are doing a lot of bumping. They got their layoff notice, and they want to do a lot of bumping. There are about 12 staff or so that, just in the King Edward Hospital, are going to be bumped around. Some are going to be put on part-time hours, reduced hours.

We have a social worker who does a tremendous amount of work on the palliative care. He is exceptionally known for the quality and time he spends with the patients and the relatives, and he got his layoff notice.

I myself am very unhappy with that. I did very well until I got his notice, and then I lost it. [interjection] We have a respiratory unit—pardon?

**Mr. Chalrperson:** No, I am sorry, I thought that you were finished. It is okay. You may continue.

**Ms. Wallace:** We have a respiratory tech who is being laid off. We have a secretary in pastoral care who is being laid off. There is going to be a deletion in the physio department. Our speech therapist's hours have been cut. Of all things, the speech therapist, and we are partly a rehab hospital?

She is working full time now, her calendar is full, and they are cutting her hours. I know part of the reason; part of the reason is not the budget cuts.

A position in X-ray is being deleted. The CSR, they are redeveloping the whole CSR, which is materials management, which is stores, CSR and the transport—that is the transporting of patients to their appointments and that. There are going to be cuts and shuffling in there. We still have not got all the words.

There is a clerk in geriatric medicine; her place is being deleted. She is being redeployed into a new position, fortunately, for her; she is probably one of the lucky ones.

You see this, I have got two pages, three pages of people's names. I have had to deal with these people in the last week. Last night was the first

night in over a week that I was able to sleep four hours without waking up. Last night was the first night I cooked a meal, because I have been up at all hours in the night going to deal with these people at 6:30 in the morning, seven o'clock. Tomorrow morning I have got to be there at seven o'clock for another meeting to let the staffing know about their positions.

I have just about had it. I am lucky I am here tonight. I am here because I am mad. I think you all should wake up to smell the flowers, because pretty soon when you get there, there ain't going to be nobody to look after you, or the quality of your care is not going to be there.

**Mr. Alcock:** Thank you, and we are all going to get there at some point.

There is another aspect of this: I mean, not only have you not been spared the layoffs, as the minister suggested Bill 22 would, but you are going to suffer the further cutbacks under Bill 22.

I know the hospitals well; I know the King George particularly well because of the existence of the post-polio patients. The polio patients for whom that hospital has been their home since the '50s, because these are people who lived in iron lungs and could not move anywhere and have become more mobile now because of the advances in technology relative to respirators and that sort of thing.

But I note that in both wings, the second floor of the George where these people live, they have inadequate fire escapes. In fact, the fire escapes are not wide enough to take these people down in their chairs. One of the compensations for that was that there was adequate staffing around that, should you have an incident, it would be possible to move patients out. Do you have any sense on what this 10-day reduction is going to be or . . . how they are going to affect staffing on the floors?

**Ms. Wallace:** I think, seriously, it is going erode some of it. How they are going to deal with it, if they are giving them one day or if it is going to be 15 minutes at the end of each shift, that has not been decided yet. We have not even discussed it as far as I know. I have not heard what their plans are.

As far as the new hospital is going to go, I have been there 26 years. The day I was hired I was taken into the board room and shown this beautiful hospital with a tower. Well, I have been through

three plans. The only thing they have got is the new day hospital, and that day hospital is a joke.

When I first started, I was working as a nursing assistant in day hospital, in the old one. When the new one went in, I was told my position was deleted because they wanted to use my money that I get in a salary to hire a nurse with a B.N. to run the department. So they deleted my job.

That day hospital was equipped when I first went there to handle 45 patients. It has never seen 45 patients; I do not think it has seen any more than 30 a day. It is not utilized properly, never has been. That is something that should be looked at. It should be looked at where it could be used on the weekends, during the evening.

All these people whom we are going to be laying off and who are working and who are going to be holding down two or three jobs, you know, they are going to end up with the health care with the cutbacks and the home care. They are going to end up looking after their loved ones. They are going to have to have some respite, they have to have somewhere for their loved ones to go to have a break, and that place is not utilized, never has been.

As far as the new hospital, I got four years and four months to go and I do not think I am going to see it. It is not a nice picture.

**Mr. Chalrperson:** Thank you very much for your presentation, Ms. Wallace. Thank you very much.

I will now call upon Richard Sparling. Did you have a written presentation, Mr. Sparling.

**Mr. Richard Sparling (Private Citizen):** Unfortunately not.

**Mr. Chalrperson:** You may begin then with your notes, Mr. Sparling.

**Mr. Sparling:** My voice will probably be crackling. I am nursing a sore throat.

Thank you for providing first of all an evening session. My days are very busy, as yours are as well, and I respect the fact that we are both here at this late hour. Thank you for your time.

I am speaking as a junior academic, a young professor at the University of Manitoba. I have been at the department of microbiology for the last three years. Before that I was doing post-doctoral research in Germany. Before that I was doing my Ph.D in the States, so I am a little bit green when it comes to politics back in my old home country, and

I have only been in Manitoba for the last three years.

For background, I accepted the position when I was interviewed four years ago at the University of Manitoba because I was very impressed with the department, the program and the professors there.

\* (2330)

With that preamble, I wish to make two points. First of all, the proposed, and I do think it is still just proposed, legislation has already caused the university to reduce our work year by six days or to reduce our salary by roughly 6 percent.

Unfortunately for me, I will not be able to take advantage of these extra holidays, whether they be paid or unpaid. Indeed, like most politicians or like most members of my department, I find it difficult to take all my entitled holidays and vacation times anyway and indeed usually tend to take a 50-hour workweek.

I wish to ask you, what part of my work, as defined by the university, which means to do sound research, sound teaching and sound community service, should I reduce so as to take advantage of these extra six days which you have empowered the university to deduct from my salary?

As I mentioned, there are three things under which I am judged as a professor: my quality in research, my quality in teaching and my quality in service. So what would happen if I would reduce by 2 percent my research? I mean, I have six extra days off. Well, that is six extra days less of research, but I cannot. I am mandated by the university to build and maintain a solid research program. My field, which is bioremediation is a very competitive area, and as you well know, grants are very difficult to obtain these days. Reduction in 2 percent of my productivity may be the difference between getting and losing my next grant, yet I would think that in this day and age, bioremediation would be a very, very important field to develop in Manitoba.

I am interested in bioremediation from foreign manure to PCBs. I work with anaerobic bacteria. I actually love sludge. One of my goals, and I have been discussing this with people in both soil science and at Manitoba Hydro for contracts, is it would be very important to develop Manitoba technology to solve Manitoba problems. Right now, for example, Manitoba Hydro has difficulties bioremediating certain diesel fuel spills that it has in

the North, and it is using California-made technology, technology that works but that has been developed in a rather warm climate. I doubt the success rate of the bioremediation treatment that they will provide for northern Manitoba to clean up these diesel problems.

We have problems with sewage. We have problems with agricultural fecal materials, et cetera. We should be able to, in Manitoba, find our own methods and means of best taking care of these problems. So I am stuck. I cannot reduce 2 percent of my research. Furthermore, my time and the time of my students in the lab is dedicated and is dictated by the micro-organisms with which I work. Just to give you an analogy, if I were a farmer, and I have indeed several friends that are farmers, many of them would love to take a vacation, but have you ever thought of asking a cow, sorry, I cannot milk you today; I am going for a day's holiday. That usually does not tend to work.

Indeed, I went to the lab on Sunday evening to do some work, and one of my students was there. The bugs had dictated that he would have to be there at that particular time. Indeed, to my wife's curse, I have been known to work on Christmas Day for a couple of hours just so I could start something so that I could be productive two or three days later. One year, to be anecdotal, I was very fortunate to be there on Christmas Day because one of our large departmental freezers was not functional. The temperature had gone up from minus 70. It was up to minus 20. Had I not per chance been there, maybe tens of thousands of dollars of samples could have been lost. It is just to say that it is very difficult for me to reduce my workload in research.

So what about teaching? Academics do not teach much. Indeed, one can say, I only teach three hours a week. Yes, three hours a week, but how many hours of preparation? I had to rebuild one of the courses I teach from scratch. I did not like what had been taught in that program, in that course before, so I wanted to put my signature on this senior course. Now, mind you, when we reach senior level, most textbooks are out of date. I had to read the literature. I had calculated and estimated about 16 hours of reading per hour lecture to develop the course and another six or seven hours a week of looking at the literature over the period of the year to maintain my course current for the next year.

Indeed, I remember presenting last semester a lecture in which I came up to this class and said, I have spent two weeks preparing this, and I just found a paper yesterday which contradicts everything I have wanted to tell you. It happens. I feel the students deserve the cutting edge. They need to know the cutting edge, if nothing else, so they will be excited to go on to further research, to go on to things that are potentially important for Manitoba, obviously.

One trivial example could be, three years ago when I started teaching, I gave an aside on the possibility of forming plastics from bacterial storage material. Last year, scientists were planning to clone the genes for those plastics into potatoes in order to make plastic potatoes, which may be a lot better harvest and a lot more lucrative harvest than the standard starch.

So I try to keep current. I try also to have—[interjection] Unfortunately, we do not have the enzymes to digest this. It would stand quite heavily. I try—[interjection] Yes, I see some people have already plastic lined up. Is that because you used the four food groups, potato chips, coffee and hamburgers—yes.

But I also try to be available for my students. I am lucky, I teach third and fourth year students. I do not teach on television to a thousand students. I actually have contact. I teach about 30 or 40 students and the goal is to excite them, to make them think. Sometimes when they come to ask questions after class, I want to be there. I do not want to say, sorry, that is 2 percent off.

Third thing, service. The government's attitude toward post-secondary education seems to be partly our fault. As academicians, we are not well-versed in political lore, and we like very much our own work and have sometimes great difficulty in publicizing our work, in publicizing to John Public, to laymen, our work and why it is important. So I do admit that I am guilty, though trying to be on the mend, about perpetuating this type of improper attitude toward post-secondary education. But does that mean I should cut 2 percent of my service? Does that mean I should take away 2 percent of what I should be putting 2 percent more into to try to convince people that science is very important?

\* (2340)

We talk about a high-technology society, a society that is run by the advances in science, and yet we seem to have great difficulties in convincing people about the importance of science in our own society. So I am stuck. I cannot cut anywhere, and I have three children and a wife, and I would like to keep it that way. [interjection] Yes. Your children are probably older. Mine are five, three and one. I come home hoping my wife will not have cooked my children for supper. I feel it is very important to play with my children, to find time with my children. I have to balance a life. Where do I balance it?

A second problem this bill is causing is I have heard that one of the reasons for the cuts is there is a perception that salaries of civil servants are inflated compared to the private sector. Boy, I wish I could earn as much as in the private sector.

Presently in academia, salaries are lower than comparable research jobs in industry by approximately 50 percent. So why would I want to be in academia? I love teaching. I want to have a little bit of a balanced life. With teaching, some people say I am rather eloquent, so why should I stay in the lab and talk to my bugs all the time?

So if I want to use my gifts best, I think academia is my place, but still it is very tempting. It is to the point that it is difficult to recruit good professors. For example, in engineering—and I am right now on a committee looking into a new position. One professor has retired and they are wanting to replace this person in environmental engineering. The problem is that bachelors of engineering often make salaries that are greater than Ph.Ds in engineering in academia. So it is very difficult to recruit good engineers to teach engineers.

I do not teach engineers. I teach pre-med students very often, but yet my quality, I am sure, is important to the quality of the doctors, the pharmacists who are being produced through the university. So our salaries are not very competitive. I am not sure that I would have decided to come here so enthusiastically had I been recruited and interviewed this year rather than four years ago. Indeed, some of our better professors that are in their early middle career are considering looking at the want ads again. Worse—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Sparling, you have approximately about five minutes.

**Mr. Sparling:** Oh, excellent.

Just to finish, my best friend is a son of a farmer and a welder. He finished school at age 16, is now doing excellent work as a welder. He has no difficulty finding a job. He makes good money. His house is pretty well paid off already. He thinks I am stupid because I have 22 years of education. That means I have not earned money until I was 28. I do confess my salary to be livable. I do not save much money, but I have only started now earning money. I did not start at 16.

So I am not sure when I will catch up. I was told by my parents, my father especially who was a good labourer, keep going in school. You are getting good grades. Come on. He is proud of me. He calls me doctor. But I am not sure that I will be able to provide a standard of living any higher for my children than my father, who was a foreman working for Noranda.

Finally, maybe you might want to ask, so what are we supposed to do with the deficit? It is a difficult problem. It is a problem that has been lasting for a long time. But I say, if you are talking about developing a high-tech industry, if you are talking about developing people, Canadians that are marketable, Canadians are not marketable at lower-end jobs. That is why all our industry is going to Mexico anyway. We need people with high education. We need people with the technology. We need to develop technology in Canada so we can export our technology.

But no matter what, I think most of us would agree that the direction of the economy is toward high technology. If we develop our own technology and if we have pride in our university system because those technologists that are produced here are proud of being Manitobans, they will want to stay here. They will found businesses. Businesses will be attracted here.

I think that maybe an investment in the education system and in the quality of the personnel working in education, especially in research, is the investment that Manitoba needs for the long term.

Thank you very much for your attention.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you very much, Mr. Sparling.

**Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources):** I have an affinity with you when you indicate that—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Enns, maybe you could pull the mike up a little. Mr. Enns, can you bring—that is it. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Enns:** Oh, my words are not that important to be recorded for posterity as long as Mr. Sparling hears me.

I have an affinity with Dr. Sparling when he indicates to the committee that he has found himself working on Christmas Day. I do have to feed my cattle on Christmas Day as well as New Year's Day, and I get much the same reaction from my spouse that you indicated.

**Mr. Sparling:** It is a really hard balancing act.

**Mr. Enns:** Really the only question I have is, and I do not think anybody in this committee is not cognizant of the importance of research, post-graduate work in the province, but you have indicated that you seem to lay stress on the importance of finding Manitoba resolutions to Manitoba problems. Are you, Doctor, really suggesting to us that we should continue to find and fund research to Manitoba problems that may have been resolved by research in Saskatchewan or Britain or California?

**Mr. Sparling:** Not necessarily in Saskatchewan, but in Britain and California, where the climate may be different, where the problems may be analogous but different due to different types of soil, due to different types of climate, the solutions may be different. The other aspect is, if we are going to import something from Saskatchewan, would it not be more lucrative to us to export to Saskatchewan our solutions?

**Mr. Enns:** I do not take issue with that. I am just saying that if a problem that we are having in Manitoba through research that has been funded somewhere else has been found applicable to our situation, surely you are not suggesting to this committee that we should—

**Mr. Sparling:** I am not looking for redundancy any more than you.

**Mr. Enns:** —that we now raise intellectual borders up around here—we cannot take research from Saskatchewan, we cannot take research from Britain, we cannot—

**Mr. Chairperson:** I am sorry, I am going to have to take my prerogative as Chairperson and call time, because time has run out. I am sorry, Mr. Sparling. Thank you very much for your presentation.

**Mr. Ashton:** Just on a matter of procedure. We are 10 minutes away from our scheduled hour of adjournment. I am just wondering if we might want to hear the next presenter and continue to the end of that presentation, but I think we might want to signal that fact to the presenter at the beginning.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Alexander Basilevsky. Fletcher Baragar. Robert Hilliard.

Did you have a written presentation, Mr. Hilliard?

**Mr. Robert Hilliard (Private Citizen):** No, I do not.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay, you may begin your presentation, Mr. Hilliard.

\* (2350)

**Mr. Hilliard:** As the Minister of Finance has noted, my employer is the Manitoba Federation of Labour, but I nevertheless have some views that I would like to give to this committee. I have no intention at all of regurgitating our brief that has been presented previously, but there are a few points that I would like to emphasize about the impact of this bill and the process that the government is using and the government's spin that is being used to justify it.

The first is that the public of Manitoba is being told that these measures are necessary in order to address a very serious deficit situation. First of all, the government tells us that by implementing this bill there will be a savings to the public purse of something approximating \$130 million.

I suppose that figure is calculated by taking an average wage, then multiplying that by how many public servants will be affected by this legislation, and then arriving at that figure. But what is not taken into consideration is the amount of money that will be necessary to keep essential services going, which the government has promised to do.

They have not taken into consideration with that figure how many of those employees covered by Bill 22 actually are not paid out of the public purse at all, Crown corporations, for example.

Why is it that people working for Manitoba Hydro, MPIC, Manitoba Telephone Systems and others are being covered by this bill when there is no relationship whatsoever to the public purse? Why are these people being included if these measures are necessary to address the deficit? In addition to that, we have a number of employers at arm's-length relationships with the provincial



government; the school boards, for example, hospital boards, nursing homes and others, which have taken a look at Bill 22, have tried to see how it could be implemented in their facility and have concluded that it is not possible to do it.

I would just like to read you a short quotation from the Human Resources Department of Deer Lodge Centre in response to the bargaining agent there about a wage reopener and the effect of Bill 22 on their bargaining. I will quote one paragraph in the Deer Lodge Centre's response to the operating engineers, and this is a quotation: Quite frankly, we cannot see ourselves implementing Bill 22 so as to allow full unpaid days off in sufficient numbers to achieve the required 2 percent cost reduction.

We say this because we do not believe that we are so richly staffed so as to enable us to schedule unpaid days off for many of our nursing staff without also scheduling replacement staff to cover all or most of the shift. The scheduling of full unpaid days off, then, would be pointless.

This is the administration of Deer Lodge Centre. Quite frankly, they took a look at your Bill 22 and found it absolutely impossible to implement.

As well, once you discount the figure that the provincial government states will be their saving in the public purse, it certainly is nothing near \$130 million. I know that there are organizations that have calculated that figure down to something in the neighbourhood of actually about \$20 million. Whatever the figure is, it is certainly a very small percentage of the \$130 million.

One other thing, of course, that the government has not considered in their so-called \$130 million savings is the loss in income tax revenue that, had those people been paid at that level, would be contributing back to the public purse. There will also be a spin-off effect on welfare rolls. It will increase the cost of welfare to the provincial government. None of these things have been part of the public spin about the value of Bill 22.

In addition, if deficit reduction was really the goal of Bill 22, the government could have embarked on a number of other initiatives that would be far more effective at reducing the deficit than Bill 22 is—for example, the tax breaks that this government has implemented since 1988 to the tune of \$213 million. If, in fact, the deficit is a crisis, and if it is a crisis that is necessary to declare war on your own

employees, then why is it at the same time that the government feels it is also okay to give tax breaks to businesses and wealthy Manitobans and others to the tune of \$213 million? If the deficit is a crisis, then why do we at the same time provide these tax breaks?

One of the previous speakers was here earlier this evening representing a school district; he pointed out that school funding for private schools has not been reduced. In fact, the government could very easily cut out \$2 million just to the elite private schools, never mind the parochial schools, just the elite private schools. Why cannot they afford to take that kind of a hit, and why is it only your own employees that can afford it?

What about the uncollected sales taxes? Mr. Chairperson, \$9 million dollars, \$15 million, whatever it is, it is certainly a substantial figure. You could do some things that, for example, the British Columbia government did, imposing a wealth tax. If Manitoba imposed a wealth tax on Manitobans earning in excess of \$70 million a year, a surtax of 1.5 percent, that would generate \$48 million, more savings to the public purse, or a greater impact on the bottom line deficit than Bill 22 would have.

There is actually quite a long list. I think that this government ought to be defending Manitobans to the federal government that are cutting back continuously on federal transfer payments. We do not hear this government protesting that. We did not hear this government protesting at all the changes to the UI system that will have another net impact on the provincial coffers by instead of having these people collect unemployment insurance, they will now wind up collecting welfare.

We could have imposed a gas tax of a little over a cent a litre. That could have generated close to \$20 million. There are a whole range of other options out there that could be implemented that would have a much more beneficial impact on the bottom line than Bill 22, which really does not have much of an impact at all.

So, if Bill 22 does not have a great impact on the deficit, then what is the real reason the government is doing this? I think the real reason the government is doing this is a blind, ideological desire to reduce government, to reduce public services to Manitobans, as much as possible turn government into something irrelevant and turn the

entire economy and the operation of our province over to the private sector, something that the private sector has never been able to do and is not responding to very well now either.

The second point I would really like to make is the process the government has used to—I think the only way to really describe it is to call it imposing their will on Manitobans against all of their wishes. This is a House in this Legislature that passes laws and constantly tells the citizens of this province that they have to respect those laws. But we do not see the government doing that themselves.

We saw with Sunday working legislation a complete disregard for existing statutes and, in fact, government sending out signals to enforcement agencies to not enforce the law on Sunday working despite the fact that the so-called replacement legislation with a sunset clause never even finished the process. It was only recently after the sunset had expired that the government finished that process, but all along, during the whole period of time, you sent out signals to the enforcement agencies in our province not to enforce existing law.

\* (0000)

Then along comes Bill 22. After very preliminary consultations with the main bargaining agent covered under Bill 22, that being the Manitoba Government Employees, and while the union leadership was involved in a process of consultation with their membership in response to a request from you to open up their collective agreement, while they were in that process, you blind-side them, cut them off at the knees, impose your will and say, forget about the collective bargaining process. This is what we are going to do anyway. That is exactly what you did.

This total disregard for the collective bargaining process I only encounter amongst employers who have no experience at all with collective bargaining. Usually, when we have the opportunity—and in fact, we did have an opportunity last week to sit down and discuss issues of mutual concern with business people who had no experience, some of whom had no experience with unions, had no experience with collective bargaining, and as a result of that, it built up a lot of myths and preconceived notions about what labour leaders

were like, what they did and what their objectives were.

We found that after you spend a couple of hours in the same room with them, we dispelled some of those myths. We did not have two heads after all, they concluded. In fact, we were concerned about the economy as much as they were, and we wanted to promote the economy just as they did. We may have disagreed on some elements, and it was important to identify those, but we found that in this kind of a communication, in sitting down and discussing areas of mutual concern and trying to problem solve, that, in fact, there was an opportunity to dialogue, and there were areas to arrive at consensus, and it did not take us a great deal of time.

This government has shown no willingness to do that with their bargaining agents. They have imposed their will through legislation instead. In violation of ILO conventions, and I am sad to have observed our Premier (Mr. Filmon) publicly seeming to mock the ILO conventions, as if they were irrelevant and of no consequence. Again, I think that strikes me as being disrespectful of process, disrespectful of consultation, disrespectful of trying to have a win-win negotiating system where everybody benefits.

Another aspect of this bill that I find particularly offensive is the retroactivity aspect which screams out to members of the public, screams out to presenters to this committee, that you are going through the motions here, that you do not have any intention of changing anything. One of the previous speakers here, Mr. Wolfe, his presence here seemed to generate so much concern that there had to be another motion passed to restrict people like Mr. Wolfe from presenting despite the fact that he clearly indicated he had made some personal sacrifice to come here to present his views.

That aside, this retroactivity aspect of Bill 22 says that you want to get this process over with, that you do not value the consultation, that you do not really want to hear from Manitobans. You have made up your minds. You are not going to change one comma in this bill. It is going to go, come hell or high water.

Well, we will see if the proof is in the pudding. You certainly have had an awful lot of presenters here. They have presented a lot of views from a lot

of different quarters from all over the province from different economic sectors and everything else. So we will see how many changes you are prepared to make.

But in summing up, what I really want to say is this bill has been dissected. I am not going to go through that. You have heard from a lot of presenters about the attack on collective bargaining. I do not believe you appreciate what that means. I do not believe that you appreciate what it means to collect a weekly or a biweekly paycheque that just covers the bills, and you have to go from one paycheque to the next to do it. You say you are a farmer, Mr. Manness. Others have different sources of income.

**Floor Comment:** Some of us have done it all our lives, my dear friend.

**Mr. Hilliard:** Well, that is fine, but I do not believe that you are spending too much of your time or too many of your members of the government have an appreciation for what it is like to collect a weekly or a biweekly paycheque that barely meets the bills.

You are more than prepared to disregard those people's concerns and those people's rights in this society to try to bargain a decent wage and benefits for themselves and decent working conditions. You have tossed those concerns right aside with no concern of yours at all. You think it has absolutely nothing to do with anything fair or just and that you are right and that is all there is to it, and your will will prevail.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Hilliard for your presentation.

**Mr. Manness:** I was not going to comment until I was challenged to do so by Mr. Hilliard. How can he possibly make the statement he does? I mean he throws it out as a matter of fact. He does not know the circumstances of certainly myself as the Minister of Finance or any member around this table. I think it is totally unjust and unfair to make that statement like he does, as if he has the wisdom of Solomon. I am troubled with that, Mr. Chairperson, because nobody really knows the financial circumstances of any of the people around this table. I think it just lessens the impact that Mr. Hilliard is trying to make.

**Mr. Hilliard:** Could I respond, please?

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Hilliard, yes.

**Mr. Hilliard:** Mr. Manness, I was not commenting on the relative wealth or lack of same that you or others may have. I was commenting more, and I will admit that it was some speculation, on the method of receiving remuneration for your work. That was the nature of my comment.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Mr. Alcock, I mean Mr. Ashton, I am sorry.

**Mr. Ashton:** We are often mistaken for each other.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Yes, you are often mistaken—he is the same height.

**Mr. Ashton:** He is the Liberal, and I am the New Democrat.

I wanted to focus in on just one section of what the presenter was talking about. I want to focus in on the bargaining aspect and the very clear evidence that exists that there was no attempt on behalf of the government to seriously discuss with MGEU anything other than what we ended up with, which was the same position of Bill 22 which was communicated to the president of MGEU when he was in The Pas at around midnight the day before it was announced by a press release in Winnipeg.

I just want to look at your perspective, coming from northern Manitoba, from a mining community. A mining company is not exactly known as being soft negotiation-wise. They are not pushovers. They are pretty tough negotiators. I am just wondering how you sort of relate your experience in northern Manitoba negotiating with mining companies to what you are seeing with this government.

I found it really intriguing what you said, that they portray the same sort of characteristics of people that are not used to collective bargaining, that the companies that are not used to it and have all sorts of misconceptions. I mean, I really hear all the misconceptions on a daily basis about what unions are, and we hear the attacks on union bosses and the rest of it, but how do you compare it, what you are seeing, having seen what happens in the private sector with some pretty tough negotiators?

**Mr. Hilliard:** Your observation about mining companies certainly meets with my experience. I do think there is a very fundamental difference, however. We certainly played hardball at the bargaining table. We have had our strikes. We have even had a few wildcats. We have had pretty

wild grievance meetings even, where I have seen a few hard hats being flung around the room before.

When it is all said and done, the mining company executives and the management know full well that the union is there to stay. We know full well that they are there to stay. We both realize that if the workers are going to receive a decent pay and a decent standard of living and if the company is going to receive enough profits to be able to provide that standard of living, in fact we have to find some way to resolve our differences, and we always do. It is not too often that there are long strikes. Occasionally, there are, but when they are, they still get worked out. The bottom line is that we all find a way to deal with the problem and get back

to work so that we can all go on benefitting from the enterprise.

The difference I find with the mining company executives and negotiators is that they treat us with some respect. They realize that they must deal with some of our concerns in order to get on with the job. What I find with this government instead is that if they cannot get their way, they impose it, and they are not interested in negotiating something else.

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

The time being 12:10 a.m., committee rise.

**COMMITTEE ROSE AT:** 12:10 a.m.