



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. 13 - 7 p.m., THURSDAY, JUNE 24, 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**

Thursday, June 24, 1993

TIME — 7 p.m.

LOCATION — Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRPERSON — Mr. Jack Reimer (Niakwa)

ATTENDANCE - 11 — QUORUM - 6

Members of the Committee present:

Hon. Messrs. Enns, Manness

Mr. Alcock, Ms. Barrett, Messrs. Helwer,
Laurendeau, McAlpine, Pallister, Reid,
Reimer, Santos

APPEARING:

Steve Ashton, MLA for Thompson

Jean Friesen, MLA for Wolseley

Linda McIntosh, MLA for Assiniboia

WITNESSES:

Diane de Delley, Private Citizen

Gaynor Powell, Private Citizen

David Turner, Manitoba Teachers' Society

Bob Davies, Winnipeg Teachers' Association

Levi Reimer, Seven Oaks Teachers'
Association

Marilyn von Stein, Charleswood Junior High

Neil MacNeil, Lakeshore Teachers'
Association

Geoff Tuckwell, Transcona-Springfield
Teachers' Association

Dave Normandale, Private Citizen

David Lerner, Private Citizen

Bob Bastable, Regional Support Centre
Daerwood School

Jim Nickarz, Private Citizen

Rollie Gillies, Interlake Teachers' Association

Rick Robertson, President, Manitoba School
Counsellors Association

Bill Smith, Private Citizen

WRITTEN SUBMISSION:

Errol Black, Arts Representative, BUFA
Executive Committee

MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION:

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

* * *

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

I have a lengthy list of persons wishing to appear before this committee. For the committee's benefit, copies of the presenters list have been distributed. Also for the public's benefit, a board outside this committee room has been set up with a list of presenters that have been preregistered. I will not read the list since members of the committee have copies.

Should anyone present wish to appear before this committee who is not preregistered, please advise Chamber staff at the back of the room, and your name will be added to this list.

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

I have a written submission to Bill 22 from Mr. Errol Black on behalf of Brandon University Faculty Association. Copies of the presentation have been made for committee members and were distributed at the start of the committee. The submission will appear at the back of the committee transcript for tonight's meeting.

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

I would like to remind all members of the public that this committee will also be hearing presentations on Bill 22 tomorrow, Friday the 25th, from 1 p.m. to 5 p.m. The meeting will take place in Room 255.

We will now continue with public presentations of Bill 22. I will call on Diane de Delley.

Ms. Diane de Delley (Private Citizen): Can you hear me all right there?

Mr. Chairperson: Yes. We will just get your copy here, and you may proceed.

Ms. de Delley: Dear Ladies and Gentlemen, I make this presentation against Bill 22, the commonly known Province of Manitoba, Canada, Public Sector Reduced Work Week and Compensation Management Act.

As a citizen learned in the private and public sector security services industry, a citizen knowledgeable in the economic crisis of rural Manitoba, and as an employee of the Manitoba Government Security and Parking Division, I have grave reservations on the effect of extending services to clients and public, the elimination of services to clients and public, the removal of payroll from the regional economy, the job enlargement and enrichment technique, the abuse of political power to supersede a signed, sealed employment contract, and the abuse of political power to deprive people of the right to free collective bargaining.

The Manitoba Government Services Security and Parking division supplies security and parking services to 14 government department clients in the city of Brandon. These services are provided under Property Management and range from securing government assets to enforcement on vehicle parking areas. The service further provides protection and safety to persons within and/or on government property.

The service was established in 1982 on a 24-hour, seven-day week cycle to accommodate the security and parking requirements of five clients. The initial staffing complement of nine patrol officer staff positions and one supervisory staff position still exist. Through the dedicated staff and exceptional high calibre of services delivered to the clients, the organization has realized an increase of seven clients.

However, due to government economic restraint programs and other mitigating circumstances, Brandon's clients in the Security and Parking

division have not gained technologically to enhance the service. Therefore, the service is approximately 99 percent manual labour dependent. The staffing complement has remained constant with a gross average income of approximately \$250,000.

With emphasis on Total Quality Management for the most effective and efficient productivity level, a balance must be maintained between equipment, manpower and the financial resource operating budget. There is a fine tension line between job enrichment, job enlargement and the elasticity of the breaking point.

In order to meet and exceed private sector competition in the marketplace, government service must retain a competitive edge consistent and comparable to measurement in the industrial average. To impose 800 labour hours into the present system is threatening the quality and quantity of service this organization can give to clients. The action will create regressive results, the opposite of what should be taking place in today's progressive society. The human implication indicates the threshold of staff has been reached.

Brandon has the same classification and rate of crime per capita as other centres. The increase in property crime is consistent with the national statistics. The demand for security service is required for government properties.

The impact of the 10-day reduced workweek has removed approximately \$9,600 from the economy of Brandon and the pockets of the security services staff. This money in all probability would have been spent in local businesses or education institutes. It has been withdrawn at the same time that people are struggling to incorporate medical service fees, drug costs, tax increases and user fees into already strained incomes and budgets.

The public, business community, police officers, firefighters and clients of the security service clients rely on the deterrent nature of the Government Services Security presence in the community and assistance to their services and needs respectively. These external groups have expressed concern over this proposed adjustment in the work schedule and property protection.

The vacated government properties contain millions in assets and present a higher risk for criminal activity than when the premise is occupied.

These premises will be vacated on Fridays throughout the summer months.

In order to implement the proposed legislation and program, the provincial building and supervisor's position were most affected.

The provincial building accommodates numerous field workers, health care clinics, consultation services, et cetera, on extended hours. Three days of security service were eliminated in addition to the withdrawal of the fixed evening security service. This has created confusion and inconvenience to the government employees and their clients. The supervisor's position has been converted to a transit unit, quasi-security officer job description. The patrol officer has taken up some of these duties.

* (1910)

The total quality management technique would have been more effective and accepted if the workforce had been communicated and participated in the change of tasks. In fact, the cost saving in excess of \$10,000 could have been realized with a more efficient and effective service than the proposed method.

As an experienced business person, I take exception to the fact the government intervention to break a signed, sealed employment contract. I voted, in good faith, in favor of ratification of the existing employment contract between the Province of Manitoba and the Manitoba Government Employees' Association bargaining agent for the employees of the civil service.

I fully expected and intended to uphold my responsibility and obligation as an employee to the contract. I expected the same integrity and commitment from the government.

As a past employer in this province I know that, if I had exercised the employment and compensation standards that this government has, the Department of Labour would have put locks on our business establishment forthwith. This proposed legislation reflects a double standard, one for government employers and another for private industry.

As a citizen, I do not condone the denial of the right to free collective bargaining that the proposed legislation implies. I think the government should resume their position at the bargaining table and try to negotiate a satisfactory resolve to this economic crisis.

I do not believe that any sector of society should be singled out and discriminated against for the failed economic policies of a government. To carry this legislation through is setting a dangerous precedent.

I personally feel that I am being forced to pay the penalty for a situation that I obviously had no control of or say in. This is totally unfair.

In conclusion, I hope you will reconsider the implementation of this legislation.

I thank you for your time and consideration.

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

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): Thank you, Ms. de Delley, for your presentation here this evening.

I believe, by your presentation here, that you are an employee of the government security services. Is that correct?

Ms. de Delley: Yes.

Mr. Reid: How many years experience do you have as a member of the security service?

Ms. de Delley: It is 11 years, and I had 11 years as a police officer with an audit and security service in private industry.

Mr. Reid: How many colleagues do you have working with you in this service?

Ms. de Delley: Ten full-time positions.

Mr. Reid: Can you give us an understanding here of the impact that this legislation is going to have on your personal life? We often hear that the government says that Manitobans are expected to tighten their belts. They said the same thing during Bill 70 last year where they froze the incomes of Manitobans employed in the public service.

Can you give us some kind of an indication of what impact this bill is going to have on your quality of life?

Ms. de Delley: It is downgrading it. It is definitely downgrading it.

Personally I was intending to continue university studies. I will not be doing that now for two reasons: by the time you finish work, you are ready for a day off—I think it is overextending you physically and psychologically—besides the financial burden. I, obviously, had to cut my budget by a \$1,000 per year. That means a lot.

Mr. Reid: You indicated in your presentation here as well that the government now is going to have to put at risk government properties, obviously the premises that will be vacated on Fridays throughout the summer months for when government, public-sector employees will not be working on those Fridays.

Can you give us an indication of what type of facilities we are talking about here that will not have that security protection?

Ms. de Delley: Yes, we do 14 properties. Actually, there are two properties in some locations, or two tenants. We have Probation, Land Titles, the courthouse, the provincial building, the Westman Executive Council Office; the agriculture centre and Natural Resources are on the same property. The library and the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation are on one property. We have Government Services, Rideau Park, Brandon Mental Health Centre, Highways, Corrections, the Assiniboine Community College and the Fire College and Emergency Training Centre.

Mr. Reid: Since it is obvious by what you indicate here that there are a considerable number of properties at risk, has the government indicated in any way to you or to your colleagues who will be performing any kind of security service to protect those properties during the Fridays in the summer months where you have indicated there will be no security?

Ms. de Delley: Yes, what happened is, we have two platoons of four men, and the supervisor has to replace us on our days off. So the everyday shift from now until January, we will not be finished—our group will not be finished until January.

The shift every day that we would have at the Assiniboine Community College, the supervisor has to go up and replace us there. So what it amounts to, since there were not enough days for him, every Monday and Friday that we would work a day shift at the Assiniboine Community College, he replaces us. So that means that every Monday and Friday he is at the Assiniboine Community College, and then because he has too many hours in, he has to take Wednesday off.

So that leaves the provincial building with three vacant days. There is no security there. Then on Tuesday and Thursday he goes back to his office at the provincial building, and he works there. Like,

we have one platoon working out of ACC, and a mobile platoon works out of the Brandon Mental Health Centre. The one out of the Brandon Mental Health Centre takes in the 12 properties.

Mr. Reid: So if I understand you correctly then, you or your colleagues will not be performing the duties because you are forced to take days off without pay. Then the supervisor will be filling in where possible in place of you or your colleagues to do those security duties. Is that correct?

Ms. de Delley: They took him out of the provincial building and put him at ACC is what happened.

Mr. Reid: So if I understand that correctly then, other employees, including supervisory staff, will be asked to make up for duties that would normally be covered by the regular employees, and employees are being asked to do more in this case, in particular the supervisors.

Ms. de Delley: It is a mixed basket all right. It is a total state of disarray. We just started the 1st of June.

Mr. Reid: You have indicated in your presentation as well that you take exception to the government intervention to break a signed and sealed employment contract and that you, from your part, fully expected and intended to uphold your responsibility and obligation. How do you feel?

I know you said here that you expected the government would uphold their part of the bargain in good faith. How do you feel now that the government has broken its word? How do your colleagues feel, the ones that you have talked to, now that the government has broken its word by way of Bill 22?

Ms. de Delley: We have lost confidence and trust. I have, and I think—

* (1920)

Mr. Reid: So you have lost confidence, trust and faith in the government then because they have broken their word to you as an employee?

Ms. de Delley: Yes.

Mr. Reid: What would you expect from your government in the future?

Ms. de Delley: As I said in the brief, if they wanted to save \$10,000, I could tell them right off the top of my head how to save \$30,000 without turning the whole place into a total state of disarray.

An Honourable Member: Send me a letter, please.

Ms. de Delley: Will we get our money back?

Mr. Reid: I am interested and curious in your comments here where you indicated where the government can save money. Maybe you could indicate for the benefit of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) and for other members here where the government can save that money.

Ms. de Delley: If they had implemented, which they are proposing or attempting to do, Total Quality Management, and if it had been implemented in the manner that is consistent with that practice, such as sitting down with your employees in a quality circle, or whatever you want to call it, we could show them how to save money and how to make the organization more efficient and effective. There would have been no doubt about that.

Mr. Chairperson: I would just like to point out there is about three minutes left for questioning.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Chair, by that I take it then that the government has never, ever taken the opportunity to sit down with you or any of your colleagues to consult about where cost savings can be realized and that you had fully expected the government would take that instead of freezing and cutting back your pay.

Ms. de Delley: Nobody consulted us about taking the 10 days. No.

Mr. Reid: I take it then that they never consulted you about any cost savings that might be realized through your department as well.

Ms. de Delley: Well, indirectly, but it has never amounted to anything. It is supposed to be there, but it is not there.

Mr. Reid: I am not quite sure that I follow the presenter on that, Mr. Chairperson. Maybe she could elaborate or expand.

Ms. de Delley: There have been meetings with Government Services on Total Quality Management but, unfortunately, in Brandon, for whatever reason, the security division is not part of those consultations, so no.

Mr. Reid: So then you have been excluded from the process where you and your colleagues could have provided the government with some direction on cost benefits or cost savings. Quite possibly, as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has

indicated, I am not sure if he is willing to listen to this now, since he has already cut back on the salaries of public sector employees, maybe this is an opportunity for the government to consider cost savings without affecting the income and the quality of life for people such as yourself.

I thank you for taking the time to come here to the committee this evening and making your presentation. It is unfortunate that we did not have the opportunity to travel to other parts of Manitoba to hear presenters from rural Manitoba.

Ms. de Delley: That is a thorn in our side, too.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentations this evening.

I was just going to ask whether there were any other presenters from out of town. I noticed some other people come in. If not, then we will start calling. Call Gaynor Powell? Did you have a written presentation?

Ms. Gaynor Powell (Private Citizen): Yes, I do.

Mr. Chairperson: Do we have—

Ms. Powell: Yes, I gave copies to the page.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay, then we will distribute it, and then you may proceed.

Ms. Powell: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, committee members and fellow speakers. I am here on behalf of the Telecommunications Employees Association of Manitoba, or TEAM. We represent the management employees of the Manitoba Telephone System, MTS, and are here to represent our concerns regarding the proposed Bill 22, which covers the mandated 10 days off for government departments and Crown corporations.

I am quite sure that many of you find it difficult to conceive of any employees complaining about being given 10 additional days off over and above their regularly scheduled holidays, et cetera. However, I must stress that we have not been given anything.

The 10 days have cost every employee 3.8 percent of their current wages, which negates the union negotiated raise of 3 percent we received last July. The reduction of salary is difficult to swallow coming so soon on the heels of the one-year, no-negotiation bill we suffered through prior to 1992.

This type of legislation effectively negates the powers of any union or association who are bargaining in good faith. It behooves one to ask

what faith one can have in any procedure which can be wiped out merely by the stroke of a pen. We all recognize the right of the government of Manitoba to manage its finances but have grave concerns over the extension of these rights to financially independent Crown corporations such as MTS. More than the reduction of salary, which has blackened an already murky financial picture for employees at the lower end of their salary bands, TEAM members are more concerned over the loss of time.

TEAM members understand the need for fiscal responsibility and reductions in overhead. Coupled with other measures being undertaken voluntarily by MTS, the days off and the associated rollback of salary are having a tremendous detrimental effect on the employees of MTS.

MTS has recently embarked on a Continuous Quality Improvement Program (CQI) which is aimed at improving our level of service to the public while empowering all employees to make decisions in a team environment. It is difficult to convince employees, at any and all levels, that they are valued members of a team expected to do more with less when the time frames they have to work in have been reduced by 10 days.

MTS is endeavouring to reduce its overhead, lower its debt ratio and face an increasing competitive threat. At the same time, we are being faced with a flattening of the organization and an overall reduction in the number of permanent employees at MTS. Individually, some of those tasks would be daunting. Together with the 10 days off, they are becoming almost impossible to successfully achieve.

Perhaps the most difficult to attain is to maintain our market share in the face of direct competition from other common carriers such as Unitel, who are now an international company with more funds and resources at their disposal than MTS can ever hope to have. Competition is beneficial to the public and can be healthy for the organizations participating as well, provided that all are playing the same rules on a level playing field.

As a consumer who is trying to purchase a product or service, if you called a company and were told that they were closed for the day, what would your reaction be? In the vast majority of cases, you would go to that company's competitor. The 10 days off are akin to handing our collective

heads to Unitel and other resellers on a silver platter.

We have already provided our competitors full access to our network, while we shoulder 70 percent of the cost and allow them to recompense us for their 30 percent over a 10-year period. Further government intervention will only increase competitions attraction and decrease MTS's viability as a corporation.

Although we have been perceived in the past to be a fat-cat monopoly, that is no longer true. We cannot afford to take 10 days off and be as competitive as we would like to be. It simply is not possible.

Let me pose another question. Whose service is going to suffer during the 10-day shutdown? Not the large corporations, but the average person who has a problem or needs a question answered. Again, the government is portraying itself as the friend of big business at the expense of the individual.

We are not allowed to charge a fair price for the province-wide services that we are obligated to provide. Have our subscribers been asked to shoulder the financial burden of the \$775 million Individual Line Service Program? This type of intervention is almost designed to make MTS a losing proposition, which leads one to suspect that we are being primed to become a proverbial fatted calf to be sold off at the whim of the Manitoba government.

What is the purpose of Bill 22? To reduce costs or reduce efficiency? The negative effects of this type of legislation are far-reaching not only for the corporation but also for the individuals it employs.

I realize that we are all supposed to believe that the recession is over and done but it is hard to believe, when the only thing that does not increase is the size of your pay cheque.

The legislation will also have an effect on all members of the Legislature, as many irate consumers, both corporate and individual, will be calling their MLAs to complain when their calls go unanswered. One must also surely wonder where their next votes will go.

Bill 22 is neither broad enough to ensure that all involved parties contribute to the financial well-being of Manitoba, nor narrow enough to penalize only those who have been directly involved in the deterioration of Manitoba's once

robust economy. I firmly believe that Bill 22 is not the solution to the province's problems.

I would be happy to answer any questions you have. Thank you for your time and consideration. Good evening.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Ms. Powell.

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Ms. Powell, for your presentation. You have indicated here that you are employed with MTS. Can you give us an indication on the number of years that you have been employed with MTS?

Ms. Powell: Nineteen years as of July 29 this year.

* (1930)

Mr. Reid: So you have seen an extended period of time with MTS. You have seen, obviously, some ups and downs in the company's financial picture in the conditions and the changes within the company. Can you give us an indication of how the company is performing in your estimation today?

Ms. Powell: As for the company, if you are talking about their financial picture, I mean obviously it is deteriorating.

I am more concerned, as an individual, with the reaction of the individuals that are employed by MTS. There has been a distinct lowering of morale.

I know that a lot of people perceive government departments and Crown corporations to be overstaffed and have people sitting around doing virtually nothing. In my department, we are absolutely scrambling; people are overworked. They are frustrated. They are having blowups at work which would not normally occur, and to be quite frank, in some areas the whole place is going down the bloody tubes.

Mr. Reid: I would take it then, by the comments that you have made here with respect to the morale of the employees, that this piece of legislation does not assist the employee frustration level in any way, and that in fact it would have a negative effect—[interjection]

Well, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) seems to make light of the decreased morale of the employees at MTS. It is unfortunate that he chooses to make light of the serious situation, obviously, you and your colleagues are finding themselves in—[interjection]

If the minister wants to ask questions, he is free to do so after I have asked my questions of the presenter.

An Honourable Member: Do not misquote what he says. That is not fair or honourable. Do not misquote what he says.

Mr. Chairperson: Order, please.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Chairperson, I ask you to call the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister) to order. If he wants to have the opportunity to ask questions, he is also free to ask questions and I welcome his presentation here tonight. I know that there have been other opportunities where he could have had that opportunity and did not take it, so I will give him the opportunity if he wants to ask questions—

Mr. Chairperson: Order, please. I will remind all members that the presenter has come here to make a presentation to the committee. It is up to the committee to listen to the presenter and then question the presenter. Mr. Reid to ask Ms. Powell questions.

Mr. Reid: Thank you, if you want to have the opportunity, you can—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Reid to ask questions of the presenter.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Chairperson, this is—

An Honourable Member: Poor baby.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Chairperson, if I am going to have to be subjected to abuse from the member for Portage la Prairie, I am going to ask you once again to call the member to order.

An Honourable Member: What are you talking about?

Mr. Chairperson: I did not hear any comments by anyone.

Mr. Reid: Can I ask you, Mr. Chairperson, then, to make sure that you are cognizant of the fact that the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Pallister), who is sitting next to me here, has on several occasions, while I am trying to ask questions of the presenter, said very derogatory comments to me of a personal nature, and this in no way facilitates the opportunity for me to ask questions of the presenter.

I know the government is very sensitive to the bill and the way presenters have chastised the government.

Ms. Powell, can you please give me an indication, if I am not subjected to more interruptions by the member here, next to me, then what your thoughts are, that a government that has broken its word to you as a public service employee in this province that is finding themselves overworked, overstressed by the pressures that are put upon you and colleagues? What are your thoughts about a government that would take these steps to break its word to you?

Ms. Powell: I do not really think I can repeat those in public.

An Honourable Member: Ah, go ahead.

Ms. Powell: Well, I mean, you know, it is great. You guys all sit here, you relax and you take it easy. I know you have stressful positions. I know you have a lot of responsibility and everything else, and I can appreciate the stresses that you must be under.

However, it is a real kick in the teeth to some of the people who are at the lower end of the salary scale at MTS. They just think you guys, quite frankly, are a bunch of scumbags, and I am inclined to agree with them.

I mean, you say, go out and negotiate, bargain, come up with a contract. Then you guys go, well, we do not think we want to do this this year, so we will just wipe it out. I mean, what the hell is this? It is not a game. You are playing with people's lives.

You take somebody that is a single-income family or a single parent with a child, and 3.8 percent might sound like peanuts to you, but it sure as hell is not to them. It is fine for you to sit here and think, oh yeah, like, these people are a real pain in the ass, and they are going on natter, natter, natter. It is a big deal for some of these people.

I was here last week when Kathy Ducharme from, I think it was, The Pas was talking, and it is a real threat. Maybe it is humorous to some people, but I do not think there is anything humorous about having to give up your home and move into a trailer.

You just cannot go on doing this. We had FOS and all these other things, and now you are doing it again. How much faith do you think we have in you? None—that is the answer.

Mr. Reid: Do you think that the government should have included employees of Crown corporations such as MTS and Hydro, who are obviously in a profitable financial situation at the

present time, should have included employees of these Crown corporations in this legislation, since these corporations are obviously making a profit?

Ms. Powell: Well, I do not know whether you can actually say that they are making a profit or not, but there are a number of large corporations in Manitoba that are making a profit and have done so through their friendship with the Manitoba government at the expense of the individuals in Manitoba.

So if we are going to pay our 3.8 percent, then there are some other companies that should be paying their 3.8 percent. So either widen it and put everybody in it or narrow it and restrict it to the government, but it is, like, go one way or the other, not this mickey mouse stuff.

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): I am interested in your comments about Unitel. Can you just expand upon that a little bit and how that is affecting their relationship or your potential competitive position with them?

Ms. Powell: Well, it is just as I said. If we have a new business that is trying to set up in Manitoba and they call MTS on July 2 or June 18 or July 16, they are not going to get anywhere. There is not going to be anybody there that can take an order for service. They might be able to take a message and that is all, but there are going to people at Unitel there every day of the week.

So if you wanted to buy a fridge and you phoned Eaton's and they were closed, where would you go, The Bay, Sears, The Brick? I mean, you guys are crucifying us. You really are.

Mr. Alcock: Has this been discussed with senior management at the corporation? Have they made representations to the government that you are aware of?

Ms. Powell: I do not know. It would be unfair of me to comment. I have my own suspicions, but I am not prepared to comment publicly on them.

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Was there any attempt made by management or by the government to discuss with you the effects of these changes on your working conditions? Was there ever any negotiation?

Mr. Powell: No. It was presented to us as a fait accompli. Here is the 10 days, live with it, and not only that, but we were also told what we were

supposed to say on our voice mail lest we offend anybody by saying the wrong thing.

Ms. Friesen: What is it that you are expected to say on your voice mail?

Ms. Powell: We are expected to say that this Manitoba Telephone System department, whatever, is closed today in support of the government's cost reduction program. That is a corporate communication that has been passed through MTS and I personally object.

Mr. Manness: The board supported it

Ms. Powell: I object to the board putting words in the mouth of the individual, Mr. Manness.

Mr. Manness: Who runs the organization? The board.

* (1940)

Ms. Friesen: I can appreciate your frustration with that kind of Orwellian language. It is the same kind of language that the government, as you know, uses in other areas. We have not had any tax increases in Manitoba, you know, we have just had contributions the public are making, and just a loss of some disposable income, but no tax increases in Manitoba according to this government. It is in keeping with the kind of language which this government prefers to use.

I wanted to ask about essential services, and has there been any effort to determine in conjunction with the employees or with management what are essential services at MTS and how essential services will be maintained?

Ms. Powell: Essential services have always been defined as things like trouble reporting, whether it is a residential service or for business service and that type of thing, and that has been established for a long period of time. Those were deemed the same essential services when the 10 days off was brought in.

Mr. Chalperson: I would just like to point out that the presenter has about three minutes left for questioning.

Ms. Friesen: I wanted to ask about the implications for your competition, the competitive environment that this government has deliberately created with Unitel, and the kinds of comments that you have made have raised in my mind some comparisons to education, and essentially the role of this government in using its power to tip the balance against public institutions. I wonder if you

see that kind of political context as well. It seemed to come very clearly in the discussion of Unitel, if you would like to expand upon that.

Mr. Powell: I think there is very definitely that concept, and it is almost as if now that the public has been trained to think that MTS as a Crown corporation or a monopoly is the bad guy, and we are not the bad guy. We have provided good telephone service for a long period of time. I am just curious to know about the government's relationship with Unitel, quite frankly.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Chairperson, I know the time is running short here for our opportunity, since we only have 20 minutes to question the presenter including the presentations as well. I thank you for coming out here this evening and making your presentation. We found it quite enlightening, in fact, your comments with respect to Unitel and the impact it is going to have upon employment opportunities for you and your colleagues at MTS and considering that the government has, through its board that they have appointed to MTS, giving them instructions on how to, for you as an employee, instruct customers or indicate to customers that services will not be provided. It is unfortunate the government has chosen to do that through the board.

We thank you for taking the time to come here this evening to make a presentation to us.

Mr. Chalperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Ms. Powell.

I would like to call on Mr. David Turner, the Manitoba Teachers' association. Mr. David Turner. His presentation has been distributed to the members. You may proceed, Mr. Turner.

Mr. David Turner (Manitoba Teachers' Society): This is the other MTS. This is our submission regarding Bill 22.

The Manitoba Teachers' Society welcomes this opportunity to comment upon and express its opposition to Bill 22, The Public Sector Reduced Work Week and Compensation Management Act. The society's opposition is based not only on the attack on collective bargaining rights, but also the specific application to the public school system and its effect on service which is provided. This submission will deal with the proposed legislation first in terms of its general thrust, and then it will deal with specific subsections.

Probably the most offensive aspect of Bill 22 is its attack on free collective bargaining rights. Since 1948, with the introduction of labour legislation in Manitoba, teachers have had the right to meet their employers as equals at the collective bargaining table with the view to negotiating a collective agreement. In 1956, with the consent of teachers, these collective bargaining rights were transferred to The Public Schools Act with the replacement of impasse resolution via strike or lockout with resolution by compulsory binding arbitration.

Bill 22, if enacted, would vest the employer the power to impose terms and conditions related to the reduced workweek after consultation, not negotiation with its employees. Such a situation is a throwback to pre-1948 conditions. Even the federal government intervention during the 1975-78 period of the anti-inflation program did not grant the employer the right to impose the employer's decision on employees.

In examining the impact of this legislation in particular areas, attention must be drawn to the effect of the target for reduction being professional development and administration days including parent-teacher interviews. While there will be just as much distress over loss of student instruction time, the society views with dismay the apparent suggestion that these other days are not essential.

In an ever-changing system, professional development becomes increasingly important. Teachers require such activities in order to keep current both in content and methodology but also in a wide range of other matters such as classroom management and dealing with special needs children while mainstreamed into regular classes. The beneficiary in all cases is the student. What is also being overlooked is that professional development is a service to the employer in that it enhances the level of service provided.

In an OECD report, as well as in Michael Wilson's last budget, North American employers have been criticized for losing competitiveness since they provide 3.5 percent of the amount of paid training when compared to Japan and Germany. An additional point is that with the loss of administration days and days for parent-teacher interviews, it is obvious that some of these activities will still be performed, requiring work reduction to occur through the curtailment of other activities by teachers. The aforementioned reductions are

shortsighted and have the potential to be damaging.

A comment must be made on inferences that teacher salary increases have been excessive or substantial, and, therefore, their constraint is warranted. Such a belief flies in the face of facts. Since 1983, teacher salary increases have exceeded inflation in only one year. The cumulative effect of negotiated settlements and arbitration awards in the last ten years is that teachers have lost 13 percent against inflation.

A fourth concern that the society wishes to bring to the committee's attention relates to the effect of this legislation on teacher pension entitlement. When Bill 22 was proposed, the accompanying news releases and explanation suggested that the intent of the legislation was to effect savings in current government and school board operating expenditures. Whether intended or not, one effect of Bill 22 will be to reduce the service component for pensionable services of all teachers as well as reduce the average final earnings of teachers retiring within the next five to seven years.

In dollar terms, the impact will be smaller than that of lost salary except that it will have a continuing effect as long as the pension is received. The society believes the intent of the legislation was restricted to controlling salaries as an operating expenditure. Therefore, the society requests that corrective measures be taken to ensure pensionable service is not affected.

Incidental to the matters raised in the foregoing, one consequence of the legislation no doubt will be a variety of implementation decisions throughout the province with the result that employees of school boards will receive greatly different treatment from one division to another. There is also an irony that Bill 22 transfers to the school boards the right to make decisions as to what aspects of the legislation they wish to implement, whereas other legislation proposed, for example Bill 16, takes away the right to make decisions, a reference to the cap placed on their taxing powers.

I now wish to discuss specific sections of Bill 22.

Section 3: Section 3 is that part of the bill which permits the provisions of the proposed act to supersede other legislation, collective agreements and other individual agreements. This submission has already commented upon the loss of rights

under collective bargaining legislation, and it is this section which gives effect to much of that outcome.

The society recognizes that the bill depends on this section being approved. Therefore, there is no suggestion of amendment but rather withdrawal of this legislation.

Section 5.4: This section requires employees to consult with the employer respecting the proposed workweek reduction, but the consultation is an empty gesture when viewed in conjunction with Section 5.5.

Section 5.5: This is the section which together with Section 3 is central to the opposition of the society to Bill 22. As noted earlier in this presentation, the right of the employer to impose terms and conditions of work after consultation rather than negotiation is a return to the pre-1948 period with the accompanying loss of employee rights. Assigning to the employer the unilateral determination of terms and conditions of employment, which should properly be the subject of free collective bargaining, is a dangerous precedent. Drawing attention to this section is not done with the intention of amending it since the entire thrust of the proposed legislation is embodied in this particular clause. Hence the society's opposition to the entire bill.

* (1950)

Section 8(b): It is this section which targets professional development and administration days as those days for which compulsory leave will be mandated. The society is dismayed that government appears to undervalue the importance of the service represented by the work done during these days. Moreover, the society is receiving mixed messages. The new Schools Finance Program introduced in 1992 contained support for professional development. At the same time this legislation provides opportunities to curtail such activity. As for administration and parent-teacher interviews, much of this work must continue without being assigned days. To achieve true work reduction, some other aspect of the service would have to be reduced in order to permit these activities to continue.

Section 12: This section defines days taken to reduce the workweek as leaves of absence and not layoff. By so doing, the collective agreement provision regarding layoff can also be circumvented. In addition, it is a fact that these

days are a leave of absence as opposed to school days which results in a reduced service eligibility for pensions. This reduction is of a magnitude of up to one-twentieth of a year per year as long as the legislation is in effect.

In conclusion, the society opposes Bill 22 both on issues of principle and those of the specific effects. The principle has been articulated above and is in the realm of the removal of bargaining rights hard won and long established. The specifics, particularly the effect on professional development, have also been outlined but no mention yet has been made about another anticipated effect. This refers to serious divisions being created between teachers and their employers. At a time when teacher morale is fragile at best, the additional pressures created by this legislation as well as the aforementioned division between teachers and their employers cannot help the education system or the student.

In conclusion, the society again expresses its appreciation for the opportunity to make its submission before this committee.

Mr. Chalperson: Thank you very much, Mr. Turner.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Thank you very much, Mr. Turner. I would like to ask you, given that the Manitoba Association of School Trustees requested that the province introduce legislation to facilitate days off without pay and before that, of course, they also requested legislation to reduce the rate of pay of the teachers, would that have been of a more acceptable solution to the dilemma that we find ourselves in had we heeded that advice from the Manitoba Association of School Trustees?

Mr. Turner: In response to the minister's question, I think the brief that I have just read to you and you have just read touches upon the effects of Bill 22 as a planned and divisive measure. I believe your question touches upon the divisiveness that this bill is augmenting between our employers and the society.

Mr. Manness: Well, fair enough, Mr. Turner, I accept that. I have probably no alternative but to accept that, but I guess there are other divisions that I must deal with.

The reality is, the Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey) complains bitterly to me in private that I cannot find enough money for education. She is

right; I cannot. Some could construe that as being divisive, but the reality is, school divisions are, of course, wanting to see more funding from the provincial government, and knowing and telling them that we can only go to a finite level because of scarce resources, we have to somehow help them cope with ever-increasing awards under arbitration.

This section that you have not specifically referred to, but certainly the part in which many of the sections that you draw to our attention gives empowering legislation to school boards. We did not say that professional development days had to be focused upon, that those indeed were the only solutions. As a matter of fact, we were hoping that there would be renegotiation for some agreements. To the best of my knowledge, that has not happened in any of our 40-some school divisions.

Might you tell us why, to the best of your knowledge, no local associations were prepared to enter into renegotiation with their local school divisions?

Mr. Turner: In response, the perception is that Bill 22 is one almighty sword, and teachers resent being told to renegotiate under the threat of that kind of a weapon.

Mr. Manness: Well, that may be the case. Mr. Rae is passing Bill 48 in Ontario, and other governments have passed bills because of the fact that there has to be some saving found in the total wage bill.

I guess what you are telling me then is that teachers, through their local associations—again, I asked for an opinion—were not prepared to renegotiate. What this legislation has attempted to do, nothing more than saying that if teachers do not want to renegotiate, school divisions will have the power to cause certain days to be taken off. I do not know what the other solution was when the total amount provided for education was only at a certain level. Maybe you have a different solution.

Mr. Turner: In response, I am somewhat puzzled by the minister's question which is slightly different but basically the same as questions I have heard put already in these hearings. My answer comes to somebody who is responsible for the last six budgets of this province, and the society has identified two trends in the budgets. One is sizable giveaways in terms of provincial taxes year by year; as a result, the aggregate of these giveaways amounts to something like \$300 million. The

second trend is perhaps not directly the minister's responsibility but certainly that of his government, and that has been the curtailment of program and service delivery within the Manitoba public sector, Bill 22 being a classic example of that curtailment.

Mr. Manness: Well, that is interesting, Mr. Chairperson. Mr. Turner, you are saying \$300 million in giveaways. We were elected duly as a party to do something with the highest tax regime in the country. That was our mandate. That was the No. 1 plank in the platform. I know, sir, you believe in democracy. Therefore, we were commanded by the people, through the election process, to do something with those highest taxes. I do not know, you say, giveaway. I do not know to whom we gave it. Most of it was given, by the way, back to the citizens of the province—almost all of it, as a matter of fact.

I would suggest to you that ultimately a good portion of that comes back as people now with increased disposable income, of course, do their spending in our province and it is taxed at a different source. More importantly than this, I gather from your remarks, particularly as you focus in on the certain sections you do, and if we were to listen to your presentation, they would basically gut the bill, and I guess that is what your request is, that this bill be withdrawn in totality, I gather.

* (2000)

Mr. Turner: That is correct.

Mr. Alcock: Thank you, Mr. Turner. Rather than redebate the central questions, I do have a specific question about your fourth concern regarding pensions, and the point has been made that this impacts inequitably on certain groups of teachers, namely those who are closer to retirement. It does not impact younger teachers at all.

I raised that with the Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey) earlier this week in Estimates, and her response was that yes, there was a specific inequity, that teachers in their final seven years of service would suffer some loss but that nobody beyond seven years would suffer a loss and that the maximum loss suffered by any retiring teacher would be on the order of \$4 a month. Can you confirm that? Have you done any studies to look at the nature of the problem created by this?

Mr. Turner: In response, I am not prepared to comment on the \$4 a month. Quite frankly, I do not

have the statistics with me to discuss that point, but you made a point earlier on before you came to the \$4 when you said only teachers nearing retirement would be affected. That is not quite true, because all teachers who are affected by the lockout provisions of Bill 22 would lose pensionable service, so all teachers affected by the lockout would suffer for the rest of their lives.

Mr. Alcock: Well, we may not be prepared to deal with the specifics of this at this point, although I would be interested in hearing from the society on it, because it is the position certainly of the minister that that is not the case, that it is only people who are in their last few years of service and that any loss would be made up by teachers who are earlier on in their careers, and that it is a very minimal effect. I am not supporting that position, I am just telling you what was stated at this table two days ago.

Mr. Turner: In response, we are as a society always pleased to give information to any member of the House.

Ms. Friesen: Thank you for your presentation. I was interested in your comment again on pensions. The society believes the intent of the legislation is restricted to controlling salaries. Therefore, the society requests corrective measures be taken on the pensions. What gave you the impression this government did not want to go after your pensions as well?

Mr. Turner: I think the brief refers to certain comments made at the time of the release of Bill 22 where apparently no mention was made of its effect on pensions, which led us to think that possibly there was some sort of benign neglect.

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Friesen, there are about two minutes left for questioning.

Ms. Friesen: Has that been followed up with the government at all? Have you had any discussions with them over this?

Mr. Turner: I am aware of an earlier presentation made by the Retired Teachers' of Manitoba, and I am aware of the interaction between Mr. Alcock and that group. I believe that one of the members is George Strang who has just retired as a staff officer and has worked for 20 years in the pensions area. I believe he is working on that.

Ms. Friesen: The minister, in his questions to you, gave the impression of one particular envelope allotted to Education over which he had no control.

I wonder if you are aware of the changes over the years since this government has been in power of the shift in balance from public financing to the increases in financing to private schools.

Mr. Turner: Yes, we are aware of that situation.

Ms. Friesen: Are you aware, too, of the Workforce 2000 training and education grants which are training better car dealerships and better private golf clubs in Manitoba? Again, a \$3-million program of this government in Education and Training.

Mr. Turner: Yes, and in response to that, I guess on a personal level, I was discussing this matter last night with a person who I shall not name, but he is in a position to know something about the training that goes into that program. He made the point that so often once the government money has expired the employee is dismissed.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Turner, your time has expired. Thank you very, very much for your presentation this evening.

I will now call on Mr. Bob Davies with the Winnipeg Teachers' Association. His presentation has been distributed to the members, so you may proceed, Mr. Davies.

Mr. Bob Davies (Winnipeg Teachers' Association): Mr. Chairperson, committee members, thank you for this opportunity to express the concerns of teachers and educators in Winnipeg School Division No. 1 to the provisions of Bill 22.

The Winnipeg Teachers' Association represents over 3,000 people including classroom teachers, school support staff, such as guidance counsellors and resource teachers, school administrators, Child Guidance Clinic clinicians, consultants and lab assistants.

We are a professional association which speaks out on educational issues as well as addressing the welfare concerns of our members. Besides having a variety of roles in the educational system, our members represent a wide range of political belief. Our opposition to Bill 22 is not based on political ideology, but because of the negative impact that this legislation will have on the quality of education in our province.

The inequities which exist in the provincial educational system will only be increased by Bill 22. This is already apparent in the reactions of

school divisions to the enabling legislation. Thirty school boards have announced that they will make use of the provisions of Bill 22 this year, but 20 have said that they will not.

The inequities are apparent even among those divisions that are reducing the number of professional development days. Seven school divisions are reducing eight days, while 11 are taking three days or less. Provincially, this has been a minimal response to the proposed legislation, and with school divisions reporting surplus funds in excess of \$55 million last year, it raises questions about the need for this legislation.

The \$16 million that was cut in grants to school divisions this year is the same amount that surplus funds increased in school division accounts over the past year. The reductions in grants could easily have been offset with the surplus funds.

Instead of targeting these available funds, however, the government has chosen to sacrifice professional development days. Training and retraining are the keys to any successful enterprise whether it is in the public or the private domain. Unfortunately, the nature of professional development days is largely misunderstood by those outside education.

First, it is necessary to differentiate between the different types of professional development. On an individual basis, like other professionals, teachers are constantly upgrading their skills on their own time and at their own expense. Evening, weekend and summer classes in specific subject or skill areas are an ongoing aspect of every teacher's life. This upgrading is done voluntarily and at no expense to the system except to the extent that qualifications for the job are improved. The same is true for other professions as they upgrade their skills.

Professional development days, however, are not driven by individual needs, but by system needs. In our division, there are seven types of in-service days.

First, parent-teacher meetings: These meetings generally require one to two days each year, and that is at the secondary level. At the elementary, often it will be as many as four days.

Student evaluation: Once or twice, again, this increases at the elementary level. Promotion meetings are held to determine program placement

for the following semester or year and to identify special student needs.

Third, administration days: Two days each year are dedicated to school opening and closing. School procedures are reviewed including emergency plans. Books and other materials are distributed and inventoried.

Fourth, school priorities: On an ongoing basis, school staffs have to develop responses to the changing nature of the students they are serving. Often these planning days are determined in co-operation with parent councils, and sometimes they include student representatives. The focus is on school improvement. Examples of topics for these days include evaluation procedures, communications with parents, discipline procedures and school organization.

Fifth, divisional priorities: Our division establishes long-term professional development topics which must be addressed by each school. Examples include multicultural education, special needs students and nonviolent crisis intervention.

Sixth, mandatory workshops: Legislation and the ongoing introduction of new curricula by the Department of Education create the need for workshops on a system-wide basis, for example, the workplace hazardous material inventory system or on a specific grade basis, for example, the new social studies curriculum.

* (2010)

Finally, the seventh area of in-servicing is special area group in-services. This occurs one day each year and is often the only opportunity outside of personal time to pursue specific grade or subject area upgrading. Participants pay for the costs of these in-services through conference fees. Some schools choose not to participate because of limited professional development days and priorities in one of the other six areas of training.

The two critical differences between these professional development days and the individual upgrading activities are: first, the topics are focused on school-based issues and needs; and second, the days require the participation of all staff. The only exceptions to these are the special area group conferences and the workshops that are mandated by the Department of Education to introduce new curricula.

Those school divisions which use the provisions of Bill 22 to eliminate professional development

days will be at a severe disadvantage to maintain their quality of educational programming. What services will be dropped, communication, evaluation, planning? What topics will be deferred, computer technology, discipline, street proofing, multicultural education?

Bill 22 is an ill-conceived piece of legislation that will hurt the quality of education in our province. It will increase the disparities in the quality of education among different school divisions. It will increase the surplus funds for those school divisions which use its powers. Because these surplus funds are only being used for one-time projects, such as capital projects, there will be no benefits for the children in the classroom. Instead, we will see more examples of school boards spending money on new central offices while pupil-teacher ratios increase in classrooms. We will see new technology systems being purchased without the ability to train staff in the use of this technology.

Bill 22 does not address the real problems which exist in the area of education finance. In a situation where the Department of Education does not have the funds to finance school divisions, the department should have looked to the surplus funds which school boards have been accumulating over the last five years. The \$55 million in surplus funds which school boards reported last year is more than three times the shortfall in provincial grants this year. That is the area that should have been the focus for legislation rather than school in-service days.

There is a second major problem with this legislation. Bill 22 infringes on the tradition of collective bargaining for school boards and teachers in this province. While this approach is consistent with the tactics being employed in other provinces and by other political parties, it has some serious implications for the future of education in Manitoba. Unlike many of the other provinces, Manitoba has had a history of local bargaining between school boards and teacher associations. Dispute resolution has been through arbitration rather than strike action.

Critics of this arrangement have claimed that the outcome has been inflated salaries for teachers as compared to other provinces. They cite the average salaries of teachers in Manitoba as evidence of this argument. This type of comparison is misleading. Teachers' salaries are

determined by two factors, experience and training. Manitoba's teachers are the second highest qualified group of educators in Canada. We are also among the most experienced. However, in the next 10 years, as this highly trained and experienced group of teachers reaches retirement age, there will be a dramatic decline in the average salaries of teachers in Manitoba. Our salary scale, in comparison with other provinces, is in the lower half.

Arbitration rulings in Manitoba have not given teachers any financial advantage. Because of the slow nature of the process, arbitration rulings have always followed a series of local contract settlements, and the arbitration rulings have always been consistent with these other local settlements in terms of salaries. Arbitration has not been used by local boards or teacher associations to get improved salary outcomes. It has been used to resolve differences in the working conditions.

Salary settlements which have been negotiated at the local level over the last 10 years have not favoured teachers. They have consistently been below the cost-of-living increases and below the economic growth of Manitoba.

The contract which we ratified in October with our division provided for a three-year term with salary increases averaging less than 2 percent for each of these years. This salary settlement was consistent with the original salary proposal of the school board. The head of negotiations for the board was the head of labour relations for MAST. Our settlement was obviously consistent with the goals of MAST for salary settlements in the province.

But Bill 22 allows school boards to unilaterally roll back these salary settlements. It eliminates the process of collective bargaining, and it eliminates the value of the many days of discussions that we had with our board. Teacher associations bargained in good faith with their boards and received fair wage increases which were agreed upon by both parties. Bill 22 negates that process.

This legislation has serious implications for the future of education in Manitoba. It abandons a negotiation process which has maintained a high level of services and stability in Manitoba's schools. Bill 22 empowers those people who believe in confrontational tactics to resolve differences.

The reality in schools is that teachers can no longer do more with less. The public school

system has been stretched to its limits. Despite increasing workloads and stresses and despite cutbacks in public and financial supports, teachers have attempted to provide the same level and quality of service. We have accepted the additional responsibilities of a changing society.

Bill 22 represents both the insult and injury. Manitoba's public education system is in danger of death from a thousand cuts and Bill 22 may be the deepest cut of all.

MLAs who care about the future of education in Manitoba should defeat Bill 22 and refer the issue of education finance back to the Department of Education. We require leadership and innovation which will enhance opportunities for children, not threaten them. Thank you very much.

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

Mr. Manness: Mr. Davies, thank you very much. I learned a lot out of your brief, particularly as you broke out some of the in-service days into groupings. I was not aware of that and I thank you.

To pick up on one of your last points, you say Bill 22 should be defeated and the issue of education finance should be referred back to the Department of Education. What do you mean by that? What is that going to prove?

Mr. Davies: It refers back to my earlier point, Mr. Minister, in terms of an alternative form of finding the funds. We have an odd situation where the Department of Education is without funds and the school boards in the province are reporting surplus funds in excess of \$55 million. It seems to me that is an area that should be looked at.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Chairperson, that is a fair comment. As a matter of fact, the government will try and ascertain the level of these surpluses.

I can assure you that when the article came out, I believe it was the Free Press some time this spring, indicating the surpluses, that was new knowledge in many respects to the government. Believe it or not, when we made our critical decisions through December, January, in this case into February, in support of public schools funding, we did not have knowledge of the magnitude in the measure of the surpluses. If we did, even if we did, how would you propose that we move a surplus from one division to another? How would you feasibly see a system brought into place that could deal with that dilemma?

Mr. Davies: In response to the figures on the surplus funds, they were obtained for us from the FRAME budget which is submitted to the Department of Education, so all of that data was certainly available to the government through the Department of Education's reporting system.

My particular feeling is that the amount of surplus funds in each of the divisions is probably commensurate with the size of the division and the size of the debts that have been created by the underfunding, so it would simply be a matter of having those school divisions use the surplus funds available to them in their own budgets.

Mr. Manness: I hate to be parochial, but I notice that, in many instances, some of the larger surpluses are in rural divisions who have deliberately by design or in many cases taken action to maybe not provide the same level of services. That was a conscious decision made by those autonomous divisions. This is a dilemma that, I think, government would have. On what basis could we attack those surpluses?

Mr. Davies: In response, it would seem to me that the autonomy of the school divisions has been removed by this legislation and by Bill 16. In fact, it does not seem to me that the government has had any problem in removing autonomy.

Mr. Manness: Well, that is a fair statement. I do not reject for one moment the fact that this has not taken away some autonomy, certainly Bill 16 more so than Bill 22, but that has not answered the question, to the extent that locally elected people have decided, for whatever reason, to build a surplus and by whatever method. I mean, is it fair then? Is society then blessing those who have gone out and spent and do not have a surplus, to the detriment of those that do?

* (2020)

Mr. Davies: In response, what the government has done, it has punished the people who, during the past year, have created the surplus funds. In fact, by settling at the levels that we settled this year, the school divisions had surplus funds left over because their anticipation was for salary level settlements at a much higher level.

In fact, over the last two years, they have put money into their budgets to allow for higher wage settlements than a lot of teachers eventually settle for. So that is the source of the surplus, or one of the sources of the surplus, and the people who

have co-operated in negotiations by settling for reasonable amounts are now the people who are being punished again for having done that.

Mr. Manness: Well, then, you see this as only a year phenomenon. I mean, you would be aware, I am sure, that the Province of Saskatchewan has served notice on its school divisions, there will be 4 percent reduction in funding next year, and you do not see that happening in Manitoba in any measure. I mean, you believe this is just a one-year phenomenon not to be repeated in terms of 1994.

Mr. Davies: In response, as I indicated, the existing surplus funds would more than three times make over the shortfall this year. I guess the question goes back to the minister in terms of whether this particular response to resolve the problem solves the problem in the long term. If in fact the elimination of professional development days extends for any period of time, the impact on our educational system and the future of it is extremely severe.

Mr. Manness: Then again, I am asking Mr. Davies as to whether or not he can help me with a methodology of transferring funds from one surplus area to an area that has no surplus. I mean, in what possible manner do we do that?

Mr. Davies: In response, it has been some 15 years since I was working in the Department of Education. I would be glad to spend some time and provide advice to the minister.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Chairperson, in fairness, I will defer to other members of the committee.

Mr. Chairperson: I would say there is approximately three minutes left.

Ms. Friesen: You stated in one part of your brief that the public school system has been stretched to its limits. You talked of increasing workloads and stresses, and others have talked of similar issues dealing with mainstreaming of handicapped children and also of increasing teacher-student ratios.

I wonder if you could give us some examples of this from your own experience or from that of your colleagues.

Mr. Davies: In response, you gave two examples; a third example is the whole issue of violence in the schools and dealing with increasingly violent ways of solving problems among students. What we are

finding, in terms of a concrete example for our association, we provide an employee assistance program with two full-time counsellors who are providing counselling to teachers on need and are finding just a tremendous increase in the demands on that service, as well as the service that is provided by the Manitoba Teachers' Society.

Cases of teachers who are having breakdowns and requiring long-term disability also have been skyrocketing over the last five years.

Ms. Friesen: Can you give us some specific examples of the conditions which teachers now face that they did not face perhaps five, 10 years ago?

Mr. Davies: I will give you an example in terms of mainstreaming. When mainstreaming was first introduced in the schools, it was done with the best of intention, and it was done with lots of supports. We had special education resource teachers. We had specially trained teacher aides. There were supports available to the teachers who were mainstreaming students with special needs.

What we found over the last three years, in particular, is that these are types of supports that are disappearing. In our division, we lost 26 teachers two years ago. This year we are losing 15 teachers in order to have our board balance the budget. They are doing so without taking advantage of Bill 22, which we are thankful for.

We believe that supports the quality of education in our division, and it supports the collective bargaining process that we have gone through with our board.

The 15 teachers, by and large, are in three areas. One area is in terms of ESL for students. So recent immigrant students are being mainstreamed without specialized and specially trained teachers to assist them. It is a reduction of guidance counselling in schools, and it is a reduction in the number of teacher-librarians. So those are the three areas in our division that are being hit this year, and over the last three years, those types of support systems for classroom teachers are disappearing.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Davies, I would like to thank you very much for your presentation. Your time has expired. Thank you very much.

I would like to now call on Levi Reimer. His presentation has been distributed to the committee members. You may proceed, Mr. Reimer.

Mr. Levi Reimer (Seven Oaks Teachers' Association): Mr. Chairperson and honoured members of the committee, I am very pleased to have some time to present to you the concerns of the Seven Oaks Teachers' Association.

The Seven Oaks Teachers' Association is opposed to the enactment of Bill 22 on the grounds that its implementation contributes to a reduction of teachers' ability to serve the needs of the students, a reduction in the opportunity for communication with parents. It interferes with collective bargaining rights, places an unfair tax on public servants and introduces grave inequities within the teaching profession in Manitoba.

In this brief, we shall outline and substantiate our objections to Bill 22, and I feel a need, before I do that, to sort of build the background upon which I reflect and make my comments.

Educational thought and practice is in a constant state of evolution. It used to be that schools served mainly academic needs of students. All teachers needed to know was subject content and methods. Very little attention was paid to social and emotional needs. Paying attention to these needs was the domain of the family and the church.

One hardly needs to comment or to document societal changes and how these changes impact on the nature of schools. Diminished influences of institutions, such as the church and the disintegration of family structures, have resulted in the devolution of responsibility for social and emotional nurturing to schools. For many students, the only place where they receive any sort of caring, in the full sense of the word, is the school.

The social disintegration in our society results in increasingly more serious social problems. Violence, chemical dependency and various other forms of aggressive or denial behaviour result from a sense of a lack of connectedness with significant others.

My purpose is not to document and analyze the social problems of our time but to draw attention to the fact that the concept of school has become a much more complex notion than it was even a generation ago. It is not so much that society in a conscious sort of way is placing increased demands upon schools, it is more that schools are the only institution left to meet the social and emotional needs of many students.

Whether we like it or not, schools have become more than just schools. Schools represent the last vestige of universality. It is the one place where children and young people have to be. Teachers are caregivers and, for many, the primary caregivers and only advocates for civility. Society expects much from them, that is, from teachers. Devaluation of the teaching profession, and we will have more to say about that later, is counter-productive, I believe, and flies in the face of the pressing learning needs of our time.

The inclusion of special needs students in regular classes makes it necessary for teachers to be knowledgeable about various types of disabilities and skills in appropriate teaching strategies. Teachers provide leadership in many community initiatives such as clubs for young people, coaching of teams, et cetera. Community programs for children and young people have concerns similar to those of schools. Developing teacher competencies has a salutary effect on community programs.

To do their jobs effectively, it is of utmost importance that teachers keep pace with the demands placed upon them as a result of the changing nature of schooling and keep up to date with new understandings about the nature of learning and teaching. Teachers need time, now more than ever, to engage in professional development activities.

In Seven Oaks, five of the 10 administration days are generally used for professional development. Generally, one of these days is used for attendance at the MTS' special area group conference in October, one is used for a divisional in-service day, and the other three are used for school-based professional development activities.

During the past year, teachers have spent time working on topics such as anger management, violence in schools, mainstreaming, true discipline, how to deal with behavioural problems, family violence and its impact on students, planning for inclusion, teachers or taunters, et cetera. That is but a sample of the list.

Teachers with specific needs attend specific workshops as they are available. However, for many issues, it is important that staff work on them together. Implementation of Bill 22 in our division would decrease or eliminate the opportunities for

school staff to work on issues of importance to individual schools.

* (2030)

The teaching profession is like no other profession in that teachers are constantly making and executing instantaneous decisions about specific situations while managing 25 other situations in front of an audience, under constant scrutiny both by parents and students. In most professions, people related to clients, who relate to clients on a one-to-one basis, have time to consider and consult before making and executing decisions. The unique demands upon teachers make it a stressful profession. The holiday time teachers presently enjoy constitutes the rest and relaxation teachers need in order to deal with the complex demands of teaching.

No private sector employer expects employees to develop an understanding of their job and the skills to do their job effectively on their own time. I have heard the question asked at the first sitting of these hearings: Is there anything in Bill 22 which prevents teachers from voluntarily doing professional development? My answer to that would be, no, there is not, but that is not the point. The point is that in-service training, we generally accept in our society, I believe, that in-service training is the responsibility of the employer.

We have heard reference to grants earlier this evening, heard reference made to grants given to employers for the purposes of professional development. For the employer not to support that devalues and undermines the importance of professional development, I believe.

If we accept that teachers need to learn constantly to keep pace with changing demands, and if we accept that the employer has a responsibility for providing opportunities for teachers to grow professionally, then we must accept that provision of days for professional development is necessary, appropriate and just.

Many teachers already devote a considerable amount of personal time to professional development. It does not seem just to ask them to do more.

Some comments about opportunity to communicate with parents. Two of Seven Oaks' administration days are generally used to meet with parents. In addition to daytime appointments, teachers also devote two evenings, and they

volunteer these two evenings to parent-teacher conferences.

Schools are under pressure. As agencies like the Child and Family Services agencies cut back on services, more of the services offered by these agencies have to be provided by the schools. There is a need to increase availability of time for meeting with parents.

The needs of our students call for a concerted community effort. To do their jobs well, parents and teachers need more school-home connections to engender understanding and support. It is counterproductive, I believe, to reduce or eliminate the amount of time schools and parents have to engage in discussion about students, schools and learning. If teachers continue to maintain the same level of communication with parents without provision of the time to do that, other areas of work will have to curtailed.

Some concerns about interference with collective bargaining rights. Teachers have had the right to bargain collectively for salaries, employee benefits and working conditions since 1948. We believe that these rights are inherent in and fundamental to citizenship in a free and democratic society. An attack on collective bargaining, which vests in the employer the right to make a final determination about a bargainable issue, is inconsistent with our deeply held democratic ideals.

Teachers have been very responsible bargainers in that they have come to reasonable agreements without much rancour and without disrupting services. The board-teacher bargaining experience demonstrates, we think, that things work best when two sides meet as equals to work at differences and to achieve agreement through discussion and compromise. Interference with that process does not bode well for labour relations.

Some comments then on what we see as attacks on public sector employees. Introducing a reduced workweek with commensurate reduction and remuneration amounts to attacks on public service employees. It is like saying, we think that these services are valuable for Manitobans, but Manitobans cannot afford to pay for them so you will have to take a reduction in wages to help pay for continuation of these services to all.

Reduced levels of revenue to the province are the result of political decisions, we believe, and not

necessarily fiscally imperative. We believe that it is the government's intent to reduce the salary levels of public service employees.

The collective bargaining process is a legitimate and appropriate way for employers and employees to determine the working conditions and levels of remuneration. Since we believe the process to be fair, we accept that the outcome is fair and do not accept that public service employees, including teachers, are overpaid. If it is believed that public service employees are overpaid relative to other professions and occupations, then perhaps a pay equity process needs to be applied to determine fair levels of remuneration. Arbitrarily designating some employee groups as being overpaid is unfair and unjust and devalues teachers and public service employees.

Some comments on inequities in the province. The number of leaves without pay varies in divisions across the province with some having no such leaves, others having up to eight such leaves. Some teachers lose income; others do not. This situation does not constitute an equal sharing of the pain resulting from expenditure reduction. Bill 16 places limitations on school boards' ability to raise revenues.

Reduced revenues from the province forces boards to reduce expenditures. Reducing revenues from the province but forcing boards to make decisions about expenditure reductions constitutes, we believe, an inappropriate offloading of responsibility by the province. It set local boards and employee groups within that jurisdiction in opposition to each other in the context of circumstances which neither side can control.

In conclusion then, we believe that Bill 22 has serious implications for the quality of service schools are able to provide, is a draconian assault on democratic rights, introduces injustices in terms of sharing the burden of reduced provincial revenues and therefore urge that it be withdrawn.

Mr. Chairperson: I thank you for your presentation, Mr. Reimer.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Chairperson, Mr. Reimer, thank you very much for your presentation tonight. It points out in very specific terms your opposition to the bill.

Mr. Reimer, I would like to engage in a little dialogue of a general nature. You may not want to be part of it, but you will tell me accordingly. I know

you would believe in democracy, and I know I have to believe that most Manitobans believe this government was put into place to do one of a few things, but certainly the primal one was to hold down the rate of taxes. Would you agree with that?

Not that you support that, Sir, the teachers support that, but indeed the majority of Manitobans.

Mr. Reimer: I would not agree with that in absolute terms. Certainly I think it is the responsibility of a government to raise revenues and fund programs responsibly. What that level of responsibility is or what it is to control them responsibly, different people have different opinions on. It is also a question, I think, of priorities, and I have raised that question before in other contexts.

It may be, and I am not an economist and I am not an expert in economics, so I am not in a position to say absolutely that the fiscal circumstances are inevitably as they are, but if they are, if indeed expenditure reduction is necessary, we would urge that the government consider its priorities in terms of not only education but other social programs which have taken a beating as opposed to various programs supporting corporations which have not.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Chairperson, with due respect, you see Mr. Reimer was on the path, but he has fallen over to some of the political rhetoric we hear from time to time. When the presenter talks about choices, that leaves the revenue side and goes over to the expenditure side. My question was very direct, it was on the revenue side, because I tell you, our first, second, third and fourth plank at being elected, a democratically elected government was on the revenue side on taxation. We were elected to hold down the level of taxation, in other words, the revenue side.

That is why when I see in the reference made to offloading on school boards, in other words, not giving them enough money—in essence that is the issue, not giving them enough money—and adding to that, I think you just made a comment that the social side is being neglected, that our choices said that we were hitting the social side. Do you know that for a fact? Do you know what the highest, quickest growing department of government has been over the course of the last four years?

Mr. Reimer: I do not know that for a fact but, nonetheless, a lot of what one reads and hears in

discussion with various people indicates that that is so and I believe that to be so.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Chairperson, I would tell Mr. Reimer that we have gutted almost 10 departments that are what we call nonsocial programs and that indeed those three departments of Family Services, Education and Health have enjoyed by far the furthest increases, except one department of government has outstripped them, and that is the Department of Finance—me, interest rates. So people say, where is the money going? The money is going for the most part after those three very major social departments and into Finance, paying the interest on our debt.

* (2040)

I would end, Mr. Reimer, by again asking then, when you say this is a tax on the public sector employees, would you then also suggest that every other group in society that experiences a reduction in their remuneration, either through salary changes and/or commodity price changes, that that represents a tax if indeed they have less remuneration at the end of the day?

Mr. Reimer: I think that asking the question that way, at least the way I understand it, kind of changes the argument. We have heard often this spring that in sharing the burden there is to be an equal sharing of the pain. We believe that the public service sector is providing a service to our society, through the citizens of our province. If there is a burden to be borne, it should be borne equally by everybody.

When we read in Frances Russell's column that the after-tax income of people earning \$70,000 a year has increased in larger proportion over a three-year period than those earning \$50,000, then we wonder about the equal sharing of the pain.

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): I would like to ask you about one of the paragraphs on page 3 of your presentation where you talk about the partial list of some of the topics that teachers in your division have worked on, I assume under professional development days, anger management, violence in schools, et cetera, should Bill 22 pass and your school division be forced to deal with the implications of that, where do you see those topics being worked on by the teachers in your school division or which ones of those will be not dealt with by teachers in Seven Oaks School Division?

Mr. Reimer: I think the argument that I try to make in this page is that teachers on an individual basis go to in-service workshops as they are available within the province. It is important, however, for many of the topics that I have listed, for schools to work on them as a staff so that there can be a coherent approach to the issues, there can be a sense of teamness, of support, of working together in terms of dealing with those issues. If professional development days are not available to school staff, that is a day in which the whole staff can meet together to work on these issues, then they will not happen.

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

I will now call on Marilyn von Stein. Did you have a written brief?

Ms. Marilyn von Stein (Charleswood Junior High): Yes, it has been presented to the committee.

Mr. Chairperson: You may begin.

Ms. von Stein: I would like to first of all extend a thank you to the committee for the opportunity to present this brief. I present to you as past president of Assiniboine South Teachers' Association.

I urge the committee to withdraw Bill 22 in order to uphold two of the following values that I see in our society: Firstly, the value of professional development or administrative days to the educational process; and secondly, the value of collective bargaining in labour relations.

Professional development administration days have for many years been an integral part of the educational process. These days provide teachers with, among other things, the following opportunities: First of all, to communicate with parents regarding the process and development of their child or children; secondly, to co-ordinate school, team or group activities, thus enhancing educational opportunities within that area; thirdly, to improve and refine teaching methods from which the children of Manitoba will directly benefit; fourthly, to develop implementation strategies for new curriculum.

Many of the benefits of professional development days remain unmentioned in that list above. However, there are positive effects in the classroom both long and short term. The

inspirational effect of professional development days is rarely mentioned or talked about. However, I suggest to you that in the area of human resources, which is precisely the area in which education operates, that morale, intellectual motivation and the like are extremely essential to a well functioning system. There is much more here than a well-oiled machine or numbers in a budget. Education is about human resources. It is about people. It is about the children of Manitoba. It is about our future.

The second value which I wish to address is the value of collective bargaining in labour relations. Not only does Bill 22 violate human resource management principles but political principles as well. Again, I remind the committee that people are not numbers. They cannot be shuffled on a page and placed neatly in a different ledger column without serious repercussions to our economy. Collective bargaining is an important part of our democratic process. It is one which contains an essential element of balance. As a lockout bill, Bill 22 removes this balance and is, I believe, undemocratic. I can assure you that the idea of balancing the budget on the backs of the workers is not an idea which came from the workers but from a governing body which has lost sight of its most valuable resource, its people.

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

Ms. Barrett: Thank you for your presentation and a brief comment, if I may, before I ask you a question. I thought your point about the fact of inspiration and motivation is one that we need to discuss, and we do far too often, certainly, in dealing with the impacts of these kinds of bills on people forget those kinds of elements. They are not quantifiable which is partly why they probably do not get discussed enough. So I appreciate your bringing that to our attention.

I am wondering if you can give us, putting the human face on some of your presentation, some specific examples of, particularly on your first page, No. 3, the improving and refining teaching methods that you feel may be jeopardized if Bill 22 is passed and PD days are lessened or eliminated in your school division in particular.

Ms. von Stein: One example, I suppose, would be the ever-increasing need to acquaint teachers with technological equipment and its use in the

classroom. It is rapidly progressing, as you are well aware, the equipment that is there, and the need for the students of the future to be able to use it. Before we can teach that, we have to acquire that knowledge ourselves, and that is an ongoing process. You cannot do it once and forget about it, you have to be constantly updating. That is one that I see in our division, at least, and I believe that is true elsewhere as well.

* (2050)

Ms. Barrett: Speaking as someone who is very ill-equipped to deal with modern technology, I can well understand that. I wonder if you can tell me, you are past president of the teachers' association, could you give me a general idea in your division about the number of years since your teachers graduated from university, since they got their teaching degrees, how many years they have actually been teaching? Is the teaching population in Assiniboine South aging?

Ms. von Stein: It is aging as it is elsewhere in the province. They have been there approximately 20 years probably.

Ms. Barrett: That is quite a statement in the sense that it really does talk to me and, I think, probably makes the point that you are trying to make, that without professional development days, the teachers who in many cases have not been in university for upwards of two decades and perhaps more will be left behind in trying to deal with the social and technological changes that have taken place in our society, which I think has been dealt with in your presentation as well as others.

Could you give us a specific example or a set kind of example of what you see might happen as a negative result if the PD days are reduced? What kinds of issues are classroom teachers going to face that they may not be able to deal with as professionally or as humanly as they should be able to?

Ms. von Stein: I will attempt to answer this one, because I think that this response is crucial to the understanding of the operation of the system, but it becomes very nebulous because there are some abstract components.

I think that what we are experiencing in the province and probably in all of society is the desire to move toward a system or a number of systems where we talk about things like empowerment, we talk about things like shared governance, we talk

about total management control and all of these kinds of things which involve group process, teamwork. To do this you need time and you need the opportunity to have people together in those groups. I think you are talking about quality time as well, because you are asking them to solve problems, you are asking them to develop policy, you are asking them to do major work. You cannot squeeze these in after hours and expect quality performance.

I think that this is probably the largest area in which things will suffer. Now, on the surface that probably does not look like anything that is very significant. In reality, all of our handling of special needs kids, all of our opportunities to operate the school system by the new proposals would probably go out the window because you have not got the time to deal with it. As I said, I do not think that you can schedule these kinds of things after hours, after a day of work or on the weekend and expect that you are going to get quality performance. It just will not happen.

Ms. Barrett: You talked about special needs kids, and I am wondering if you can give me a general idea or even a specific idea about how many special needs kids are in the Assiniboine South School Division, what the average number might be in a classroom or what an average classroom might look like as far as special needs kids are concerned. Are they concentrated in particular schools or are they spread out through the division? What kind of a challenge and an opportunity do they provide the school division?

I am particularly interested in special needs kids, because I think we have as a society made the determination that we value the individual's ability to reach their maximum potential, and we have said that children should be wherever possible in school with other children but recognizing, as we have in the past attempted to recognize, that we need to provide resources to enable that to happen most expeditiously.

What does the possibility of not having PD time to deal with the issues surrounding special needs kids in your division, what changes do you see taking place, and can you put it into a normal average classroom context?

Ms. von Stejn: I will try to make or answer this with an example. Not that many years ago, I think it was approximately three, four years ago, I had

myself a classroom of 30 students. I had one funded student in that room who had a full-time aide with him, and I had 14 of those students who were considered at-risk students. So when you talk about the degree of challenge with which the average teacher has to face on a daily basis, it is overwhelming.

On top of that, any of the kind of work that has to occur, for example, around the funded student, is work that involves teams and groups and meetings. That all has to happen somewhere, sometime, somehow along the day.

Very often, in fact, we frequently use our administration days to do some of this stuff, sharing from past teachers to the receiving teacher, planning, projects or caseloads around the students, et cetera. All of that stuff happens on those administrative days and will be seriously affected.

We fully mainstream. We have no special classrooms anywhere in the division. All of our students of any nature whatsoever are in the classroom.

Ms. Barrett: That is quite an example.

Two questions, one is, what age or grade were these children, and could you give us some sense of what the 14 at-risk kids, what the risks were with those kids? This is half of the class.

Ms. von Stejn: Yes. Age, they were Grade 9, so they are 15 years old. "At-risk," this is a nebulous term; you would have a great assortment. Mostly they are reluctant learners. They fall in the category of the socially, emotionally deprived children that we are seeing on an increasing basis within our society.

The major problem in our classrooms is not the children at the extreme end of the exceptional scale that are funded and receive probably aide help, it is the other students that we are seeing in increasing numbers in our society for which we do not have an answer, and the resources are extremely limited. The behaviourally challenged—you can call them at risk—at that time, it is a whole bag of emotional, social problems which have not even been defined yet.

Mr. Alcock: Mr. Chairperson, I recall a discussion not terribly long ago also where, because of the complete mainstreaming, the teachers are being called upon to do a lot of things that I do not think a lot of people realize. They are being called upon to

provide services that are not the kinds of services that were provided by teachers when I grew up. I am thinking specifically of administering medicine, certain kinds of medical procedures and that sort of thing.

Can you speak a little about that, because I think it would help the committee members to know that and also to get some sense of how PD days are used, not just to deal with academic issues, but there are some very complex personal care issues that teachers are now being called upon to perform in a way they never have been?

Ms. von Stein: For starters, if I can begin to paint a picture, at the beginning of the school year, we receive a package listing the numbers of students in our building that have medical problems of one sort or another. You may not be aware, there is a tremendously high percentage of these students that have allergic reactions and asthma, for example. This is just common. It means that teachers need to be trained in how to administer medication that these students need on a daily basis, whether it be an emergency situation or regular medication.

* (2100)

At the society level, and I am sure Mr. Turner is far more able to speak to this than I, but we have been dealing all year with the issue of how much medication should teachers be allowed to give. This did not seem to be a thing that we wanted to be involved with, but the students we have require it.

So we have been in this dilemma with ourselves and the medical profession all year. This has not yet been resolved. There are all kinds of medical procedures which either the teachers themselves or a teacher's aide or someone else in the building has to administer for that child, whether it be medical procedures or medication. This is part of the daily life of a teacher today.

Mr. Alcock: The other question, and you raise it in your brief, and certainly we have heard it over and over again from other groups, is the destruction of the bargaining relationship in the agreements. What took place in your division as Bill 22 was announced relative to negotiations, discussions, et cetera, with your group?

Ms. von Stein: First of all, our division is relatively affluent. It has a surplus of \$2 million. Secondly, we were trying to strike an agreement through

negotiations for a contract that expired in 1991. We went to conciliation and reached an agreement on our side of the bargaining table. The board, however, was not able to stand behind their negotiation committee and failed to ratify their agreement. They had a number of excuses partly tied to funding issues, et cetera, but however, it broke down at that point.

Since that time, in fact just a couple of weeks ago, they did ratify and brought it back to us and asked us to comply. However, they only offered that on one hand and then took away the same amount by taking away the PD days to the total of four. So really, we are right back where we started. What they had wanted all along was a wage freeze, and they just manipulated things so they got what they had wanted.

Mr. Chalrperson: I would point out that there is approximately about two minutes left.

Ms. Friesen: One of the things that a number of speakers have spoken about is the lack of trust that this has engendered between, essentially, citizens and their government. I wondered if you could comment on that from a teacher's perspective, who presumably also has to teach civics in the classroom and is now put in a particularly difficult position by a government who has abandoned a contract, who has walked away from the whole thrust of labour relations since the 1940s.

Ms. von Stein: I guess I still hold some trust in the democratic process or I would not be speaking before you this evening. I fear that some of the people around the table may, however, have their minds slightly closed and may be viewing things from an altogether different perspective than I would like to see them taking. As I said in my brief, I feel that you are dealing with people and that that has to count more than some other factors that seem to be outweighing everything else.

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

Ms. von Stein: Thank you.

Mr. Chalrperson: As was previously indicated at the beginning of the discussions, we would try to accommodate out-of-town presenters. It has been brought to my attention that there is a presenter from Ashern, Mr. Neil MacNeil. Is there a willingness to hear this presenter at this time? Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Chalrperson: Mr. MacNeil, No. 14, yes. He has a written presentation, and we will distribute it at this time. Mr. MacNeil, you may begin.

Mr. Neil MacNeil (Lakeshore Teachers' Association): Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Neil MacNeil, and I am here representing the teachers of Lakeshore School Division.

It is absolutely unconscionable that the government of this province has seen fit to attack education in the way that this legislation does. You are obviously not aware of the tremendous damage this bill is causing, so I will attempt to explain it for you.

First and foremost, the consequence of this bill for the students that we teach, for our kids in Lakeshore, will be a reduced standard of education. This is unavoidable and irrevocable. In Lakeshore, we have had three days taken away, two administration days and one parent-teacher day. Are you not aware of the importance of the activities that take place on these days?

We need time to consult with students and their parents on their progress. We need time to prepare lessons and curricula. We need time to prepare displays and to clean our classrooms. We need time to mark papers and assignments at the end of a term and to fill out progress reports. I teach senior high sciences, and I personally need time to take inventory and to prepare supply orders, a process that takes days by itself. Many of my colleagues have similar duties pertaining to their area of teaching.

Next year, because of Bill 22, the teachers of Lakeshore will have all of one day to accomplish all of these tasks. Please understand, it is not as though we have a wealth of time presently to do these things during the regular school day. We teachers have 40 minutes every second day when we are not in contact with a class full of students if these 40 minutes are taken away or not taken away to supervise the class of someone who is home sick or to carry out some other duty. Are you so ignorant of our profession as educators that you do not realize the importance of these activities? You must be made to understand that with the schools closed, these activities will not be carried out. Our kids deserve better treatment than that.

How can you, in all good conscience, allow differing standards of education to be formally established in this province? How can you pass

legislation, the effect of which is to provide a lower quality of education for our kids in Lakeshore, than for the 93,000 students who live in divisions and districts where Bill 22 is not being imposed? Make no mistake about it. We have worked very hard in Lakeshore to make up for the disadvantages inherent in our division.

This bill, however, is an attack that we cannot compensate for. Our teachers are tired. They cannot possibly do more work in less time, and to top it all off, for a lower salary. The morale in our staff rooms has never been lower, and this government must answer for the effect that this will have on education. Our kids deserve better.

Another consequence of this bill concerns the collective bargaining process and the damage caused to the relationship between teachers and our local school board. When I became involved with the executive of our local teachers' association three years ago, both we and our trustees made earnest efforts to improve that relationship. We established a round table bargaining process that provided for real communication instead of confrontation, and as a result of this process, we were the first division in the province to conclude and to sign a collective agreement.

Now, however, our trustees sincerely believe that they have no other choice but to impose the provisions of Bill 22. Because you are making it legal to do so they have broken our agreement. The trust that we worked so hard to nurture is broken, and it will not be so easily re-established.

This government has driven a wedge between us that both sides feel powerless to remove. If you claim to know anything about education and educators, then understand this—teachers care about kids. No one would or could tolerate the long hours and sometimes overwhelming stress levels involved in our profession, unless we really believed that this was the most important job in the world.

The effects of this legislation are so far-reaching, though, and the intentions of this government toward education so careless that our teachers have felt compelled to protest in the only manner we see available.

The teachers of Lakeshore are, to the best of my knowledge, unanimous in asking our school board to rescind the imposition of Bill 22. Failing that, we have passed a motion that calls upon teachers not

to volunteer next year for extracurricular activities that occur outside of regular school hours.

Unlike this government, we will not play games. We will not pretend that the consequences of our decision are very severe and will have a serious impact on our kids. The consequences of allowing this government to proceed on its destructive path are, however, much more serious.

If you care about kids like we do, you will stop the passage of this bill. Our kids in Lakeshore are counting on you to do the right thing, not just the most expedient thing. We want to be able to tell them that this government will stand up for their education. Our kids deserve better treatment.

* (2110)

Mr. Chairperson: I thank you for your presentation, Mr. MacNeil.

Mr. Manness: Mr. MacNeil, I have to ask you a very serious question because of the tone of your presentation. Some would say it was almost threatening, but that is fine. I am not troubled by that, because I feel other threats as the fiscal trustee of the province.

Mr. MacNeil, I will ask this question. You are obviously aware of what other governments in Canada are doing. I do not want to bring them in, necessarily the facts or the specific details of what other provinces are contemplating, but you must have a theory. You are an educated person. You must have a theory why it is that governments across the land are having to adopt various measures within the area of education, within all areas. Why do you think governments do this?

Do you think they do it because they want to be politically popular? Do you see a win on this? You must have a theory as to why, not the government of Manitoba per se, governments across the land of all political stripes are having to take these very, very hard decisions. If you have a theory, could you share it with me, please?

Mr. MacNeil: You bet. It is my belief, like I said in this presentation, that you must be ignorant of the consequences of this kind of legislation for the kids in Lakeshore and for the kids in other school divisions.

This has to lead to a lower standard of education—it has to. You could not impose this kind of legislation, if you were aware of the

consequences of this legislation. You could not have done it.

Now, you are making reference to what is happening in other provinces. I am sure my colleagues with MTS can make the case much better for the fact that this government, since 1988, has seen fit to reduce taxation levels, to strip themselves of revenue. I believe that the figure that has been quoted is something to the tune of \$300 million.

Now I am not prepared to get into those kinds of arguments because I am not really qualified to carry on those kinds of arguments, but what I am qualified to speak about is what is happening in our classrooms. Like I said, we have 97 teachers in Lakeshore, and we are unanimous in this. The consequences of this legislation are going to be a reduced standard of education.

This government claims that it is standing up for education, that education is so terribly important, but that is not what this legislation is going to do. This legislation is going to strip our kids of some part of their education.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Chairperson, I am sure Mr. MacNeil believes in the democratic process. I am sure he fully understands that what he is trying to say—I could be wrong—is that those of us around this table, particularly in the government, do not care about kids. He nods approvingly at that comment.

So he seems to be saying then that the democratic system has fallen down, that in government now is a bunch of people who do not care about kids, that only he cares, or people who share his view care about kids.

He says "ignorant," he says the government must be ignorant. He can, of course, say that he has not heard what has happened in British Columbia. My goodness, in that province, eight or 10 of the cabinet had to back away from the decision because they considered themselves educators. I guess they were ignorant educators then, because they were in the position of power. But they had to take some tough decisions. Again, the question was, and I go back to it, what would be the theory then as to why governments across the land are having to make these very, as some would say, draconian decisions?

Why are they having to do it? This must be something more than ignorance.

Mr. MacNeil: No, Mr. Manness, it is ignorance. If you were to spend some time with us out in Lakeshore and take a look at the work we are doing, take a look at the workload we are working under, and if you could possibly take a look at what we are doing and then tell me that taking away those three days is not going to lead to a lower standard of education, you cannot do it.

That is ignorance. This government is claiming that they stand for education. Now if this government would say, we cannot afford the standard of education we have had in the past so the quality of education is going to be cut, that would at least be honest. It would still be a terrible thing, but it would at least be honest.

Mr. Manness: I guess then, and you believe, Mr. MacNeil, withdrawing your support for extracurricular activities is going to make it better?

Mr. MacNeil: Yes, I do.

Mr. Manness: You believe that is going to help the children?

Mr. MacNeil: I believe that there is a possibility that if we take these kinds of measures, somebody is going to pay attention.

Mr. Alcock: Mr. Chairperson, the word "ignorance" is getting used around the table quite a bit, probably with some justification.

I think, Mr. MacNeil, what you are attempting to do is to make people aware of what the consequences are of certain decisions, and you can make a decision for all the right or necessary reasons and it can still backfire on you in a number of ways. I think that is what we are hearing tonight from a variety of presenters.

I would like you to just enlarge upon one point that you make in your presentation. The government makes the point that what they are doing is distributing the load fairly, that it is a tough time, everybody is going to have to share a little piece of the pain, yet you make the point that there are 93,000 children, and I believe, if my math is right, that is about 40 percent of the total kids in the education system now that are going to have a different quality of education. We are going to begin to see a separation in the kind of education that is provided across the province.

Can you just underscore that a little bit and help explain to the government just how that is another unintended consequence of their legislation,

perhaps another example of how they have failed to consider the impact of some of their decisions?

Mr. MacNeil: I am told by some that Bill 22 and the decision to cut education funding this year and the decision to hold property tax increases at 2 percent are an attempt to strip the school divisions of the surpluses that have been built up, some \$57 million in surpluses that school divisions have built up around the province. We do not have a surplus out in Lakeshore. The budget shows a \$10 surplus. I think we are one of two or three or four school divisions that do not have a rainy day surplus to fall back on. So this year we have lost a couple more teachers again.

We have lost our divisional band program. A couple of years ago we lost our OEC programs in the high schools. We have seen education cut over and over and over again. At least we had a full school year to work with, now we do not have that. I mean, if you are attempting to provide the same standard of education to all kids in the province—I think that is the mandate of any government, to provide the same standard of education. Well, this legislation does not do it. This legislation is providing a lower standard in Lakeshore than it is in many other places in this province.

What that does then is it pits teacher against teacher. I am sure there are teachers in Winnipeg who would take offence to the kinds of things that I am saying and say that I am attacking the standard of education that they have. I do not want a piece of what they have. I am not asking you to take away from them and give something to the teachers in Lakeshore. I mean, they have a full plate. Those teachers have a full plate, but we have more than a full plate right now, and it has been made worse again this year. But this year it is formal. This year it is formal that it is 194 days in Lakeshore and 197 days in 22 other divisions and districts around this province, and it is 189 days in some of the others.

An Honourable Member: No, it is not. It is voluntary.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I am not sure what the Minister of Finance was attempting to contribute to discussion, but it might be helpful to members of the committee and presenters if it was done through the record, because what I find interesting in this whole discussion is the response

to some of the questions. I was particularly surprised at the earlier talk from the Minister of Finance asking for your theory of what this government was doing.

I want to ask you more in terms of fairness here, because I think some of us would suggest that what the government is essentially doing is taking care of its deficit problems by going the easy route, in this particular case, picking on public sector workers and attempting to take advantage of some of the scapegoat type of tactics that we have seen. Believe you me, I have sat and listened to some of the debate, and I would classify some of the comments as being nothing more or less than scapegoat attacks on public sector workers.

I am wondering if you consider it fair that the government has singled out one sector, either through the 10 days off or the reduction of in-service days, administration days, and whether you feel if it was done in terms of, say, the population generally to the same degree, if it was a direct tax on the public, how you think people would respond, because some of us feel it is essentially a tax on the public sector workers that we are seeing with Bill 22?

* (2120)

Mr. MacNeil: This government has made it clear that they have no intention of taking on the entire public; that is why they will not raise taxes to fund education. That much is clear. So you are absolutely right, it is a special tax on educators and other civil service employees. That is exactly what this is.

But I am not concerned about the tax on teachers. I have gone around as president of our association and I have spoken to all 97 teachers in the division and there is not a one of them that is complaining that they are losing one and a half percent of their salary. That is not what they are upset about. You have to understand that. This is not about our pay cheques. The concern here is about the education for our kids.

This has allowed our school board to take away three days of valuable teaching time. Just because the kids are not in the schools does not mean that it is not valuable teaching time. We need this time, but your legislation says that we are being given a three-day, unpaid leave of absence. That is not voluntary time, that is a leave of absence, and I think, if I am understanding this correctly, that this is

the first time I have heard anybody have the gall to suggest that on an unpaid leave of absence the teachers are supposed to come in and do the same work that they used to do.

I think that is the first time I am hearing that, and that surprised me, I did not think anybody would have the gall to suggest that. Nobody is suggesting that any of the other civil service employees come in on their unpaid days and volunteer their time. We have been volunteering our time a whole heck of a lot during these extracurricular activities. I coach senior boys volleyball. That is a commitment of more than 300 hours a year just for that one extracurricular, and I personally do more than that.

We are telling you right now that if we do not get these three days back, the teachers of Glacier have decided that we are going to protest in the only way that we see that we can and those things will not be done next year.

Mr. Chairperson: I thank you, Mr. MacNeil, for your presentation this evening. Thank you very much.

Point of Order

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Chairperson, I am not officially on this committee. I am a member of the Legislature, and I am entitled to ask questions. I just would like to ask if the government will indicate if the new policy now is to filibuster in terms of questions, because we are seeing increasingly tonight and other committee hearings that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) wants to spend time answering questions. I think it is unfair to members of the opposition—

Mr. Chairperson: No, I am sorry. In previous presenters, the questions were asked on both sides of the House. Order, please. The questions that were asked were asked by the minister and as by all committee members, committee members have the opportunity to ask questions. There is no point of order.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. MacNeil. Your time has expired, Mr. MacNeil. Thank you very much, Mr. MacNeil. The next presenter is Mr. Geoff Tuckwell. His presentation has been presented. Mr. Tuckwell, you may proceed.

Mr. Geoff Tuckwell (Transcona-Springfield Teachers' Association): Mr. Chairperson, members of the committee, I wish to speak this evening on the impact that Bill 22 will have on the educational system in the Transcona-Springfield School Division.

Under the auspices of Bill 22, our Board of Trustees have voted to take away six out of the 10 PD administration days for the '93-94 school year, thereby shutting down the entire school system for those six days.

Interestingly enough, the Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey) in her letter that designates the teaching days for the '93-94 school year states, and I quote: The number of days for teacher in-service, parent-teacher conferences, administration and pupil evaluation in grades kindergarten to 12 shall not exceed 10 days of which at least five shall be used for teacher in-service.

Although the minister recognizes that professional development is equally important as those days set aside for administrative activities, it is now clear that the days allocated for professional development in the Transcona-Springfield School Division will essentially disappear in the '93-94 school year. It is very distressing for me to even state this and to understand why it is happening. An explanation of administrative and PD days is necessary, and I wish to account for these days from a teacher's perspective.

I have heard several members of the committee asking for specific examples of how this will affect our school system, and I hope to show you some of these in this brief.

Administrative days are important for the reporting and organizational duties that play a crucial part of the school system. In middle-year schools, a teacher may be responsible for marking exams and making up reports for 200 students or more. In senior-year schools, where the exams are usually longer and more complex in nature, it is not uncommon for a teacher's workload to exceed 120 students. Early-year teachers use up a great deal of time updating individual cumulative files that follow a student up through the system, as well as grading their classes of 30 or more students on the majority of subjects that the children are taking.

At all levels, meetings with other teachers to assess individual student performances in other

disciplines take time as well. Parent-teacher interviews are scheduled both during the days and evenings to accommodate those parents that work different time shifts. Graduation exercises must be organized and executed efficiently in order to send the children on to higher levels of education.

The point is, these administrative activities must be done. They are as important as the teaching and interactive events that occur in the classroom. Time must be set aside for these duties. To my mind, PD was never intended to compete with administrative days, but this is now the case in Transcona-Springfield with only four days left.

Teaching is not a static activity. Anyone who enters teaching must be ready for changes and must be fond of taking on new challenges. It is part of the job. We live in a rapidly changing society and the educational system must keep up with the society that it reflects. Professional development is a continual part of a teacher's job—pure and simple. In my opinion, a teacher that receives no professional development will soon begin to fail him or herself as well as the students entrusted to his or her care. A school system without professional development is much like a train with a locomotive suddenly disappearing. The train will coast along for a while but will eventually come to a screeching stop.

Many parents that I have spoken to acknowledge the benefits of professional development, but they are not clear on the topics that are currently being looked at through PD. With this committee's indulgence, I would like to mention some of the PD activities that are occurring this year in the Transcona-Springfield School Division and will need follow-up in future years. I would like to divide these workshops and lectures into three classifications.

1. Curriculum: Society is demanding more and more from its K to 12 school system, and for that reason curriculum is going through a major upheaval at all levels. I will give you just some simple examples here. In early years there is a program that ties into our new freedom from violence policy in a division where the students work out problems amongst themselves, and it is called Violence Prevention in Daily Life and Relationships. There is another one called The Thinking Framework for gifted children from K to 4, and it is new this year. Of course, it is to challenge

those who otherwise may get rather restless and bored in a regular classroom.

Middle years: The math curriculum, which I think has been mentioned already for 5 to 8, was piloted last year in some of our schools and will be implemented for the first time in September.

* (2130)

Senior years is going through a major upheaval, besides all of the courses in my area of business education which we are changing. There are two new courses, Skills for Independent Living and health, which have been made compulsory at the Grade 10 level. Divisionally, we have approximately 40 sections of these courses to be studied and taught from the ground up. Many teachers who have been assigned to teach these courses are totally unfamiliar with the course content.

(Mr. Edward Helwer, Acting Chairperson, in the Chair)

2. Methodology: Many of the changes to the curriculum involve using new technologies to enhance the course material and content. I am sure that many of you that sit on this committee have spent countless hours learning how to operate a computer system successfully. It takes a great deal of time to learn the complexities of word processing or a spreadsheet or any of the other packages. Let me take this one step further. It is one thing to learn your way around a computer; it is quite another to gain the expertise and methodology needed to teach one how to use a computer properly. Again, to learn such skills takes time, and it is time that is no longer afforded to the teachers of Transcona-Springfield School Division.

3. Classroom Management and Discipline: This seems to be taking a lot more time than it used to, and I guess it is because of the changing definition of school. Before any learning can occur in a classroom, the environment must be that of a learning environment.

Conservative estimates indicate that 25 percent of all students in the K to 12 public school system do not follow a normal learning curve. In other words, they do not fit readily into a normal classroom situation. Many of these children bring their anger to the classroom, bring their overwhelming needs for love and understanding, and bring their aggressions aimed at fellow

students and teachers alike. There are a lot of needy kids out there, and those needs must be addressed before any meaningful learning can take place.

Without proper training, teachers cannot cope with these children, and all the others in the class suffer. They suffer because the teacher's attention is consumed by the children who have behavioural disorders and the learning curve plummets. Other children receive little or no individual instruction, and that can be very frustrating to the students and to the classroom teacher.

In a survey sent out to all teachers in Transcona-Springfield School Division this year, there were a possible 100 subjects listed that dealt with primarily professional development. The top ten priorities listed by teachers were all related to classroom management and discipline or instructional strategies. To my mind, teachers are saying that they need help to effectively deliver their programs and that help is needed primarily in the area of coping with behavioural disorders.

Ironically one of the most acclaimed workshops held in Transcona-Springfield School Division this year took a full five days. It was called WEVAS, which is an acronym for Working Effectively with Violent and Aggressive Students. It was hosted by the Department of Education and Training and involved some 40 teachers from all schools in our division.

These teachers were taught methodology and procedure and are now trained and willing and expected to give a workshop on WEVAS to those teachers in their respective schools. The recommendation from the Department of Education and Training is that all teachers in the school be in-serviced over a full three-day period by the trainers who attended this workshop. I call it ironic because on one hand the department is recommending three-day workshops for all teachers on one area of classroom management and on the other hand proposing legislation to effectively wipe out all days that were set aside for PD.

As I see it, PD can be accomplished during the school day in one of two ways. You can call in a substitute; you can send kids home. Both methods can be used effectively for specific types of inservicing. Bringing in a substitute for several teachers who must meet because of common

curriculum changes or strategies works well for a day or so but it does tend to interrupt the learning cycle. Younger students sometimes feel like their teachers have deserted them. Older students sometimes see the substitute as an excuse to do little or no work. Substitutes are willing to teach and to give instruction but they are severely limited by not knowing the make-up of that particular class or the specific needs of the individual students. Furthermore, from the divisional standpoint, this can be a costly item, especially if substitute fees must be paid for a large group to meet.

In past years sending the kids home to create an in-service day in my opinion has probably been the best bang for the buck. The entire division or one level of schools or even an entire school is involved in a particular workshop. Large groups can get together to hear the latest research or strategies from an individual that would be too costly to in-service small groups. To give you an example, we had Stephen Lewis scheduled to come in and speak to us on race and equity relations, and unfortunately we do know we just do not have a day for him so we have just had to cancel it.

In-service days are also important in team-building exercises or issues that may involve an entire school. Colleagues get to share ideas not only at school level but also the departmental, divisional and provincial levels as well, and that is important. Unfortunately, with six days gone, these are no longer an option. At best some levels, primarily the early years people, may get one day for the entire school year, and even that is questionable.

Divisions have favoured these days in the past because they still receive their grant money even though the kids are not in school. What Bill 22 does is give the divisions the right to close the schools, reduce the teachers' pay, yet still receive the provincial grant money for those days. The losers here are the teachers and ultimately their students.

This question was brought up and other ones. Why do not the teachers do PD on their own time? My answer to that question is, we do. There are numerous workshops on Saturdays and weeknights. I offer the following workshops that I—just prior to this hearing being mentioned around June 16, I went down to the professional development bulletin board in the staff room at the

high school where I teach and I found a variety of things which I wrote down.

I will give you just a quick list here: Differentiated Curriculum in the High School; Teacher Effectiveness; Co-operative Learning; Teaching Through Learning Channels; WEVAS, as I have mentioned before, was another one; Mind, Memory and Learning. There was one on Education in Crisis; Breaking Through Barriers to Literacy; Hands on to the New Math Curriculum; Today's Children: Our Keys to Tomorrow.

At first glance this list of diverse noncredit workshops may show little in common except they may be of interest to high school teachers like myself. However, the common element that they share is that they are all either held during the summer months or on part of the weekends during the summer, spring, fall. This list, I should add, is a list from one school on one particular day. A similar list is available in all schools at all levels and updated as the year progresses.

Furthermore, dozens of teachers in the Transcona-Springfield School Division are enrolled in Continuing Education classes given at the universities during evenings and summertimes, usually for credit towards some post-graduate degree. These courses are paid by us, the teachers. In addition, most of the workshops that we attend on divisional time, or on our own time, cost money. If there are funds available, it is the policy of our division to pay half, if there is money available, and then we pay the rest.

Also, I wish this committee to be reminded that a typical teacher's day does not end at 3:30 p.m. Preparation and marking are part of the job that must be done, usually at home during the evenings or on weekends, and there are things like PTA meetings that we as parents strongly support and attend, as well as families to look after. We need PD time during regular working hours to keep up with changing curriculum and our changing clientele.

Mr. Acting Chairperson, I have tried to look at the issues that concern the children and how Bill 22 will affect them in our division. There are several other arguments against this bill that I have not addressed. One is how the collective bargaining will be literally squashed by this bill, a process that has worked to the advantage of education in

Transcona-Springfield School Division for decades now.

Furthermore, teachers are being told that they must subsidize education in Transcona-Springfield for the '93-94 school year on an average of \$1,500 per teacher. The teachers of Transcona-Springfield are being treated inequitably primarily because of the division that we work in and for no other reason that I can see. Suddenly, under the shadow of Bill 22, the teachers of Transcona-Springfield School Division are making an average of \$1,500 less than, say, teachers in St. Vital or Winnipeg and are receiving six less PD and administration days. Where is the value in this? I would like to ask the question, are we being punished for something we did?

I am asking you to consider the inequities Bill 22 will have on the children and the teachers of my division. In my opinion, neither group is receiving the quality of training and expertise that some divisions can afford. Bill 22 will create have and have-not pockets of education in this province, a situation that is intolerable under the Charter of Rights where equality of education is guaranteed.

I urge the committee to reject Bill 22 and all the negative effects it will have on the educational system in Transcona-Springfield. Thank you.

The Acting Chairperson (Mr. Helwer): Thank you, Mr. Tuckwell.

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Tuckwell, for your presentation. I share many of your concerns that you have expressed here, and looking at the opening comments of your presentations, and the analogy you use about a train that will coast along for a while but will eventually come to a screeching stop is one that is appropriate for our community that we both represent.

I must comment to you as a parent of Transcona. My children attend the schools in Transcona, and I have been very impressed by the level of professionalism and the quality of education that the teachers have attempted to provide to my children. I ask that you pass along these comments to those teachers and my appreciation for the efforts that they have made. I have heard similar comments from other parents in the community too about the level and quality of teaching in the community itself.

* (2140)

But I have questions here with respect to your presentation. You talked about some of the concerns that the teachers have and the training and the skills they need to develop to deal with situations that teachers encounter within the school during the day. Is there, from your experience and from the information you may have received from some of your colleagues, difficulty with violence in the schools in our community? Has this program that you have indicated that is available for teachers, the Working Effectively with Violent and Aggressive Students assisted teachers with dealing effectively with these problems in the schools?

The Acting Chairperson (Mr. Helwer): Mr. Tuckwell, before you start I want to just remind you that you have about a minute and a half left on your time. Please answer the question. Proceed.

Mr. Tuckwell: I believe the first freedom-from-violence policy in the province was born in Transcona, and we have had one year of it now and we are developing it and modifying it and trying to make it work better. I think it is working out there, from what I have spoken to teachers, but there is quite a bit of work to do on it, and there is a lot of education, especially at the classroom level, and I think that is what we are working on right now.

Mr. Reid: Can you give, Mr. Tuckwell, for the benefit of members of this committee, an indication on what impacts this legislation and for that matter, Bill 16 as well, what impact you have seen in the division with respect to paraprofessionals, teachers or program cuts that may have occurred?

Mr. Tuckwell: Well, this year, by the look of it, the cuts are not going to be probably as deep as they have been in past years, and the reason I say that is because I think we have been affected by cuts to education in Transcona-Springfield rather dramatically over the last five years. We have been basically cutting to the bone, and that is why it is a little unfortunate that we happened to get hit this year with Bill 22 because it is going to impact even greater.

The Acting Chairperson (Mr. Helwer): The time is up, Mr. Reid, I am sorry. Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Tuckwell.

The next presenter is Dave Normandale. Your presentation has been distributed. You may proceed when you are ready, Mr. Normandale.

Mr. Dave Normandale (Private Citizen): I am a teacher, and I do work in Transcona-Springfield, but I am not speaking on behalf of that group today. Jeff has already done that. I am not speaking on behalf of the Teachers' Society, either.

Who I am speaking on behalf of are the kids I touch that are not in my classroom. That is coming from the fact that I am one of the people that goes out and runs professional development workshops.

In the last year, I have worked in River East School Division, Dauphin, Dauphin-Ochre; I have worked in Agassiz, I have even done some work at the Faculty of Education. Before I get into that, though, just let me tell you a little about myself.

I am one of those aging baby boomers that Neil MacNeil mentioned a couple of presentations ago. I am 46 years old; I have been teaching for almost 24 years. There are a large number of us out there, and I think that is an important point to remember.

In fact, three weeks ago we had a little celebration for some of my colleagues, and in the last two years we have thanked something like, well, over 10 percent of our teaching staff who are of 25 years or longer of service. If we transfer that to the province, what that basically means is, we are looking at something like 20,000 kids, minimum, that are being taught by people who left high school in '65 or earlier.

When I left high school, manned space flight had been going for four years, all right? And at that time, I had a part-time job in the summer. I was working at the Manitoba Telephone System on a IBM 360 computer. It took up half the basement of Empress Street. That kind of stuff is what we had.

Now, I walked into my shared classroom the other day, and there is a textbook sitting there. It is called: The History of the World since 1968. That is the year that many of my colleagues, myself included, got our first degree. What has happened since that time? Quite a bit.

I remember when we had one television channel in this city and that now we can buy TV sets ready to receive 155, and that is just one example. So change is a constant in our lives. To be quite honest with you, it is happening in education, not as fast as business, but it is happening.

What I have to say here is that what I am living is a change in the high school English program. I have not always done high school English, but I am in it now. The changes that are coming, I think, are

just excellent. I have been a part of the steering committee for the last two years working on this high school English program, and I think it is world class.

In fact, we are starting to get requests for this curriculum from around the world. Parts of it are being sent down to California, because they feel this is the best that they have come across. That is where I come in, because high school English is never going to be the same, folks.

I have lived this curriculum for five years, because I never have to work under the old one. That is the difference between what I do and what is happening in other classrooms across this province, because I was never really a high school English teacher. I did other things. When I came in, I lived this curriculum for five years, and now I have some skills that I can take out to my colleagues in other places who are looking upon this as new and frightening, in some places.

High school English teachers, you know, are small "c" conservative by nature. They are the last people that the public can take a finger point at if something goes wrong. I can understand that change is a threat to them. So through the High School Review Committee and Education Manitoba we are proposing change, and teachers need help in implementing it.

So away we go. I show those teachers what is happening in my classroom. I show them samples of the work that my kids are doing. I say, this is where I made some mistakes and here is how I voided it. This is what worked, this is what is good and this is what is bad.

Classroom approaches are changing, and if that person at the front of the room is not comfortable with what is going on, then we are going to have some problems. So I can try and alleviate some of those discomforts and transfer some of that comfort level that I have, so that teachers can start to implement some change. That is how I reach out and touch those students, whom I believe I am speaking for tonight.

In my brief, I touch on something called the writing process, which is not really very new. It has been around since, I think, Socrates sat under the trees. We seemed to have got away from it for awhile. I can go in, I can show my people how this thing works, and I have demonstrable proof that it does make for better students.

You know, it is interesting that I have been asked to go out to the faculty of education to do this stuff, too. I remember the minister, the Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey), that is, at the MAST convention when she was talking with the media. She said that professional development is really important; teacher training is really important.

It is no good just teaching the young guys. There are a whole bunch of us still out there with a few years left under our belts. We have got to get the wheels greased from time to time.

So we have to take a look at what happens when you get that professional development. Now, Jeff, in his presentation before talked about how word processing skills, spreadsheets and desktop publishing—I am sure you all read the article in the Free Press last week about computer illiteracy. It has been professional development in Transcona Collegiate that has allowed that to happen.

* (2150)

We put our teachers through days upon days of professional development on this MS DOS stuff that we brought in to replace our Apples. You take a look at the writing skills that my kids are doing right now in my English class, and they are a darn sight better than what was being churned out when I went through school.

We are also bringing in Manitoba authors into our high school English program. The only reason we are doing that is because we are having time in professional development to sit down and take a look at this stuff. You know, a funny thing about this is that most Manitoba authors, Dave Elias, Dennis Cooley, when they write, they are not making up teacher guides to go with their stuff. Somebody has got to do that, and professional development allows us to sit around, talk about how we can implement this material into our classrooms and give the kids a taste of something different, something that reflects a part of the culture in the land in which they live.

So it is professional developments that are teaching the old dogs of baby boomers like me the new tricks that are needed for student success.

Here is a specific example. For four years I have been telling my Grade 12 kids about how important it is to get your résumé done. Last October 23, at College Pierre Elliott Trudeau, I listened to a professional development spokesperson from Victoria who explained how her high school was

picking up something like \$500,000 of bursaries and scholarship opportunities because they are developing the résumé to go in Grade 10.

I thought, wow, is not that great. The rationale was so smart. What is the point of teaching a kid in Grade 12 about résumé writing if some of the stuff that needs to be on that résumé had to be done in Grades 10 and 11? So I changed, and now we are doing it in Grade 10, we are building it in Grade 11 and it is fine tuned in 12.

What is happening is I have got a young man who will be vice president of Transcona Collegiate next term, and I said, Francisco, how come? He said, well, I want to have a good grad, and this helps guarantee it. Secondly, he said, I thought "vice president" would look good on my résumé. He is absolutely right. It is a small thing, but it came right out of that professional development workshop.

Next year, personally, I am not going to have six of those. Now I think that is really unfortunate. The last one I went to talked about the seven intelligences identified by Gardner [phonetic], and how if we can reach out and discover how some of these kids are working, we might be able to turn some of them around and maybe save one or two of them that we have been losing.

(Mr. Chairperson in the Chair)

I think it is a wonderful opportunity. I would like to know more about it because the bottom line on this is that I may be able to save but yet one more kid. Chances are we probably will not talk about that. But professional development is what keeps teachers fresh. Take away six of my days and we are going to have some problems in keeping me fresh.

Take away the professional development and part of the skills needed to meet the future is taken away from our kids. I have sat here for two nights now listening to comments and questions and I get the feeling that is a pretty big statement, that kids are going to suffer if professional development is taken away. The day before I listened to the honourable Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey) speak at Grant Memorial. I listened to Willard Daggett from New York, who said that teachers should be getting 20 or more days for professional development because we need to focus on computer skills, probability, physics, applied

sciences because we cannot meet the needs of the business world today.

How about higher level thinking and communication skills because the unskilled job is rapidly becoming nonexistent and business itself is into real heavy retraining and they expect people to do it. They pay people to do it. The upgrading in the business world is the business equivalent of professional development. Daggett is probably right, but to meet what he wants to do is going to take major upheaval in the Department of Education, and right now we have got some short-term problems that we have to look at.

Geoff already talked about the violence thing. He did not tell you we had a kid with a gun in the school last year. I am glad I did not meet up with him because I would not have known what to do, to be quite honest. That is a scary thought, and this whole thing about violence as a means of problem solving is something that is rising astronomically. It is not just against teachers, do not get me wrong here. Kids are beating on each other, and when that happens it messes up your classroom.

I would like to be able to take some of this nonaggressive training so I can break up some situations without getting myself in trouble, but we are losing those six days. We have 40 teachers who have gone through five days. That is 200 days of professional development with the intention of teaching me who did not go something about what is going on and handling violent aggressive kids, and I do not have any days in which to do it. Dumb move.

Anyway, it has got to the point where the Premier said on CJOB radio that teachers do not live in a real world, and you know, for once in my life I think he is right. Teachers do not live in a real world. We are living in a fantasy world. It is a comic book adventure, where a teacher with a capital T takes on the troubles of the world expected by society. It is teacher with a capital T that takes on this stuff because he believes or she believes that he is going to make a difference. The problem is always coming back to the kids. It is child-based. So one more problem is no big deal, we will take it on.

I have five special kids in my one class, two paraprofessionals. I have worked special needs for five years, family life courses, nutrition programs, counselling. Do you know that we are as teachers the front-line abuse identifiers? We

are the ones who pick up on the first signals, and we have a procedure that we are supposed to follow. Do you know how many hours of professional development I have had on that? Two hours, 2:30 to 4:30, on abuse identification and reporting, and I think that is pretty pathetic.

Surrogate parenting—I have had phone calls at two o'clock in the morning from kids. You do not hang up on them. Medical intervention—I have not had to do that yet, but that is not to say it is not coming. So with limited training we have been taking all this stuff on because the kids are going to be the winners, but I do not think that is going to happen anymore, because we have new curriculum in math, we have new curriculum in health, we have Skills for Independent Living, we have new approaches in high school English, high school social studies.

We finally got rid of the 01s, the 01/00 classification. We are recognizing that kids are kids and we can teach them and we can move them on. We have teachers all over this province that wonder how we are going to teach this. The department is saying, no more 01 courses, no more 00 courses and yet now, the year of implementation of that and there is no professional development to show them how to teach kids that are coming from all over the map as far as their skills are concerned in English.

I am teaching a brand new course in September, it is called Skills for Independent Living. It is a 300-page curriculum, there is no textbook and I have had no in-service work.

Now it sounds like teachers are wearing black hats because some of us will not take quietly what others are saying we should, our share of the pain. Pain hurts and it is good to have support when it hits, but there is something inherently and morally wrong when pain is being inflicted on one and somebody else is not getting it. I really think, as well, that what we have here is a certain amount of immorality, to put the dollar ahead of the future of our kids. By taking away my professional development and the PD of other teachers, that is exactly what you are doing.

On your way to work tomorrow, you pass by a school yard, take a look at some kids as you drive by. The one who is graduating in my school, that is on Monday, he is not going to have any impact from this bill, but that kid in kindergarten is going to miss

out on absolutely, possibly years of professional development. Because unlike others in this room, I think this is just the thin edge of the wedge and it is all going to go.

If we do not get a chance to explore the latest in educational progress, we are going to come to that screeching halt. That train is not going to come to a stop, it is going to fall off the tracks. Mentioned and touched on is the inequality of this bill, in that Winnipeg No. 1, Seven Oaks, Norwood are not losing any days this year, whereas Transcona is losing six, Fort Garry is losing six, Agassiz is losing eight. You are creating pockets of inequality and I really do not think that is right.

The fact that the bottom line on all this, it is professional development that is going to impact on the kids. I loved your throne speech but, boy, you are taking the keys and you are throwing them away. Simply stated, I think that this bill is bad legislation and I think you should withdraw it.

Mr. Chalrperson: Thank you very much for your presentation. There is approximately five minutes left.

Mr. Reid: Thank you very much, Mr. Normandale, for your interesting presentation. You obviously have a great deal of experience in a variety of areas in the teaching profession and you have indicated that you have spent, I believe you said, five years of your education career in teaching children with special needs.

Mr. Normandale: The last five years.

* (2200)

Mr. Reid: The last five years, okay. Can you give me an indication—I sense that because you have had the opportunity to take part in professional development day training, this has provided you with some insight on how to cope and to deal with the problems that you encounter in trying to assist the children that have these special needs. Can you give me some idea and give members of the committee some idea of what that professional development training that I sense that you have has allowed you to bring to the children of the community?

Mr. Normandale: I hate to disappoint you but about 99 percent of that training was seat of the pants in the classroom, working with a colleague and going to a couple of conferences, but it did help.

Mr. Reid: Then you have gained that, obviously, by your experience as a teacher over the twenty-some years that you have been teaching. Do you sense that other teachers, your colleagues, that would also, I believe, probably encounter some similar problems that you would yourself as a teacher dealing with children with special needs, benefit from a continuation of the professional development training programs that were listed by the previous presenter?

Do you think that if they were removed that the teachers would not acquire the skills? I know the minister here has said on numerous occasions that teachers should go after hours and weekends and during the summer break and use their own time to brush up on the skills necessary, and that it should be totally upon the teachers themselves to acquire those skills.

Mr. Manness: I never said that once. Tell the truth.

Mr. Reid: The minister seems to take some exception with that comment, but I will leave that for his own questioning.

Can you tell me the impact that those other teachers, your colleagues, have experienced and what they have gained from the professional development days that are so important to their training of our children?

Mr. Normandale: I would suggest to the committee that all teachers have special needs and that professional development benefits all of them. It does not matter whether it is in English or whether it is in the violence or whether it is in science or the new math curriculum, you are going to pick up something that you are going to be able to use with at least one student every time you walk in. Usually it is going to be with more.

Mr. Reid: The school division in which you teach, which is my own community as well, has cut back on the professional development days as you have already indicated. Has the division, the school board trustees, given any indication to yourself or other teachers in the division of what they might expect for the coming year by way of program cutbacks, teacher or paraprofessional cutbacks or further reductions in even the administrative days, the only administrative days that are left?

Mr. Normandale: I have not been directly informed of that yet. I have got some grapevine stuff, but it is nothing concrete.

Mr. Reid: The previous presenter, and I think yourself as well, indicated that—and there was a problem or concern in the community about the requirement, and I think there is even a court case that is ongoing with respect to teachers having to deal with children with special needs and administer medication to students. Have there been any programs that you are aware of that have given teachers the opportunity to acquire skills, and how far do you sense, looking at your experience as a teacher, teachers should go with having to provide medication for students within the community?

Mr. Normandale: I do not think teachers should be giving medication to students under any circumstance.

Mr. Reid: That is an important statement. I am glad that the Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey) is here to hear that, knowing that the concerns that are in the community—[interjection] The member obviously is sensitive to this. [interjection]

Mr. Chairperson: Order, please. The member's time has just about expired.

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Normandale, for coming out here this evening and making a presentation to us. We appreciate your taking the time.

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

I would now like to call on Mr. Barry Wolfe. Mr. Barry Wolfe? I will then call on Mr. Rejean La Roche. Rejean La Roche. I will then call on Mr. David Lerner. You may just proceed, Mr. Lerner.

Mr. David Lerner (Private Citizen): Thank you. I want to take this opportunity to thank the committee for allowing me to make a brief oral presentation and then perhaps respond to any questions you may have.

I feel that much of what I came here to say tonight would be repetitive, so what I have chosen to do instead is raise three issues that I have not heard in the two evenings that I have sat with you through presentations on Bill 22.

I should start though by perhaps giving you a little bit of background information about myself. I teach kids, and I have proudly said that in this province for 22 years. Those of you who know me know that that is something I say quite often. I am very, very alarmed at what I see happening to the teaching force in this province because of this bill,

and the purpose of my presentation tonight is to urge the committee to convince the minister to withdraw it.

I have three reasons that I have not heard discussed tonight that I want to raise. Aside from all that I have heard about the value of PD that I strongly agree with, I want to raise the issue of some clarification for what Mr. Alcock raised earlier regarding the loss of pension rights.

It is possible that there is some confusion because there are two parts to that calculation. One of the parts, you had it right, was the calculation that is based on the final average earnings in the last seven and the last five years of teaching. For those who are at the point of retirement that would be a considerable loss, but also I need to point out to you, every teacher every year that they are in service received credit for the number of days that they have taught, and when there will be a shortfall of four days or eight days or 11 days or whatever in a given school year, they then receive less than a full year's credit. So, therefore, even a beginning teacher will suffer as a result of the legislation, and that is a very onerous piece of this bill.

The second area that I have not heard raised tonight and is one that is of concern to me as someone who considers himself a dedicated professional is the reaction of parents to the potential loss of the professional development days. I really urge the committee to do some serious thinking and perhaps some talking with their constituents about what the parents, especially the parents of school-age children, feel about the proposed takeaway, especially of the parent interviews which are such an integral part of effective modern teaching.

Lastly, I am wanting the committee to take a look at the loss of collective bargaining rights that we are potentially to suffer under Bill 22 from a basic human rights level. It is my understanding that both the United Nations charter and the Canadian Charter of Rights would want us to be treated equitably by the lawmakers of this province, so I therefore want to raise that as an issue as well.

I could say many other things that I have heard said in the two evenings that I have spent here, but I had much rather respond to the questions of the committee members if I may.

Mr. Chairperson: I thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Lerner.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Lerner, in your last comment you talked about the human rights issue. Do you feel that it is fair that these students that are graduating today and no doubt the ones that are going to graduate in the years to come have a per capita debt without their knowledge of anywhere between \$20,000 and \$50,000? Does human rights, should that whole issue be expected to address that issue at all, and is that right?

Mr. Lerner: That is an interesting question and one that I almost wish we had an infinite amount of time to talk about. I can give you my perception and that is on behalf of my own children and my descendants, may they live and be well when they come. The answer to that is yes, that is very fair. It is perfectly equitable that if every Canadian faces the same debt load as every other Canadian, I do not have any problem with that as a person.

The question then becomes, is the deficit, stated on an individual basis, as you have stated, is it a problem for that economy, is it a burden that the economy cannot bear? I see that as an issue. I teach it as an issue and say that there are definitely two schools of thought about whether the current deficit is alarming or not, and I guess I will leave it at that.

* (2210)

Mr. Manness: Mr. Chairperson, I will only ask one more question. Mr. Lerner talks about the "equality" of the debt on a per capita basis and, of course, society will not let it be equalized because there are some who have more advantages and some that have less. I dare say those that are beneficially employed probably will be carrying in 10 years a per capita debt of closer to \$100,000 and every one of us then has to put incredible faith that, as a player in the world, we will continue to be competitive, that we will continue to be able to create wealth so that the interest on that debt can be paid.

Mr. Lerner, I ask you the question, you totally believe that under the circumstances that—and the governments and the governance. I will not ask you to show your favour for the federal government that is now in place or indeed the one that may come and replace it. Do you have that much confidence that Canada is going to continue to sail along, wealth will be created, and your children and

mine that are gainfully employed and have that type of debt are going to be able to contribute and pay on that debt?

Mr. Lerner: In a word, yes. The reason for that is quite simply stated. The reason for that is that Canada's most valuable resource is the minds of its young people, and the single most damaging and detrimental thing that a government can do to the economy is to refuse to invest appropriately in the most valuable resource that it possesses.

Mr. Alcock: Thank you, Mr. Lerner. Mr. Chairperson, I am interested in a couple of things here, because I think this question of fairness that gets used as a justification for this bill is something that is brought up over and over again, in the sense that if you accept the fact, as a number of governments have, that there is a problem—and I certainly share that belief that there is a problem—that people would be willing to share the load in solving that problem if they believed that it was being distributed equitably.

What we seem to hear here in Bill 22 is that there is strong evidence that it is not being distributed equitably. We have seen that from presenter after presenter after presenter. You make the comment on the pension plans. What I had said earlier was what was the information that the government presented was that there would be no impact on younger teachers and there would be a very minimal impact on older teachers. I think it is important that we clarify just how inequitable this particular solution to this problem is.

I am interested though in your comments on the younger teachers and the impact that they are going to feel from the changes in the pension plan. I wonder if you could expand upon that a little bit.

Mr. Lerner: I want to perhaps give my perception first about how I perceive this tax. I perceive this tax as a poll tax on public sector employees. It is rather interesting that one of the motivating factors that brought my family first to this country is a very similar form of taxation. A hundred years ago, the first member of my family migrated here, No. 1, to avoid that particular situation, and No. 2, to avoid a very unfair military draft situation.

That is my perception and that is a perception of the teachers I am in contact with. They are incensed by this. They are wanting to express their frustration. They feel powerless. They feel unappreciated. They have been devastated by the

remarks in the press that have been made by the Premier of this province and by the Minister of Finance about their professional organization and about the work that they do and their disinclination to provide services for free to this province.

So, in simple terms, this is a very, very disappointing approach that the government has taken. As a Manitoban, I am more than willing to share in the addressing of the problems of this province. When I feel that I am being treated equitably, I have never refused to pay fair taxes. I am even someone that goes around praising the GST as a very efficient tax and that I do not have a problem with it. I teach that in my classroom, I am here to tell you. So it is not that I have an unbalanced attitude about taxes. This is a very unfair thing.

Mr. Conrad Santos (Broadway): Mr. Lerner, one of the points you raised is the parental reaction to the loss of professional development days. I consider teachers as bearers and transmitters of knowledge and skill from one generation to the next, all the time adapting to the forces of change in society. Do you think that without such professional development the blind will be leading the blind?

Mr. Lerner: I believe that the loss of the professional development days will put us in a position where it will be difficult, if not impossible, for us to do a proper job of communicating with parents, implementing curriculum and upgrading our knowledge and our ability to deliver in the classroom.

Mr. Santos: Mr. Chairperson, do you think this is more serious than the loss of pension rights?

Mr. Lerner: Absolutely.

Ms. Barrett: Mr. Chairperson, I, too, would like to say I thought your presentation was excellent, Mr. Lerner, with the possible exception of your statements about the Goods and Services Tax, but that will come at another time.

I, too, wanted to ask about your second point, the reaction of parents. This is my first evening at the hearings, and I have not heard that mentioned as much as I think it may be. There are so many issues that I am glad you brought it up, but I am wondering if you can give us some specific examples of parental reaction to what they see as the impacts of Bill 22.

Mr. Lerner: Thank you, I am sorry if I am overriding you.

The school I teach in is one where the parents are very active. The school I teach in, the doors open at 10 to seven in the morning, and there are kids in the building. There are teams in the gym. There are bands practising. It is a beautiful thing to behold. If you are there till six o'clock at night, there are kids leaving who have just finished practices and games. The building is worked to the hilt, and the parents are in that building watching their kids practise and watching their kids play games, that type of thing.

The parents that I have spoken to since this bill was introduced and it was announced the professional days were in jeopardy are very, very disappointed that these days will be lost. In particular the parent interviews are something they place a high value on.

Ms. Barrett: Do the parents that you have spoken with see the impacts of Bill 22 as being something that teachers—they are concerned about particularly the loss of parent-teacher interviews, which I can understand as a major potential problem. Do they agree with what some of the government comments have been that teachers should be doing these on their own time and this is only part of the fairness of all of us in Manitoba having to pay for the fiscal and monetary decisions of the federal government over the last 10 years and the decisions of this government over the last five years? Do they agree with that, or do they see it in slightly different terms?

Mr. Lerner: I do not feel I am in a fair position to say if the parents of the kids I teach have discussed that with me because I do not regard that as something that I would discuss with them on a professional basis. I know that my neighbours and the people that know that I am a teacher feel that we are getting hit pretty hard. They are well aware that we have had 10 tough years at the bargaining table and that we have fallen behind inflation rather badly and they feel that we have done our share. They do not feel that we are fat cats out there ready for plucking; they feel that we are easy targets and we got picked on because we are easy targets.

Ms. Barrett: Could you talk a little bit about what you see as the impact of Bill 22 on the parent-teacher interviews?

* (2220)

Mr. Lerner: I believe that especially for the neediest kids of all, it will be difficult if not impossible to schedule appropriate conferences for their needs. I am someone that probably conferenced around special needs kids this year alone, I would ballpark it at 12 or 15 times, and each conference was from, say, four to six or from eight to nine in the morning, a minimum of one hour, often two hours. I have seen situations where 12 or 15 professionals were sitting around the table with the mum and dad of one girl or one boy and just slaving over that case, so that is the most grievous lost.

The kids that are most at risk in this province are not going to get the kind of service they need, the kind of caring that I know that they desperately need if they are to be saved, and I believe it is a shortsighted cost saving because I think the Corrections Service of Canada people quoted us a cost of \$54,000 a year for one adult in penitentiary in this province. So when you are talking at-risk kids, if they go down because you did not do what you should have done because you did not have the time, that is an outrage, and that is the kind of outrage this province just cannot afford.

Ms. Barrett: One final question, or I hope it is a final question, I know your time is getting short. You were talking about this one particular child or example with 12 or 15 professionals sitting around talking about a particular child, are those 12 or 15 teachers or are those other professionals that are interacting with this child?

Mr. Lerner: I will describe such a meeting if I may: one person from our divisional clinic who is a psychologist, one person from the clinic who is a learning specialist, the vice-principal, the principal, the seven or eight teachers that teach that individual, the parents and, in one instance, the boy himself in the case I am thinking of. Do not make the mistake of thinking that is one in the 150 to 200 kids that I teach. That is just the one that I chose to speak about. I had much more needy kids that I am not even discussing.

I also maybe should throw in that it is ironic that I am here today because today a CD-ROM computer arrived at our school that I am desperately going to need some training in so that I can do one of the things I love doing most which is teaching enrichment about media literacy. I have never seen or heard of a CD—or I have heard of it

but I have never played with a CD-ROM before and I need some in-servicing.

Mr. Brian Pallster (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Lerner, one cannot help but be impressed with the sincerity of your comments. As has been the case with a number of the other presenters, what seems to be striking a common theme I think is the concern—and perhaps you can give me your feelings on this as to whether this is a valid observation or not—that the pay cut part of this is not the issue, so much as is the days off as a reflection of, as you have said and others have said it, a kind of a lack of appreciation for the work that teachers do. Is that a fair observation?

Mr. Lerner: I can tell you that when I made a conscious decision to select into education as opposed to other professions that were there for me, I was aware that I was not going to become a rich man. I did not go into teaching to grow rich, but I went in in the expectation that I would be maintained at a certain earning power and a certain style of life. I have seen the erosion of that in the last 10 years, so I cannot in honesty separate the loss of pay from the PD. But I did not come here today to argue on behalf of my family's earning power. That is not my primary purpose in being here. Others have stated that case. I am here to indicate the deep concern I have for the ongoing implications of what this proposes to do.

Mr. Chalrperson: You only have one minute for one short quick question, Mr. Santos.

Mr. Santos: How do you feel about the loss of collective bargaining rights?

Mr. Lerner: That loss galls me as much as anything else I have talked about, because I am somebody who is a strong believer, who has negotiated on behalf of my teachers in my local three or four times, who believes you go into the arena, you fight it out and what comes out the other end is something you live with till the next round. What has happened here is that what we have had since 1948 has, with a swipe of a legislator's pen, been potentially taken away, Mr. Santos, and I just cannot live with that. I just cannot believe that is happening here in Manitoba. It absolutely amazes me.

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

Mr. Lerner: Thank you for the chance.

Mr. Chairperson: I would like to call on Mr. Bob Bastable. Mr. Bob Bastable? His presentation has been distributed. You may begin.

Mr. Bob Bastable (Regional Support Centre, Daerwood School): Thank you, Mr. Chairperson and members of the legislative committee. I would like to present my brief, and it is quite brief, on behalf of the growing number of troubled and troubling students which are in the public school system.

At present I am a teacher-counsellor at the Regional Support Centre in Selkirk which is a joint effort initiated by five school divisions. That in itself, I guess, is a sign of major concerns that would be similar to the people on this side of the table and the people on that side of the table agreeing unanimously on what we are talking about.

The purpose of this centre is to provide support for students who are at risk, students who are experiencing behavioural and/or emotional difficulties which are preventing them from functioning successfully in the regular school system. Basically, all these kids are expelled or kicked out of, not only their school, but their school division.

Studies have shown that over 40 percent of conduct-disordered children will continue in a lifetime of serious psychological disturbances. As adults they place a heavy burden on society because of the personnel and money involved in diagnosis, treatment and judicial process. Social problems which appear early in childhood tend to be persistent and often herald serious mental health and adjustment difficulties in adulthood. I guess there is a saying on some commercial, you can pay me now or you can pay me later.

Unfortunately, when I see in the newspaper stories of kids who are in trouble with the law, I often think it is too bad, it is unfortunate that someone could not intervene when those children were in kindergarten. If you talked to any kindergarten teacher, they could probably tell you they can pick and predict probably very accurately which students are likely to experience difficulties as they grow older.

I have been very fortunate that I have been able to take specific training in working with severely behaviourally disruptive students. These professional development opportunities have been

crucial to our success in dealing with these students. Fortunately, or unfortunately, all of the students that we deal with go back to their school system and to "their regular classroom." And I am not sure if there is a regular classroom anymore. The teachers who are receiving these students need, desperately, and are looking for professional development time to acquire the necessary skills to deal effectively with these troubled and troubling children.

Schools also need the time to examine plans for the growing number of these children. These children do not impact only in the four walls. Not only do they impact the school—the community and eventually the judicial system.

I feel that Bill 22 has helped to eliminate, in some cases, all of these opportunities. If a school division uses all its days, the PD days, where are those teachers going to get the training? I applaud the government's struggle to balance the budget and to demand the efficient use of tax dollars. I do, however, believe that government has not shown its stated commitment to the education of our children. During times of financial hardship—and Lord knows that we are experiencing that now and probably in the future—children often suffer the most. Unemployment—there is a lot of tension in homes, and the children often bear the brunt.

* (2230)

Daycare and the public school system is for many troubled students their only hope of breaking the cycle and becoming productive, valued members of society. I should add, taxpayers. If they are not helped, these are the people who will not be able to pay taxes. Either they are in jail or they are unemployed.

I just looked at this, this morning, a letter from Mr. Ed Helwer, MLA for Gimli constituency. Is he here? [interjection] Oh, then I hope this is right. It is a letter in response to Mr. Art Ammeter, who is a teacher in Selkirk, and Mr. Helwer in response talks about the Filmon government—has streamlined its spending:

We want to ensure that the quality of education for this province, and so we have asked school boards to find inefficiency in their administrative operations and correct it. In doing so, the children are ensured of a superior education while the province does not have to deal with exorbitant spending and runaway costs.

In my school division the inefficiencies that I have seen are: 1. reduction of PD days, which I guess are inefficient; cuts in staff, which are inefficient; elementary school principals spending part-time teaching, I guess that is an inefficiency. I question whether those are inefficiencies. I also question whether the result is going to be a superior education. I have grave concerns. Thank you.

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

Ms. Barrett: I appreciate your coming, particularly from an educational program that I do not believe has been heard from in these hearing processes. I would like to ask you, if I may, a question or two about the program that you are involved with. I would like to know how many kids are in your program, what their age range is, and how long they are in this particular program.

Mr. Bastable: Ours is a short-term project. This was the first year. We have just received word that we are a "go" for next year. After that we are not sure. It is a six-week intervention, basically for students who range from Grades 3 to 9, and we have roughly six students in a session for six weeks. During that time they are on an individualized program with family counselling and a transition teacher. Our job, basically, is to deal with the student for six weeks, try some different strategies, work with the family, and then, hopefully, towards the end of the six weeks, look at ways in which that student can succeed back in their home school.

I might just add that the evaluations we evaluate, the parents have an evaluation, the schools have an evaluation and the students have an evaluation. Looking at the evaluations, the one that we thought would probably be the hardest to get positive results would be from the families. I can say that we have had, I would say 95 percent of the families have been ecstatic that their children are being seen in a positive light. The school system has been very positive, and actually, the students.

In terms of success, again, it depends on your definition of success. Some students have done very well. We had one student who ended up on the honour roll which was a shock to everybody, and others have gone on to permanent residence in MATC, and some students have been placed in foster homes which we would consider as a success, or at least, a start of a success.

Ms. Barrett: Who is this program funded by and what kind of follow-up—is there any follow-up or any continuing connection with the regular school system then, or how do you connect both at the front end and the back end with the schools?

Mr. Bastable: Our mandate is to follow the students for a year after we receive them, and that is our transition process. For instance, today I was out at a school visiting kids who were in our first session. It is funded by the five school divisions. Next year, it is funded by four school divisions. One school division has dropped out due to lack of funds.

Again, in terms of funding for next year, we are in the process of applying for new initiative grants or something to cover the costs of hopefully hiring a teacher assistant. Money is tough. There are no inefficiencies in our program. I am good at stealing so that helps.

Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I appreciate the work you do, and I know it is very important work. The way you are talking, obviously it is clear you care deeply about it, and that is commendable. I think that is probably to the benefit of your students as well.

I wanted to ask you, because there has been a lot of talk about the concerns about the fact that we are cutting back, but very little talk about why we are having to go through some of the things we are having to go through. Have you by any chance—this may be the easiest way for people who are not as intimately involved with this as we have to be—did you by any chance watch the W5 program on New Zealand recently?

Mr. Bastable: No, I did not.

Mrs. McIntosh: It was a very interesting program, and if you could get yourself a transcript, it might be of some assistance to you and to your colleagues in trying to understand the types of things that happen when the deficit gets out of control, spending gets out of control, credit ratings slip, and a country goes over the edge, because New Zealand, which had the third highest standard of living in the world, went to the 22nd lowest standard of living in the world overnight.

They closed over 700 post offices in one morning. They sold off their railroad. They sold off their airlines. They had to do a whole number, so they stopped all farm subsidies, all instantly, because suddenly they had gotten out of control in

a way that we could if we did not do the kinds of things we are having to do. They do not have to worry anymore about difficult choices. Their choices are being made for them by international money lenders.

We do not want to ever be in a situation where we have bankers in Zurich and London and other places making our decisions for us. They do not have the luxury of worrying about losing professional days. The things that have happened to them have been much more severe than this. We do not want to be the New Zealand of the north.

That is just one example that happened fairly recently to a country that was in a situation not dissimilar to ours.

We do not want to be in a position of having to say to people, there is not enough money to give you to do the things that you know if you had the money you could do more and more.

I will not say much more than that, except to leave you with a thought. If you are able to get a transcript of that tape or come across it, would you be willing to watch it and share it with your colleagues just for the bit of the rationale that comes in?

Mr. Bastable: I really have no desire to, and I am not being rude. I applaud the government's struggle to balance the budget. I have no qualms about that. As a taxpayer, I realize that if we do not, we are in trouble.

What bothers me, and I hope it is not because I am an educator, is that I think our children are our greatest asset, and I think there are other priorities which can be put aside.

Again, I just returned from a flight from Cleveland, and at the airport, I see these huge jets. I know, at least from what I know, that the \$300 payment does not come close to covering the cost. Where does that money come from? I do not see many kids on the plane. I am sure, if it was pay as you go, there might be less travel, but it is not going to affect the kids that I deal with at all. Those kids are lucky if they travel on the bus.

I hear they are talking—and I know it is not maybe the provincial government, but they are talking about cutting back the transit in Winnipeg. I doubt very much if that is going to have a severe impact on children. It might have an impact on adults.

* (2240)

I think there is a difference. I think, once you are 18, you are an adult, and if you have had all the benefits that society can provide up until then, I do not have as many qualms about making those people pay.

It is very painful to see somebody in kindergarten who cannot sit still, who comes to school bruised, who cannot open a book because they do not know which side to open. They do not know what to do with a pencil. Those children, I think, are the ones that suffer, and those children are the ones who are being forced to sit in a classroom with 30 other kids. I think that is criminal.

Having one less bus come down Donald Street past my door or an extra couple of \$100 taxes—I think that is the job of the government. I think the government has to say, we will not sacrifice our children, because again, I hope it never occurs that one of our grandchildren is attacked, beaten, or worse by a student or by an adult who could have helped as a student.

I think my last statement, again, the daycare system and the public school system is for many troubled students their only hope of breaking the cycle and becoming productive, valued members of society. I would think if we wait until they are in jail, it becomes much more expensive. What can be cheaper than hiring another kindergarten teacher and dividing a class into 15 or 16?

Mr. Santos: Do you put the value of monetary savings ahead of the educational future of children?

Mr. Bastable: If you are talking about money and students?

Mr. Santos: Supposedly, Bill 22 will result in some kind of savings by cutting out teachers' professional development days.

Mr. Bastable: Yes, I think, as most other people have said, these professional development days are not an inefficiency, they are not a luxury. They do benefit teachers and in turn benefit students. The PD days that I am talking about in my specific little part of the world, teachers cannot handle students who are troubled in normal ways. The way they behave causes people to react in a very normal way, which does not work with them. Excuse the language, but if somebody tells you to you-know-what, you get mad and react back. That

is what they are looking for in many cases. So I do not think you are saving anything in the long run.

Mr. Santos: Could you elaborate further on the unintended consequences of this loss of attention on children in general, particularly the behaviourally and emotionally disturbed children?

Mr. Bastable: A lot of people do not realize that these kids impact the other students in the classroom. They impact the teachers. They are extremely draining on anybody whom they encounter, and yet they are being placed in the public school system. The Diagnostic Centre in Winnipeg, I believe, just has closed. Where do you send these?

When our program was initially looked at, it was to look at kids who were kind of at risk, kind of not over the falls. What we found was that the kids who are over the falls, who have hit the rocks at the bottom and are now drowning have no place to go. There is no place to go for these kids. Knowles is filled, the Diagnostic Centre, I believe, is closed. The Health Sciences Centre—you might have a six-month waiting list, so the public school system, the normal traditional classroom, is the place where these kids go.

Mr. Chalrperson: There is only about one minute left for one quick question, Mr. Santos.

Mr. Santos: Do you feel that the government has special responsibility for these emotionally deprived children?

Mr. Bastable: Who else can? Who else does? I think the public school system, I think teachers in general are trying, but if you look at the long-term disability and the burnout rate of teachers, part of that is maybe with our age, we have less patience and stamina. But I think the public school system is having a hard time dealing with those. I know teachers who have very little training in dealing with this type of student cannot deal with them.

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

I will now call on Kathy Harness. Mr. Victor Kuzyk. Mr. Mark Miles. Mr. Jim Nickarz. Do you have a written presentation, sir?

Mr. Jim Nickarz (Private Citizen): No, I do not. I only have a few notes.

Mr. Chalrperson: That is fine.

Mr. Nickarz: It is a difficult time of year for teachers. We are pretty tired, and I had a few days when I just could not think, hardly.

Mr. Chalrperson: You may proceed then.

Mr. Nickarz: I am here to protest against Bill 22. Bill 22 is one of the many spending cuts enacted by the Tory Conservative government of Manitoba supposedly because of the high deficit in Manitoba. The deficit is a lie. That is, the deficit hysteria is a lie. Manitoba does have a debt, around \$5.2 billion, and it has been that way for the past five years, more or less, since the Tories took over from the NDP in 1988.

The federal Tory Conservative government started the cry of deficit reduction, and Manitoba Tories are using it to perpetrate inhuman cuts to our province's poor and working classes. Ask me about New Zealand. In Manitoba we do not have a deficit problem. We have a revenue problem, because the Tory Conservative government refuses to tax the rich and make them pay their fair share. This, making the rich pay their taxes of course, is not the Conservative agenda. Conservative governments promote big business, give huge tax breaks to large corporations and to rich people and rich families.

The Tory Conservative government does not care about the poor in our province. Consequently, it has cut help for the poor, increased taxes to the poor and the middle class. The middle class, of course, pays the most taxes. I lose over one-third of my paycheque each month to taxes.

Some rich people in businesses in our province pay no taxes and get patronage and plum jobs from this government. I believe that current Conservatives want a two-class society, the elite class being the rich with all the power and the wealth, and the other class being the poor working class with no power and very little wealth, just enough to survive work and to be good consumers.

Bill 22 has not passed yet. A couple of months ago this Tory Conservative government cut funding from some 56 agencies for the poor. Many lost all of their funding. Child and Family Services got 10 Fridays forced leave without pay this summer. Will abuse take 10 days off? We all know that people are just starting to report family abuse, that we have only seen the tip of the iceberg with regards to this kind of abuse. Now the SKY Project was cut off completely, that is, the Street Kids and Youth

Project. There are many more, but I do not have time to mention them all.

First, hear about one group that was not cut off. That is the Consumers' Association of Manitoba, the Tory plum for Jenny Hillard who ran for the Conservatives in the Crescentwood by-election.

Child poverty in Manitoba is the highest in the country; 72,000 children live in poverty in Manitoba. The rural dental program for children was cut from 49 to five workers. Now there is only one dentist to serve the whole of rural Manitoba.

When asked about the increase in food banks in Manitoba, Premier Filmon said that there were food banks when the Conservative government came into power, and there will be food banks after we are gone. That is true, I guess.

The United Nations rebuked Canada for neglecting the rights of the poor and failing to reduce poverty, and I quote: Half of single mothers, as well as large numbers of children, live in poverty in Canada. Families are forced to relinquish their children to foster care because they are unable to provide adequate housing and other necessities.

Funding for foster care was also cut in Manitoba. These are some of the unhappy children the teachers face in our classrooms every day. Is it no wonder that violence is on the rise inside the classroom and on the streets. Juvenile assaults are up 20 percent. Juvenile robberies are up 40 percent. Poverty is the worst form of violence, and it is being perpetrated on our children by our Tory Conservative government.

* (2250)

There are new taxes on candy bars, hamburgers and fries, diapers and on prescription drugs, women's sanitary napkins. The handicapped are suffering. There are user fees for catheter bags. There is a \$300 user fee for colostomy patients. Health care reform—health care cuts is what it is, so deep that people dying on waiting lists for operations are travelling to the United States to pay for these operations to save their lives. That \$4-million deal with U.S. consultant Connie Curran to try and cut \$45 million to \$65 million from our health care program, she is finding out that it cannot be done. Why do you not buy her out for the \$300,000 and let it go? Our health care is not extravagant. Your cuts will destroy it. I think that might be part of your agenda as well.

Bill 22 affects education in Manitoba, of course. Our Tory Conservative Premier Gary Filmon said, and I quote: My government realizes that education and training are the keys that unlock a world of opportunity and a future of economic growth and prosperity. To this end, my government will chart a course to equip Manitobans with the knowledge and skills they require to meet the challenges of a new century.

Surely, Mr. Filmon, or I guess he is not talking about young people who depend on the Student Social Allowances to finish high school—that has been cut—or the aboriginal single mothers and immigrants who depend on funding from the ACCESS program to finish university. That was cut. Our own Lieutenant-Governor, Yvon Dumont, was one of the first Metis in Manitoba to use the ACCESS program back in 1970, but no more, not under this Tory Conservative government.

I imagine Mr. Filmon might be talking about students who attend private schools in our province. Funding to public schools has gone up at a rate of from about 2 to 7 percent yearly under the Tory Conservative government, but funding to private schools has tripled in that same time span. This year, it is over \$20 million going to private schools for funding so far; the whole year is not over.

Private schools do not have to give out their total budget figure, so I cannot compare them with figures for public schools, but one word should shed some light on the subject. That word is Zamboni. St. John's-Ravenscourt has a Zamboni to clean its hockey rink in its indoor arena. Meanwhile, 66 special needs clinicians have been cut from the Manitoba Department of Education.

Bill 22 is an attack on our collective bargaining system. Teachers have contracts, agreements with their divisions. Bill 22 arbitrarily negates these agreements and takes money from teachers' pockets as well as from the students we educate. The same, of course, has been done to our nurses, bus drivers, city workers and other groups. Why did they not take action and strike? That is what I ask.

Perhaps some were apathetic, or probably many feared the high unemployment figures, or maybe they bought the idea of tightening their belts. They believed the deficit hysteria lie. There was a concerted effort by the Tory government to sell this

deficit hysteria. They have got people pointing fingers at one another and, perhaps out of jealousy, wanting to see other people have their salaries cut too. Well, it is working.

Now the government is suggesting that people on welfare be required to work fixing our roads. Would not they be someone to point fingers at and feel better than?—scapegoats, perfect scapegoats.

H.H. Loewen of the Manitoba Coalition Against Racism said, and I quote: Ignorance, poverty and despair create a climate for racism and neofascism.

Obviously, the rise of the Ku Klux Klan and other groups in our province are evidence of that. It is easy to keep the poor fighting amongst each other, and with 12,000 jobs lost in Manitoba in the last two months, 140 LPNs laid off from St. Boniface just last week or announced layoffs, 11.1 percent unemployment in Winnipeg, a minimum wage that went from the highest in Canada to fourth from the bottom during the recent Tory Conservative reign, people who were once middleclass workers are being reduced to poverty.

Why would our Tory Conservative government want to promote poverty? Well, possibly because if you keep the poor too busy trying to survive, they probably will not have the presence of mind to be aware of what this government is doing to Manitoba and vote effectively. The Conservatives may well win the next election in '95, I believe.

Not to forget that desperate poor people will work cheap like in Mexico, therefore, profit for big business will rise. Bill 22 is part of this scheme, and it can get worse. We still have a long way to go before our workers are as poor and desperate as the workers in Mexico. But the Manitoba Association of School Trustees' newsletter of March 1993 contains a reference to a telephone call from Clayton Manness cautioning that 1993-94 would not be the last year for cuts.

It will get worse. I believe that it is time for economic restraint, myself, actually global restraint. We are destroying our planet. It is time to slow down consumerism, slow down making things that we really do not need and trying to sell them hand over fist and using up our resources.

I would accept restraint, wage restraint, if I could trust the government in power. But this government lacks credibility. There are many examples: the mismanagement of the Immigration Investment Fund, the Charleswood bridge offer to

the City of Winnipeg, \$13,080,000 to help build a bridge that would serve a part of Winnipeg that traditionally votes Conservative. That bridge was a low priority item for the City of Winnipeg. That \$13 million could almost cover the proposed \$16 million of the public school funding that is going to be cut for 1993-94.

Then, of course, the MLAs still get their pensions after serving two terms. Harold Neufeld, a Conservative MLA, quit for the following reason, and I quote: The caucus was trying to think of a way to give themselves a raise without the taxpayer realizing it.

Share the pain. Then, of course, there is Arni Thorsteinson, a major Tory fundraiser appointed to the Bank of Canada by Mulroney, eventually rejected by the Bank of Canada because of the \$6-million default on a loan from Manitoba Housing and Renewal, but he still sits on our Manitoba Hydro board.

How do they get away with this? Well, I think media is part of it. They have the money or the influence to attain a sufficient volume of media time, TV, I would say, mostly, to make themselves look good.

Have you seen the official opposition on TV lately? Perhaps a few seconds once in a blue moon or very seldom in the newspapers. I have got most of my information from the newspaper. But did you not see Harry Enns, the Tory Conservative Minister of Environment, looking good when he proclaimed the new provincial park near Churchill? Of course, there will be no logging in this park. There are no trees in the tundra.

Meanwhile, there is a bill coming out that would allow logging in some 60 to 70 percent of Manitoba's forest including our provincial parks. This logging can be done at the discretion of the companies involved, the businesses involved. Do you think that these businesses are going to consider our wildlife habitat, or will they consider profit when they log and probably clear cut in our provincial parks?

I call upon all Manitobans to speak out against this government. A single voice can be heard. I call upon workers to take job action to show their dissatisfaction with Bill 22 and its forced intrusion upon our collective bargaining agreements.

I call upon the teachers of the province to withdraw voluntary services to show the public and

after that to educate the public of this province about the abuses of the Tory Conservative government as perpetrating on the poor and working people of Manitoba.

I call upon this government to call an election immediately and let the electorate decide whether or not it has had enough of this elitist Tory Conservative government, a government that takes from the poor and gives to the rich while the middle-class income wage earners pay for it.

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

Mr. Manness: Mr. Chairperson, thank you very much to the presenter. Indeed, if I were not sitting here and I were reliving this, I would swear I was listening to the Leader of the NDP on the Budget Debate. But I am not, I am here and I am listening seriously to the presenter.

I ask him if he is aware that we have the highest business tax rates, large corporation, small corporation, in the land?

Mr. Nickarz: No, I am not.

Mr. Manness: Now that I have told you, and it is truth, does that at all reduce some of the vitriol that you want to direct towards this government or not?

Mr. Nickarz: No, not really, because there is supposed to be a trickle-down effect with business. You are supposed to get jobs. Where are they?

Mr. Manness: No, no. We have got the highest taxes, so are you saying then we should reduce the taxes or increase them more?

* (2300)

Mr. Nickarz: Well, I guess I am getting confused. No, I was not aware of that. Yes, I think there could be more taxes on big businesses. Well, not necessarily big businesses, but maybe just the rich people who are making a lot of money. I think I read somewhere there were a number of people making over \$70,000 a year in this province who were not paying any taxes. You know, I am not an expert, I just get my information from the newspapers and from TV.

Mr. Manness: Well, I know what you mean. My mother-in-law gets her information from the newspaper, and as a matter of fact there was an article here about a month ago where she took issue with something she read in the paper, and she said, well, how can you do it? I said, well, it is totally in error. I know, I made the decision. She

says, oh no, oh no, it was written in the paper. I know you are wrong.

So I know the impact that the newspaper has, but are you aware that out of the 480,000 tax filers in the province of Manitoba, roughly six percent have income over \$50,000?

Mr. Nickarz: No, I was not aware of that either.

Mr. Manness: Would you call then all those who are earning under \$50,000, many who are teachers, I acknowledge that, and many other so-called ordinary citizens of life within our community, that they then should be expected to pay significantly more tax? Because unless they do, we will never address this problem. Are you aware of these and would you suggest then that we tax everybody at a higher level?

Mr. Nickarz: I think we could do with an increase in income tax, you know, if we are going to stop this assault on the poor, because obviously the poor, the more poor we have the worse it is going to get. The poorer people get, the more violence, the more suffering. It is going to increase itself many times over as they get older and have no place to work and are frustrated. As I said, I would be willing to take a cut or to pay more taxes to help the poor in this province.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Chairperson, I agree with the presenter in some respects. I mean, I am not an avowed capitalist. I am far from it. As a matter of fact, I lay a lot of the ills of the nation at the feet of lazy capital that has not been wealth creating, more concerned about real estate, speculative in nature, and always have been, but I still subscribe to the old philosophy that says that you cannot help the poor by destroying the rich. Many people believe that, and one of the big problems we have in this country, we do not have a lot of rich people, and loyal rich people, unfortunately. I wish we had more so we could go after them and tax them. I really do.

Final point. Are you aware what is happening, and I mean, again, I just sense the venom directed towards, as you call, the Tory Conservative government, and I would indicate to you, and you must be aware of what is happening in seven other provinces which are not Tory. Let us leave Alberta aside. There are three other administrations that are NDP and four that are Liberal. Why would they be following this same path?

I guess you understand why we are because you really believe that we are these mean-spirited people you make us out to be. But what about these other seven provinces? Why are they doing it when they do not carry Conservative labels?

Mr. Nickarz: There have been clawbacks to the provinces by the federal government, and, of course, the federal government is increasing the deficit by over \$35 billion per year over the past ten years, I guess, or however long time they have been in power. I guess you cannot multiply \$35 billion times 10 because they are only up to about \$470 billion, so maybe it has not been quite that much, over \$30 billion anyway per year and clawing back to the provinces.

When you mention 6 percent of the people make over \$50,000, how much does that amount to in money, in real wealth? You know, maybe 6 percent are making a heck of a lot of money. Does that include the businesses that have tax breaks? Does that include businesses? I am not sure.

Ms. Barrett: I appreciated your presentation and look forward to reading it in Hansard. At the beginning of your speech or maybe even before you began, you mentioned New Zealand. I am wondering if you did have some comments that you would like to make in response to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs' (Mrs. McIntosh) statements about New Zealand's economic situation vis-à-vis our Canadian context.

Mr. Nickarz: I saw that show on New Zealand, and I thought the Conservative federal government is setting us up for bankruptcy. Why would they do that? Well, maybe because they know they are going to lose the next election and they want to leave the next government with a very difficult time. It seems so logical when you think about it. You know, I tend to think that the Conservatives are representing big business, and big business is really influencing what is happening in the world.

You talk about a global economy. Who wants a global economy? Canada needs protection against these people. I do not know what is happening. The lobbyists in Canada do not have to declare the numbers involved in the lobbying. I cannot remember exactly what it was. They do not have to declare how much the deal costs or whatever. I am not sure about that. They do not have to declare some numbers anyway, in terms of money in their lobbying. So what exactly is

happening, I do not know, but what better way to reduce Canada to the status of Mexico than a good bankruptcy?

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Nickarz. Your time has expired.

I call on either Dorris Hunter or Rollie Gilles (phonetic). Your presentation has been distributed. You may begin, Mr. Gilles (phonetic).

Mr. Rollie Gilles (Interlake Teachers Association): Good evening. My name is Rollie Gilles.

Mr. Chairperson: Oh, I am sorry, Mr. Gilles.

Mr. Gilles: I have lived with it all my life. It is nothing new.

Mr. Chairperson: You may proceed, Mr. Gilles (phonetic).

Mr. Gilles: Gilles. G-i-l-l-i-e-s.

Mr. Chairperson: Yes, I have got it here. Gilles, am sorry.

Mr. Gilles: Mr. Chairperson, ladies and gentlemen, I am speaking to you this evening or behalf of the Interlake Teachers' Association. We are an association whose teachers work in schools that are rural, yet due to our proximity to the city of Winnipeg, we are also strongly influenced by this major urban centre. In this way we share the concerns of our fellow teachers, both rural and urban.

Our concerns are with the proposed legislation, Bill 22. We are concerned, as teachers of the Interlake, with the damage that this bill will cause within our school division and within our profession. Ultimately, however, our greatest concern is the damage that will be done to the students within the Manitoba public school system, for ultimately it will be those students who will carry the load and bear the consequences of this proposed legislation.

As you consider this legislation, I must state at the outset that attempting to be fiscally responsible as a government is indeed a worthwhile aim. As a taxpayer, I have often questioned the policies and practices of governments at all levels. Like most taxpayers, I appreciate any attempt to hold the line or limit taxation. I also know, however, that there are those areas where government must spend those tax dollars. Public school system is an area where a government must spend those tax dollars.

Bill 22 is an attempt to cut off those dollars before they reach the classrooms of our public schools.

To achieve this end, the proposed legislation will not directly slash its school division funds, nor will it attack directly the wages of all Manitoba teachers across the province. Rather, it will limit the ability of each division to tax its residents with a cap that has been imposed on special levies. As a rural area, we have a smaller tax base to draw on and will suffer accordingly.

* (2310)

In the past, we have heard this government talk about maintaining standards throughout the entire province, both rural and urban areas. We have seen government offices decentralized to spread government resources throughout the province. Now we see rural school divisions cut back. A teacher working in the Interlake will now receive less money than those working in some city divisions. Rural areas have always tried to encourage teachers to come out of the city to teach. Bill 22, rural school divisions now have an even harder job if they are unable to offer comparative wages to teachers.

Bill 22 also attacks the area of professional development for teachers. In a rural area, professional development is very important if teachers are to upgrade and stay informed. Bill 22 attacks knowing that public concern is limited. For the public, although it has concern for the education of children, it has little concern for the professional development of the teachers of those children. We have heard in recent weeks how teachers should be responsible for their own professional development, how they receive so much time off they can pursue their own PD, how they are overpaid and how other professions maintain their own professional development.

Teachers do carry out their own professional development. In order to upgrade their standing, they return to university classes either in the evening or during summer breaks. They pay for these courses and require them if they are to receive the remuneration that the so-called average teacher receives, yet public concern and, with the proposed legislation, government concern assumes that professional development that is pursued during a teacher's normal working day is somehow not important. School boards have been given carte blanche authority to replace up to eight of these professional development days with unpaid holidays, or as it is known by most working professionals, a lockout.

What activities will a teacher not be pursuing during these days? I could list many activities, but I will focus this evening on one personal example. It was a course I took with other staff members entitled Nonviolent Crisis Intervention. It is a course that instructs people on how to deal with children who act out in an emotionally and physically violent way. Unfortunately, as in our society at large, children are increasingly using violence as a means of coping with frustration both in and outside the classroom.

There was a course that has been quite beneficial to me. Since taking the course, I have, in my day-to-day work, been sworn at, punched at, kicked, spat on and have had to dodge flying rocks. Thanks largely to the nonviolent training, I have handled each incident in such a way that I was not injured, and most importantly, I was able to deal with the child without injury to them. I do not wish to use this example to scare or excite. I wish only to point out that I would I would have been unprepared to deal with these situations, and they are situations that teachers deal with.

We also must deal with children from broken or dysfunctional homes, children who are abused, ill fed, drug abusers, or in some form disadvantaged. When I first began to train to be a teacher a new word, mainstreaming, was being tossed around. It meant that all special-needs children would be put into regular classrooms, not segregated into special classrooms or schools. There would be one education system for all students. The teaching profession responded to this challenge. At the time there were critics of mainstreaming who said that special needs children would be dumped into classrooms and teachers without proper training or assistance would have to deal with a number of situations they would simply not be prepared for.

As the proposed Bill 22 legislation is tabled, and teachers in this province lose up to eight days of professional development time I am concerned for the well-being of those special-needs children.

Our society came to the teachers of this province and asked them to include all students. We agreed to accept this challenge asking in turn that professional development training be made available to teachers. We bargained in good faith across the province to that end. PD days were put into contracts, binding, legal contracts. Now we have before us Bill 22. With a stroke of pen these

contracts, these agreements, are made null and void. Teachers in this province have dealt in good faith. We have trusted our provincial government and negotiated in a fair and meaningful way.

As I look over Bill 22 I am reminded of a line from an old song that says: "as through this world you wander you will see lots of funny men, some will rob you with a six gun and some with a fountain pen." Teachers in Manitoba are being robbed, robbed not so much in dollars or even lost days but rather robbed of a fair bargaining system they have trusted in for decades. The students of Manitoba too are being robbed, robbed of an opportunity to be a part of an education system equal and available to all students. For there was a time when our education system was not available to all.

I wish to close this evening, again, on a personal note. Where I grew up there was a boy who lived across our back lane. He did not play with the other children. He rarely left his back yard, around which his parents had built a high fence. This boy was born with Down's syndrome. He took a different school bus to a different school. I recall one time when this boy escaped his back-yard prison. As he walked down the lane children flocked to him with the unabashed curiosity that children display. Quickly his mother appeared and led the boy away. I cannot forget her expression of pain and anguish.

A few months ago I attended a PD day in our division. I listened to a motivational speaker talk to us about the great job she felt teachers were doing. As well as being informative, this speaker finished a slide presentation with a picture from her daughter's graduation. Her daughter graduated with her peers, having enjoyed her regular school experience, and began to prepare for a life on her own. The speaker's daughter had been born with Down's syndrome, and as I watched this woman speaking to us, I saw a look of love and pride for her daughter and of thankfulness for the teachers who had made her daughter's graduation possible.

I left the hall that day, as did my fellow colleagues, with a feeling that we had the most important job anyone could do. We are part of a profession who took people once destined for institutions and gave them a meaningful life. I am proud of this profession. Teachers accepted a challenge and have not disappointed us. We are proud, too, of the students. Children can be mean and heartless, yet we see children of all

descriptions accepted in our classrooms. The children have not disappointed us.

Now we ask the same of our government. Will you stop a bill destined to undermine fair practice to teachers, destined to hurt those students who most need our help, destined to undermine a fair education system open to all regardless of economic advantage, destined to split rural and urban school divisions? We say to this government, do not disappoint us.

On behalf of the teachers of the Interlake, we ask that you not pass Bill 22 and bring inequality to the teachers and students of the Manitoba public school system.

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

* (2320)

Mr. Manness: Thank you very much, Mr. Gillies. I only have one question. You ask us to withdraw Bill 22, certainly its effect on public school teachers. I think that the reference to the public school system could be removed overnight if there had been or if there were willingness on teachers to voluntarily take less. Why in your estimation have they refused to do that? The nurses have, other groups in society have. Why are the teachers so unwilling to do so?

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Gilles (phonetic).

Mr. Gillies: Mr. Gillies.

Mr. Chairperson: Oh, I am sorry, Gillies.

Mr. Gillies: My classroom would be writing it out on the board a few times by now.

I think, sir, that in terms of the nurses, speaking on a personal basis, if someone had given me 14 percent two years ago, I would gladly turn around and give you 2 percent back now.

I think more importantly, in terms of why have the teachers not jumped forward and voluntarily given up part of their wages, I think that someone, somewhere has taught you very well and you have done your homework, because you know that you have before you as teachers a group that do volunteer. We volunteer a lot of extra time and effort to not only fulfill the regular requirements of our job but a lot of things over and above that, and to ask us to voluntarily pay for the education of these children, I do not believe is fair. I think as a teacher my responsibility lies in educating these children, but not in paying for their education.

Mr. Manness: I hear you, and I do not know all my colleagues around this table and all parties, I do not know what they do in their spare time intimately, but I know we all contribute in a voluntary fashion to some aspect of society. Indeed, society could not function if we did not. So I honestly do not know whether teachers are contributing more on a voluntary basis. Maybe it has been quantified somewhere, and maybe the assertion can be made, but as I look around, I see where many of us contribute on a voluntary nature to society, and without it society could not exist.

Many of us and indeed many in the public sector are taking voluntary reductions, so I still do not understand why it is that the teachers on this particular issue have been so reluctant to take a voluntary reduction because if they had, I can tell you we would not be including them in Bill 22.

Mr. Gillies: I think to bring it back to a personal level, and again within our association, the problem we have is that we have been faced with a school board that was not quite in the dire financial straits as some of the other school divisions. They were sitting on a surplus in the area of \$800,000, and they chose to use this legislation to cut teachers' wages \$240,000.

So as I dropped by our old division office the other day as they were busily packing up and preparing to move into their newly renovated offices with their air conditioning and their new carpet, et cetera, I was a little bit annoyed that I was being asked to pay for that. I may be kind of old style, but I am a single wage earner and I am trying to raise two small boys. I do not particularly appreciate it when members who represent our taxpayers and our public come to me and say, we have got to dip into your pocket to pay for these things. Meanwhile they are sitting on a surplus and they are building new bus shelters and new division offices and then turning around and telling teachers, oh, by the way, you have to pay for that, too.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Chairperson, I accept the answer because certainly when you look at decisions that are made very close in proximity to the bargaining at times that that does cause one to react and I understand that. Firstly, as far as air conditioning, I hope you realize this building is not air conditioned, and although every time it comes up at Treasury Board that maybe we should

consider it, the reality is there are more important priorities.

More importantly, and I do not know whether you want to believe me or not, but this government, indeed this Minister of Finance, is as concerned about your children as my own, and that is why we are making some of these difficult decisions. I know people in the audience are not going to believe this, but to this point Education and Health and Family Services have been more or less spared.

What I would like to have said to the preceding speaker, and he might not want to take it seriously, I was called—as the financial trustee of a million people, when I wanted to do my last loan in New York—by the banker, who would not give it to me until I told him exactly what was going to be released in our quarterly report. The first time in the history of this province that question was asked, and I went white, and I tell you, I went cold.

That told me how close we are to the line. This is real. I say to you that this is not—and I know and I took great sincerity out of your presentation but I talked to the greater audience—I mean, this is not fooling around, this is real.

I only say to you that we are all part of this in the family. You probably heard somebody from one of the Crowns say, well, why us, we have a profit? But the reality is we are all in this together. In fairness, it has to be and the fairness is—

Ms. Barrett: No, we are not, . . . reality we would be a lot better off . . .

Mr. Manness: Of course, Ms. Barrett has all of the answers. They have all the answers over on the other side. I do not claim to have all the answers, never have. All I know is these are difficult decisions that have to be made and somebody has to make them. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Barrett. I am sorry, Mr. Gillies, did you want to comment?

Mr. Gillies: I wondered if there was a question in there.

Ms. Barrett: No.

Mr. Gillies: There was not.

Ms. Barrett: Thank you. You have now experienced firsthand what many of us experience daily in the Legislature.

I wanted to ask you, and I know we have a very short amount of time, but I was interested in your

first example about the nonviolent crisis intervention course. Did all of the teachers in your division or in your school take this course? How long was this course and what do you see will be the impact on yourself personally and other teachers if you are not able to take this course in the future?

Mr. Gillies: The course—I am not sure about division-wide, I know our entire staff was trained. We were trained over—I believe the course is about three to five hours depending on the intensity that you get into, but it was done basically at noon hours and before 8:30 in the morning. We did not take an actual PD day from our school allotment to do it.

What happens if you do not have it? When you face these situations, the great thing is that you have been trained and you know how to respond.

I go back—I spent some time on ski patrol years ago, and they taught us that you always respond to any emergency exactly the same way. You do not know what the situation may be, and you have to be prepared for everything. This is what nonviolence sort of taught us, as well, in that we are prepared. When we see situations starting to develop, we can step in and solve the problem before it does get to a point where the only solution left is to duck or run.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much or your presentation this evening.

Mr. Gillies: Well, thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen.

Mr. Chairperson: I will now call on Mr. Rick Robertson. Mr. Rick Robertson? We have your presentation before us. You may begin, sir.

Mr. Rick Robertson (President, Manitoba School Counsellors Association): I want to just start with a quote from the throne speech. I think you have probably heard this many times but I think it applies to my presentation.

I quote: My government realizes that Education and Training are the keys that unlock a world of opportunity and a future of economic growth and prosperity. To this end, my government will chart a course to equip Manitobans with the knowledge and skills they require to meet the challenges of a new century. It is from the throne speech on November 26, 1992.

* (2330)

There is the assumption of the School Counsellors Association that these words apply as much to counsellors as they do to the children of this province. The Manitoba School Counsellors Association represents school counsellors throughout Manitoba. As an association, we co-operate with a number of other agencies such as Child and Family Services, the Child Guidance Clinic, the Home and School association, the University of Manitoba, the Faculty of Education, Red River Community College and the Department of Education, just to name a few.

MSCA also liaises with a number of other counselling agencies that operate in Manitoba and across Canada. We have ties with the Canadian Guidance & Counselling Foundation, the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba, Teen-Touch and agencies for school health. MSCA has several chapters in Winnipeg and in other major cities and centres throughout the province.

Our mandate is to support the children of Manitoba in acquiring the best possible education. There are many ways in which counsellors go about doing this. Many obstacles lay in the path of learning for children, and it is counsellors who help children recognize these obstacles and find ways to remove them.

Counsellors are increasingly relied upon by teachers, students and administrators to develop and administer preventative and developmental programs to all children so that everyone benefits from their knowledge. However, large caseloads and other job restraints often limit the effectiveness of programming to the most chronic cases in the school system.

(Mr. Edward Helwer, Acting Chairperson, in the Chair)

In 1992, the Manitoba School Counsellors Association undertook a survey of its membership to assess the needs of counsellors in our changing society. The results of the survey were clear. Of the 349 surveys sent to counsellors throughout the province, 345 were returned. This represents a return rate of 70 percent. Results came from 45 school divisions and districts, from independent, band-operated and federal schools in the province.

The survey results found that there are still schools without counsellors, and many schools have counsellors on a part-time basis. This leaves many needy children without access to the

specialized services that counsellors can provide. Half of all school counsellors work in senior high schools.

In addition to the personal and group counselling, counsellors teach such subjects as guidance, career development, family life, AIDS education, violence prevention, conflict resolution, drug and alcohol education and child abuse prevention. Twenty-three percent of counsellors teach other subjects as part of their duties or teaching assignment. Counsellors also do extracurricular work. Forty percent of counsellors responding to the survey spent an average of three hours or more per week counselling students outside of regular school hours and an additional three hours or more on paperwork.

Counselling becomes more demanding each year. Sixty-six percent of the counsellors reported that the number on their counselling caseload had increased and that the severity of the caseload had also increased. Eighty percent indicated an increase in workload in the last year. The same percentage indicated that over the past five years, their caseload had increased, as had the severity of cases.

Reduction of social agency support by the government of Manitoba over the past few years has increased the pressure on schools to provide more services. Child and Family Services are now closed on Fridays during the summer months. Counsellors who find children at their door late Friday afternoon because they do not want to go home, knowing what is in store for them, must scramble to find safe places for these children to go. I have been in that particular predicament myself. This situation increases both the child's and the counsellor's anxiety level.

Thirty percent of Manitoba's population is under the age of 18, while only 4 percent of the provincial health budget is slotted for this age group. Of 122 psychiatrists in Manitoba, only 13 practise outside of Winnipeg, and there are only 10 child and adolescent mental health workers stationed outside of Winnipeg. These services are inadequate to meet the mental health needs of our children.

School counsellors are very busy people with a great many issues to deal with. I would like to name some of the topics and issues that come to the attention of counsellors on a daily basis. These

topics are in no particular order, but the extent of the list will surely enlighten you to the need that school counsellors have to keep informed and on top of current issues, trends and practices.

Incest, sexual abuse, physical abuse—did you know that Manitoba has over 25 abuse cases reported each year? There is emotional abuse, birth control—did you know there are six common methods of birth control in use today? Abortion, diabetes, cancer, wellness or general well-being, suicide—suicide continues to be a major cause of death among children and teens. Did you know that 10 percent of the 26,000 calls to Klinik each year are from people contemplating or flirting with suicide? Eating disorders, poverty, debts, gambling addictions, women's issues, men's issues, gay and lesbian issues, sexuality, literacy, drug and alcohol abuse—did you know that one family in four is affected in some way by drug or alcohol abuse?

Divorce, separation issues—half of all marriages now end in divorce. Manitoba Family Services mediates in over 900 divorces and custody cases each year. Single-parent issues, death and loss issues, grieving and depression—did you know that 41 percent of Manitobans claim they frequently feel depressed? This is higher than anywhere else in Canada. Depression affects 4 percent to 5 percent of the population or 40,000 Manitobans at any given time. Manitoba hospitals reported treating 6,198 cases of mental disorders in 1990-91.

Stress—the statistics are just as depressing. A recent request for a farm stress line in Manitoba is evidence enough that there is a need for this service. To go on, mainstreaming, new age trends, peer relationships, racism, antiracism, intervention programs, mediation, fetal alcohol syndrome, hyperactivity, smoking, gangs, cults, AIDS and other STDs—did you know that there are 42 sexually transmittable diseases, and it is expected that there will be 20 million AIDS cases worldwide by the year 2000? One can only speculate on the number of HIV-positive people there will be by that date.

(Mr. Chairperson in the Chair)

Last on my list, but far from least, is violence. The statistics are staggering. In 1990, 74 women and 26 men were killed by their partners. One in three women is abused by her partner at least once

in her lifetime, while one in 40 men uses violence to inflict severe punishment on their partner.

Teachers also face violence on a daily basis. A recent study by The Manitoba Teachers' Society found that one in 10 teachers reported being physically attacked in the past year. I personally have been threatened and assaulted by students on several occasions. Every school seems to have one or more violent students.

This is not a complete list of what counsellors have to deal with in their job, but it may give you more insight into what counsellors see, hear and must deal with on a daily basis. The longer you are in a school the more cases you become aware of. Counsellors are under increasing pressure to fix these kids.

Professional development—the question arises, how do you go about fixing this situation? Crisis counselling helps temporarily, but for long-term effect, more is needed. Prevention programs are a major need in our schools today.

To offer these programs in most cases, to plan, prepare and implement such programs takes considerable work. Counsellors and teachers can only acquire the skills and knowledge necessary to operate these programs through specialized training sessions. Dealing with difficult discipline problems that schools confront on a daily basis is not part of the basic teacher training program offered at university. The necessary skills required to deal with these problems come from specialized training programs. The children of Manitoba need counsellors who are capable of meeting their needs, no matter how extreme these needs may be. Professional development gives counsellors this opportunity to learn new and more effective techniques and to refine and perfect old methods.

The Manitoba School Counsellors Association plans and offers several professional development conferences, workshops and seminars each year to assist counsellors in acquiring these skills, techniques and knowledge. This professional development system is in grave danger of collapsing under the weight of Bill 22.

Our annual Special Area Groups Conference, SAG for short, a tradition in Manitoba every October, may disappear as a result of Bill 22 and government direction to eliminate professional development funding for teachers. These conferences are not cheap to put on. It is often the

registration fees from the last 50 or 60 participants that determine whether a conference breaks even or loses money. Quality professional development costs between \$75 and \$150 per day in these times. If you add in food, transportation and lodging, it becomes very expensive. If you also lose your salary for the day, the cost becomes prohibitive. Counsellors cannot afford to pay more.

* (2340)

It is ironic that a conference the Minister of Education Rosemary Vodrey is sponsoring this October for school counsellors may be cancelled because of legislation she has introduced that effectively eliminates professional development for counsellors and teachers.

This is the law. Manitoba is destined to become an intellectual wasteland where educators become increasingly out of touch with new and innovative techniques that may be able to solve some of the pressing problems of the school system and the community if this bill is permitted to pass into law.

The Manitoba School Counsellors Association is present here today to ask the government of Manitoba to defeat Bill 22. This is a devastating piece of legislation. The education system is like a delicate flower. In education we know that if you nurture a flower it grows and flourishes, but if you crush it, it wilts and dies. Bill 22 has already delivered a crushing blow to education. Please stop this legislation from becoming law. It has already taken the bloom out of education and out of educators.

In your hand you hold the key that can unlock the door to our children's future of good economic growth and prosperity. Live up to your promise to chart a course to equip Manitobans with the knowledge and skills they need to meet the challenge of the next century. The decision you make on this matter will have an effect for decades to come. Do not take your decision lightly.

Thank you on behalf of the Manitoba School Counsellors Association.

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

Ms. Barrett: I appreciate very much the information you have given us in this presentation. I know that while statistics are usually seen as dry things and you do not usually use the word "evocative" when you think of statistics, but the statistics that you have outlined in your paper today

certainly paint a picture for me, as someone who is not and has not been for quite a long period of time involved directly in the school system, about what is actually happening to the students and the teachers and the counsellors that are involved in our school systems each day.

I wanted to make that comment and then I have just one question. Are the school counsellors spread throughout the province or are they, like so many things in this province, focused mostly in Winnipeg, and rural and northern communities have less access to the skills and benefits that counselling can bring to the schools?

Mr. Robertson: Yes, most counsellors are centered in the city in the larger divisions that can afford the cost of a counselling system. I worked in Duck Mountain School Division. I was the only trained counsellor in that division when I was there. When you work in a situation—like they are very isolated, you do not have the opportunity to talk to other counsellors, discuss situations as they arise. Also school principals are not trained in counselling, so they do not understand the issues in the same manner that a counsellor would or approach them in the same manner.

When I worked in The Pas also, if you were a counsellor and you wanted in-servicing, you had to come to Winnipeg for that primarily. Now they do have some. There has been an increase in some professional development in the North over the last few years, but the bulk of it is still done in southern Manitoba.

This year the Counsellors' Association, we are going to do a satellite broadcast in November to reach counsellors, not only counsellors but people who are working in a counselling role, in remote and northern areas as well. So we are trying to reach out and get to these people and give them information. We also publish a quarterly journal to also provide information of practical value to people in the field.

Ms. Barrett: Just one other brief question, what is the impact that you see in Bill 22 and that ability specifically to reach out to deal with and to try and eliminate the distance that the geography and the population demographics puts on the people of Manitoba?

Mr. Robertson: As I pointed out in my presentation, planning for our SAG conference, we are already seeing a lot of cancellations. We have

a summer institute every year in August. We are down to less than half of what we normally get at our summer institute. So the effects of Bill 22 in our opinion are already taking effect. We are looking at our SAG conference. If it does go, it is going to be downscaled to probably half of what it normally is, if it goes at all. So it is, for us, a very devastating bill.

Mr. Santos: Mr. Chairperson, just to restore gender balance, I noticed that you do not have any statistics about men who are abused by their mother or their partner. Is there any explanation for this lack of statistics?

Mr. Robertson: Yes, I just did not really mean this to be a report on statistics, a statistical report. The information coming out on the number of men abused by their parents is not as complete as it is for females, although there are an awful lot more males coming out now that have been abused. I think statistics are around one in 10 males are abused at some point in their life.

Mr. Santos: If violence is better prevented than cured, how do you propose to prevent violence, especially among younger and younger kids?

Mr. Robertson: The trend in counselling today and the real push is in preventative and developmental programming. One statistic that I have read recently in a study in the social sciences was that if you have not reached a student by the end of Grade 3 who is violent or aggressive you can consider them chronic, that after the Grade 3 level you are just going to have to do stopgap measures with them. You cannot cure the problem. You are not likely to cure the problem after that age level.

So the trend now is to try and work the full classroom. As a counsellor you work in a full classroom with a preventative program. We have heard about the WEVAS program, the second step program from the committee of children, and peer mediators to work on the playgrounds to help kids learn those skills, and assertiveness skills with kids that are affected by violent kids, how they can protect themselves and so on. So there are a lot of programs that can be developed, but you need the personnel to be trained to do those things.

Mr. Chairperson: One quick question, Mr. Santos.

Mr. Santos: We know that those who live by the sword shall die by the sword. Also, violent people usually die violently. How do you account then for

the alarming increase of violence among younger and younger generations?

Mr. Robertson: Well, I have seen with the recession, as people start to take more drastic measures to make ends meet, I think that violence has just spread generally. I think also there has been a lot of talk about media effect on violence. I certainly think there has been some effect there. I do not know, I am not sure where all the violence comes from. There is a difference in that our society has changed, so that there is a different way of parenting today than there was 20 years ago, and so the change in parenting has also created an effect on how people interrelate with each other.

Mr. Chalperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Robertson.

I will now call on Mr. Ross Skabar.

Mr. Bill Smith. Mr. Smith have a presentation? We have your presentation. You may proceed, Mr. Smith.

Mr. Bill Smith (Private Citizen): In opening, I would like to thank the committee for the opportunity to speak to the enabling provisions of Bill 22, The Public Sector Reduced Work Week and Compensation Management Act.

I am a teacher in Assiniboine South School Division. I teach physical education, Grade 8 social studies and science, and I act as a team leader for the Grade 8 students and staff. My teaching load is thirty-seven 40-minute classes with 11 preparation periods in a six-day cycle. I have six years of university training and have been teaching for 24 years.

During my 24 years, I have been relatively content with my negotiated contracts. I like to consider myself a professional and believe I have earned the right to be involved in determining my lot. Until this year, I felt good about my profession and the responsibilities it entails. However, Bill 22, coupled with the fact that we have not had a contract for two years, triggered a sense of cynicism and discouragement I had not felt before. Frankly, it scared me to feel this way.

* (2350)

I am sure by now you are well aware of the interference this bill creates with our collective bargaining rights, how it will affect the quality of programming, the inequities across the province,

the effects on pensions and the infringement on local autonomy.

This last point, by the way, is something I still do not understand. How can school boards, who lament the loss of self-determination and autonomy due to provincial government controls and interference, run to the government and ask them to enact enabling legislation on leave without pay?

Is this not a perfect opportunity to sit down with their employees and communities and come up with some budgetary solutions? These are the same boards who talk to their staffs about shared governance and encourage communities and students to demand a say in their schooling. Autonomy and shared governance are not principles of convenience but real and vital goals towards good education. In my mind, this is reason enough to withdraw Bill 22 and give the decision back to the school boards, the employees and the school communities.

These issues aside, I would like to speak to the committee about teaching. I think it is important to understand the nature of teaching in your deliberations. As I indicated earlier, I did not like the way I was feeling about teaching. I was saying things to myself like: If they cut us back, then I will cut back. I will stop attending those extra meetings about special needs kids. I will not run a basketball program for those 40 students who did not make the team, and I will give my class busy work while I do my reports.

These are not thoughts dedicated teachers have, but they were there for the first time in 24 years. You see, teaching is not like other occupations. It is not a nine-to-five job. There are incredible stresses both physically and emotionally. I need my holidays to recharge my batteries. I need my professional development days to stay current and vital so that the students I teach will have the best I can give. I need my administration days to meet with parents and effectively evaluate student progress. Schooling is not an office that you shut down for a day and then open up the next.

Teaching is a difficult occupation to describe to a nonteacher. Probably as teachers we are at fault for not attempting to verbalize what it is all about. In an attempt to give you some idea, I thought I would share with you a typical day. There are variations and constant unexpected twists, but nine

to five, with an hour for lunch, it has not been that for me yet.

Tuesday, June 9, 1993: 6:30 a.m., get up, ready for a 7:30 running club; 7:30-8:40, run with the students to the park and back; 8:40-9:00, read the staff bulletin, get ready for first class and no time to shower; 9:00-9:40, physical education class, Grade 9 racquetball and ultimate; 9:40-10:17, meet with resource to discuss students in my academic class; 10:17-10:50, preparation, pull together material for class on Renaissance, period 5; 10:50-11:00, break, talk to some students who snuck out the back door and were smoking around the corner of the school; 11:00-11:40, Grade 8 physical education, racquetball and ultimate; 11:40-12:15, Grade 8 social studies class on Renaissance; 12:15-1:20, grab some lunch and get to a Grade 8 team meeting to discuss a variety of issues around year-end and plans for Grade 8 outing at Birds Hill; 1:20-2:40, a double science class working on flight and making gliders—it takes 15 minutes to settle the class down because I was called out to attend to a girl who ran to school too fast to be on time and had an asthma attack, and someone had to get the Ventolin while I was watching this particular girl—2:40-3:20, Grade 9 physical education, racquetball, ultimate; 3:20-3:50, put away the equipment in the gym and prepare for a parent meeting around a student at four o'clock, keep an eye on some students who wanted to play some basketball; 4:00-5:00, meet with parents, decide on a number of strategies for behaviour until the end of year, a resource teacher and another classroom teacher are involved; 5:00-9:00, personal activities; 9:00-11:30, prepare for Wednesday's classes and type the minutes to the team meeting.

Well, as you can see, this was a full day. One can debate whether this is typical or not, but when I look back on my year, a good portion of it was to do with teaching. As well, this work log for Tuesday, June 8, does not capture the hundreds of mental, emotional interactions that occurred with staff, students and parents. Teaching is not like other occupations.

My point in all of this is that teaching and schooling are different, and deliberations on unpaid days, funding cutbacks and wage freezes should consider the nature of schooling. I am fully prepared to play my role in fiscal responsibility and consider all cost-saving measures put forward for education. However, I am also a dedicated

professional and believe I have the right to meet with my employers and reach a mutually acceptable agreement without government intervention.

In closing, I urge the committee to consider the uniqueness of education and teaching during the deliberations and recommend against enabling legislation of Bill 22. Take this step, and I know my feelings of discouragement and cynicism will subside. Consider the words of Theodore Sizer in Horace's *Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School*: People who are denied the tools and time they need quickly become discouraged. They believe that those responsible for their work do not respect it. Neglect breeds cynicism. Thank you.

Mr. Chalperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Smith.

Mr. Alcock: Thank you, Mr. Smith.

On page 1, you make the comment: Is this not a perfect opportunity to sit down with their employees and communities and come up with some budgetary solutions? Was none of that done? Were there no discussions within your division to see if there were alternatives to the decisions that were taken?

Mr. Smith: There were no discussions. We are still in the process of arriving at a contract which we have been working on for two years. So there was no discussion or no opportunity to sit down and talk about the four days. In our school division, it happens to be four days. You come to school one morning, and it was decided at a school board meeting that is four days.

I think that to me is one of the most important parts of all of this. I consider myself to be a good teacher. I think I am being open and honest with the committee here. I talked to a lot of my colleagues who, I think, feel the same way. I think you are misreading teachers, if you are thinking that they are not prepared to do their share.

As I have heard at the committee hearing here in your comments, I have heard that you consider this to be a "we" problem but I do not get the sense that "us" or "me" and everyone is involved in the decision.

That is one of the prime things that really bothers me. I believe that a large majority of the teachers would be prepared to consider a lot of different alternatives. The only thing I think they are asking

is that they have some say in it. Let us go back to sitting down with the school board and seeing where we can make cuts, and see where we can make ends meet. I think that is one of the basic fundamental things that I would like to see.

I know in the teachers that I talked to, somehow, if that could happen, I think you would come out with a lot better decision in the end. I do believe that the school divisions and the budgets would start to balance.

Mr. Alcock: Well, the member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) says that is exactly what Bill 22 does, and I think he fails to understand—

An Honourable Member: That is your leader, the member for St. James, Reg.

Mr. Alcock: I am sorry. You are right. It is Sturgeon Creek—

An Honourable Member: Edwards in the cabinet—wake up, Reg.

Mr. Alcock: Yes, I feel absolutely shocked and appalled that I would make such a mistake. Obviously, they are not one and the same.

There is an interesting point here. I mean, there is a sense that somehow the government still believes that you can pass Bill 22 and you do not affect your ability to bargain, and you do not affect your ability to have these discussions. You can just go ahead.

* (0000)

What is interesting to me in the situation we are at is the Finance minister talks about the need to deal with the provincial government debt, et cetera, et cetera. They made that decision when they made the decision about the level of funding that they were going to provide school divisions. That took care of it. The rest of this does not affect their budget whatsoever.

It does not affect the provincial budget one nickel, but it has a tremendous impact on what is happening in the school divisions, and I think you might want to explain to the member for Sturgeon Creek (Mr. McAlpine) and others just how this does impact on collective bargaining, because I still think that lesson has not got through, that this is not a tool to improve communication or to improve bargaining, it is a tool that destroys it.

Mr. Smith: Precisely, and I guess that is what I have been trying to say to you, speaking on a personal level, speaking on how I feel. That is, to

me, one of the most critical things that we are trying to get at here. It does not appear to me, I agree. Just as I was listening to the conversations earlier, it occurred to me that if the government is only giving our school division 2 percent, and they are saying you cannot go any higher than that, that is all the money you are going to get from us—if that is what they are saying and they leave it at that, then they give it back to the school board and say all right, this is how much you have to work with, work with it.

I am trying to say also, on a personal level, that I have the sense, and I think I know teachers quite well in terms of how they have settled on negotiations and that, that they would be prepared to sit down.

If you had some parameters on the number of days that you were going to allow them to take, you might even have them say we are prepared to take a 2 percent cut in our salary. We are also prepared to maybe cut back here, but you have to listen to us a little bit, and when the fellow was talking about the new school board building that was being built, then you have to cut back there. It has to be everybody doing this together. It has to be a shared decision, and it has to be shared governance and that is what has to happen.

Bill 22, by saying it is 10 days and I am sorry that is the way it is, that to me does not give us a choice. That to me does not give us that choice.

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (St. Norbert): I would like to thank you. You do not mind if I ask a question, do you, Becky?

Mr. Chairperson: No, certainly not.

Mr. Laurendeau: I figured I should ask Becky's permission.

Thanks for making the presentation, Bill, and thanks for putting that information on the record. I do not think you could find one member of this Legislature that is actually happy with this bill. I mean, we would all like to be able to take and throw it out the window, each and everyone of us, but I do not think we as a government have an opportunity to do what is necessary within the fiscal responsibility of government today without this form of legislation.

If there was a way for the teachers, for the employees of government to come to an agreement, I would use all my powers to tell this

Finance minister (Mr. Manness), let us not pass this bill—but I do not see that being possible.

How would you go to your association and say, let us see what we can do with the school boards, and come up with an agreement so this type of legislation is not necessary?

Mr. Smith: I guess you are talking to an optimist and a trustful person and one who believes in the collective bargaining process, and you are talking to someone here who believes that we should have our say. I think if you want in the next two minutes we could get rid of this bill and go ahead, and I think we would have time when we look at surpluses. I think teachers are waiting. They want some signal to feel like they have some say in what is going to happen to them. I really believe that you would be surprised at the kinds of decisions that they would come up with to balance the budget. That is all we are asking for.

I remember earlier this evening when they talked about the New Zealand situation. I do not think we are that close to the cliff. That analogy to me, I could not believe it and I wondered why, but I do not think that we are that close to the edge of the cliff.

I look in our school division. We have a small school division within the city here. We have, by the time this year's surplus is tallied into it, somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$3.5 million. Now, all we are saying is then that might be another part of the creative solution. Let us use that in the short term to try and get us to a point where we can make some decisions around this and sit down together and do that.

So we will never know unless you say, let us try it—and I do not think you have tried it yet. I do not think you have honestly tried it, because I as a teacher do not feel like I have had any say yet. So you have not tried it. You have gone ahead, I am not sure where you got your information about, but I do not think you have talked to teachers, and I do not think you have talked to employees. It may be a reaction on your part by the numbers, but I do not think you have tried it yet, and that is what we are asking for.

Mr. Laurendeau: Mr. Smith, have you had a chance to review the bill at this time? Are you aware, within the bill there is a clause that demands 30 days of negotiations, of discussion with your group?

An Honourable Member: They will negotiate with a gun at your head.

Mr. Chalrperson: Mr. Laurendeau has asked a question of Mr. Smith.

Mr. Smith: I must be honest with you again, that I do not know a lot of the actual, you know, the technicalities of the bill, and I have not spent that much time reading into it. I do know that our school division has already taken two years to try and negotiate a 2 percent-2 percent-2 percent salary increase, and we have been back and forth. I think we need more than 30 days. I mean, I do not think the urgency is that great. I think we have to let collective bargaining take its course, and I do not think collective bargaining will take its course in 30 days.

So there may well be a time limit, but I do not think 30 days is fair. I do not think that 30 days is the urgency that the government seems to be leading us, you know, making us feel there is.

Mr. Laurendeau: I would just like to relate one fact to you, and it is with a school division that I have had the opportunity of working with. They had come to—well, they had not come to an agreement but they were close to it, and the negotiations just broke down in the very end.

I did not call what happened collective bargaining when an arbitrator arbitrarily turned around and told the school division, this is the increase that is going to happen; this is the increase that the teachers are going to have. I do not find that bargaining when an arbitrator walks in and says, this is the final deal and the school divisions have no choice but to accept what is on the table at this time.

Mr. Smith: You are probably quite right. I mean, that is the process. But the teachers are also risking in this too, and we are currently now in a situation in our school division where we are talking about 2 percent-2 percent-2 percent over a three-year contract, and there are some other clauses in there around lunch-hour supervision and all of that.

We initially thought this was a good package and were prepared to ratify. The board was not prepared to ratify. We went to conciliation, some of the clauses were left out, one in particular, a layoff clause. The board then came back and said, well, let us ratify. Then the teachers said no, there are some things in here that are not quite right, some changes have to happen. Bill 22 has become quite

active. There has been some discussion about realigning school divisions and that sort of thing. Now we are back at sort of a stalemate here in terms of our negotiations.

We are taking some risks when we go to the arbitrator, too, because the latest settlement, one of the settlements in Brandon settled at a 1 percent-something. If they are using precedent, when I said to our negotiations people, I said: How could this happen? We are taking a bit of chance here. We could settle right now for 2 percent and a layoff clause that maybe we could renegotiate the next contract. They are saying, well, we will get our 2 percent in arbitration. I said, what about the Brandon situation? They said, well, that was a rookie arbitrator. I said, well, we take our chances as does the school board.

I think that is the intent of the process. You put your cards on the table, and they put their cards on the table, and finally you reach an impasse. Then the arbitrator comes in. I mean, you cannot say that the arbitration board is in favour of the school board or the teachers. That is not what is intended.

Mr. Chairperson: I thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Smith. Your time has expired.

Mr. Smith: Okay, I thank you for your time as well.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your time. I will remind all present and committee members that the meeting will reconvene tomorrow at one o'clock to hear presentations in this room again.

Committee rise.

COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 12:10 a.m.

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS PRESENTED BUT NOT READ

Memorandum to: The Standing Committee on Economic Development

At the outset, I would like to thank the committee for giving me the opportunity to comment on Bill 22. Certainly, this particular bill warrants comment and criticism. It is, in my opinion, one of the worst pieces of legislation ever introduced by a government in this province. The legislation is ill conceived; a bill with no justification, a bill with not a single redeeming feature.

The bill is completely at odds with entrenched values and traditions in Manitoba. As well, the bill is at odds with values and standards that have

been endorsed and promoted by Canada, at an international level. The bill negates the rights of public sector workers in Manitoba. The bill is malevolent and inequitable. The bill will have insidious and enduring consequences. Bill 22 is, in short, a bad piece of legislation that should be withdrawn in its entirety.

Before I turn to the specifics of Bill 22, I would like to establish a context for my criticism.

The Manitoba Economy

Manitoba's economy is declining relative to other provinces in Canada. Table 1 compares gross domestic product in Manitoba to the Canadian gross domestic product. The relative decline in Manitoba's GDP is both perceptible and persistent.

Table 1
Gross Domestic Product
at Market Prices in Manitoba
as a Percent of Canadian Gross Domestic Product

Year	Canada (millions of dollars)	Manitoba	Manitoba as a Percent of Canada
1983	402,859	14,787	3.67
1984	443,268	16,411	3.70
1985	477,273	17,704	3.71
1986	504,124	18,421	3.65
1987	549,152	19,492	3.55
1988	607,114	21,631	3.56
1989	649,080	22,949	3.54
1990	666,993	23,650	3.54
1991	671,668	23,340	3.47
1992	684,184	23,751	3.47

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Economic Observer (11-010), May, 1993, Table 12.1

As is shown in Table 2, a similar trend is evident in employment data.

Table 2
Employment Trends, Canada and Manitoba,
1983-1992
Total Employment (Thousands)

Year	Canada	Manitoba	Manitoba as a Percent of Canada
1983	10,675.4	459.3	4.3
1984	10,931.8	470.0	4.3
1985	11,221.2	475.3	4.2
1986	11,531.1	486.1	4.2
1987	11,861.0	492.2	4.2
1988	12,244.5	493.6	4.0

1989	12,485.6	497.9	4.0
1990	12,571.6	505.0	4.0
1991	12,340.1	493.6	4.0
1992	12,240.3	483.7	4.0

Employment in Manufacturing (Thousands)

Year	Canada	Manitoba	Manitoba as a Percent of Canada
1983	1,873.9	58.4	3.1
1984	1,953.7	57.7	3.0
1985	1,959.9	57.8	2.9
1986	1,988.7	56.4	2.8
1987	2,018.2	56.1	2.8
1988	2,104.0	62.6	3.0
1989	2,125.9	61.8	2.9
1990	2,000.6	54.3	2.7
1991	1,864.7	55.1	3.0
1992	1,788.0	51.4	2.9

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Annual Analysis (71-220), 1992.

The decline in employment in Manitoba in relation to the rest of the country has been relatively slow, but it is nevertheless persistent and pervasive. Moreover, aggregate employment trends conceal some of the other changes that are taking place in employment in this province. For example, in 1992, full-time employment in Manitoba was 3.8 percent of full-time employment in Canada. In 1983, the proportion was 4.2 percent.

This more rapid relative decline in full-time employment is a reflection of the fact that a rising proportion of jobs created in Manitoba are part-time jobs. Table 3 compares composition of employment in Manitoba and Canada in 1983 and 1992.

Table 3
Composition of Employment in Manitoba
1983 and 1992 (Thousands)

	1983	1992	Change in No. of Jobs	
			1983	1992
Manitoba			As a percent of total	
Full time	382	390	+8	34.8
Part time	79	94	+15	65.2
Total	461	484	+23	100.0
Canada				
Full time	9,083	10,182	1,099	73.0
Part time	1,651	2,058	407	27.0
Total	10,734	12,240	1,506	100.0

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour Force Annual Averages, 1983 and 1992.

Two-thirds of the jobs created in Manitoba between 1983 and 1992 were part-time jobs. The comparable proportion for Canada as a whole was less than one-third.

The final comparison I would make is for average weekly earnings. This comparison is presented in Table 4. These data are self-explanatory, but it should be noted that since 1989 the rate of relative decline in average weekly earnings in Manitoba has accelerated.

Table 4
Average Weekly Earnings, Manitoba and Canada
1983 - 1992

Year	Manitoba	Canada	Manitoba as a Percent of Canada
1983	356.78	384.09	92.9
1984	375.74	400.34	93.8
1985	384.29	414.42	92.7
1986	398.32	426.71	93.3
1987	411.08	442.73	92.8
1988	423.30	462.13	91.6
1989	446.46	485.95	91.9
1990	461.92	508.01	90.9
			Manitoba as a Percent of Canada
Year	Manitoba	Canada	Manitoba as a Percent of Canada
1991	477.93	531.59	89.9
1992	488.56	549.80	88.9

Sources: Manitoba bureau of Statistics, Manitoba Statistical Review, First Quarter 1992; Statistics Canada, Canadian Economic Observer (11-010), May 1992

The problems in the Manitoba economy are not the result solely of developments within the province. On the contrary, policy initiatives by the federal government, especially in recent years, have exacerbated conditions in the province.

These policies are well known to members of the committee: reduction in transfers to the province under the Established Programs Financing Arrangements, which have accentuated the fiscal problems of the Manitoba government; the restructuring of federal Crown corporations, notably, Via Rail and Canada Post, which have resulted in job losses and the conversion of "good" jobs to "bad" jobs; cutbacks in transfer programs,

for example, unemployment insurance, which have reduced the flow of funds into Manitoba; the FTA, which resulted in the closure of plants in Manitoba and impaired the ability of the provincial government to use its powers to promote development and economic growth; and the GST, which reduced the purchasing power of Manitoba consumers and, together with changes to income and corporation taxes, accentuated inequities in the tax structure.

In addition to all of this, of course, we had a perverse monetary policy originating with the central bank and endorsed by the federal government. This policy raised interest rates in Canada relative to interest rates in the United States. The results of the policy were: (i) reduced investment, reduced sales and output, and rising unemployment, a recession; (ii) a rise in the external value of the Canadian dollar which undermined Canadian exports and led to unprecedented spending by Canadians in adjacent U.S. states; (iii) an increase in the costs of domestic borrowing to provincial governments; and (iv) a dramatic increase in foreign holdings of Canadian government debt, as foreign investors purchased government securities to take advantage of higher returns.

Other policies which will do further damage to the Canadian and Manitoba economies are on the agenda. Perhaps the most significant of these policies is the NAFTA, which is due to take effect January 1, 1994. The NAFTA will create additional problems for Manitoba-based firms in both domestic and export markets.

The present Manitoba government has been among the most enthusiastic supporters of federal government policies; indeed, on many occasions the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) expressed regret that the federal government did not go further with some of its measures, for example, cutbacks in federal government expenditures.

For its part, the Manitoba government has accommodated itself to the general deterioration in conditions by seeking to compete for investment and jobs on the basis of low taxes for corporations and high-income individuals, and low wages for workers. To hold the line on progressive taxes, the government has resorted to cutbacks in expenditures on social welfare programs and increases in the tax take from regressive taxes.

This is a very risky strategy with potentially serious consequences for the provincial economy. The low-tax, low-wage strategy is likely to attract precisely those firms that rely on low taxes and low wages to generate acceptable after-tax rates of return. The bulk of such firms will be relatively footloose, with the capacity to relocate very readily in response to more favourable conditions, lower taxes and lower wages in other jurisdictions, provinces, and states. Moreover, a low-wage policy will induce migration of skilled and educated workers to other jurisdictions. The lack of skilled workers combined with a decaying infrastructure will deter high-wage firms that utilize skilled labour from locating in Manitoba.

The Manitoba Budget

The latest budget for 1993-94 reflects the priorities of the Manitoba government.

Manitoba was hit hard by the 1990-1991 recession. Table 5 provides comparative data on the impact of the recession in Manitoba and Canada.

Table 5
Impact of Recession in Manitoba and Canada,
Selected Indicators

	Manitoba	Canada
Change in Gross Domestic Product at market prices 1989 - 1992	3.5%	5.4%
Change in Final Domestic Demand at 1986 prices 1989 - 1992	-0.8%	-0.4%
Employment in 1992 as percent of Employment in 1990.	95.8%	97.4%
Percent change in Average Hourly Earnings 1986 - 1992	24.0%	30.7%

Source: Statistics Canada, Canadian Economic Observer, May, 1993.

There was some improvement in the Manitoba economy in 1992, but the unemployment rate nevertheless increased from 8.8 percent to 9.6 percent. Moreover, the participation rate for the province continued to decline, falling from 66.9 percent in 1991 to 60.0 percent in 1992. This decline translates into about 8,000 individuals who either left, or did not enter, the labour market in response to the lack of job opportunities in the Manitoba economy.

The general deterioration in the economy was reflected, as well, in an increase in the incidence of

families and individuals below the Statistics Canada low income after tax cutoffs, 1986 base. For the country as a whole, the incidence of low income increased from 8.3 percent in 1989 to 10.2 percent in 1991, an increase of 22.9 percent. In Manitoba, the incidence jumped from 9.6 percent to 13.0 percent, an increase of 35.0 percent. [Statistics Canada, Income After Tax, Distribution by Size in Canada, 1991 (13-210)].

Clearly, these conditions called for a budget that would create jobs and alleviate low incomes. Instead, the budget did precisely the opposite.

Since first taking office in 1988, the budgets of the present government have been driven by the single-minded obsession of not increasing tax rates on personal and corporate incomes. This was again the major preoccupation of the Minister of Finance in preparing the 1993-94 budget. Thus, on page 6 of The 1993 Manitoba Budget the minister notes, with great enthusiasm that in an effort to keep Manitoba competitive: I am pleased to announce that, for the sixth budget in a row, there will be no major tax increases.

No increase in personal or corporate income taxes. No increase in the provincial sales tax rate. No increase in payroll or capital tax rates.

This claim is, however, misleading, because the minister did in fact increase taxes by extending the application of the provincial sales tax to a broad range of goods and services and by reducing the property tax credit by \$75 and imposing a minimum property tax threshold of \$250. These charges combined are projected to add over \$90 million to the tax bills of Manitobans. Moreover, the impact of these changes will fall most heavily on people at the bottom end of the income distribution.

A second consideration which apparently figures prominently in the government's budget deliberations is deficit reduction. In addition to the expansion of the sales tax and the reduction in the property tax credit, the budget (i) reduces expenditures on social welfare programs, health, education, and welfare; (ii) eliminates grants to a large number of organizations providing services to people in low-income groups and to disadvantaged individuals; (iii) calls for the further promotion of gambling as a means of generating additional revenues; and (iv) imposes a wage clawback on all public sector workers in Manitoba.

In the budget statement the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) claims that his government has called upon all Manitobans to make sacrifices to protect all that we hold dear. In reality, the budget imposes disproportionate sacrifices on the poor, the disabled, the aboriginal community, the civil service, and all other workers in the public sector and exempts corporations and the wealthy from such sacrifices.

Bill 22

Other presenters at this hearing will deal at length with the philosophical, legal, and political aspects of Bill 22. Therefore, I shall restrict my observations to issues and concerns that have been raised within my own union, the Brandon University Faculty Union.

(1) Concerns have been raised about the fact that Bill 22 was unilaterally imposed by the government without consultation with either the unions or the employees affected by the provision of the legislation. Most employees affected by Bill 22 belong to unions. In the case of the civil servants employed by the Manitoba government, a collective agreement is in place. In most other situations, for example, in the universities, collective agreements expired March 31, 1993, and are currently being renegotiated. Members of BUFA consider Bill 22 a contravention of their collective bargaining rights. They also note the hypocrisy inherent in the fact that the government which has imposed Bill 22 is the same government that repealed final offer selection legislation on the grounds that FOS was a violation of the principles of free collective bargaining.

(2) Bill 22 has disrupted the collective bargaining process at Brandon University, and in other situations as well, in two ways.

First, the employer has used Bill 22 as a pretext for delaying serious collective bargaining aimed at renewing collective agreements with the four campus bargaining units.

Secondly, the employer has used the climate produced by Bill 22 and other activities of the Manitoba government to put a host of regressive demands on the table, which are intended to reduce the rights of members and establish centralized, authoritarian, decision-making processes on campus. Members of my own union and members of other campus unions are convinced that, if it had not been for Bill 22, we

would have negotiated by now renewed collective agreements mutually acceptable to both parties, collective agreements that respected the rights of employees and recognized the difficult fiscal situation facing the university.

(3) Bill 22 is inequitable in its impact. It works like a proportional tax in that it takes the same proportion of salary from each employee. Thus, at Brandon University, for example, six days in pay are being snatched back from each employee. This represents about 2.3 percent of gross salary. However, the reduction in take-home pay will be greater for individuals in lower salary brackets than for those in the top salary brackets. Even if this were not the case, people in lower salary brackets would still find it more difficult to adjust to the loss of pay because of fixed commitments and the added burden associated with increases in sales and property taxes resulting from changes in the budget.

(4) The reduction in salary bills resulting from Bill 22 will adversely affect local and regional economies. Specifically, the associated reduction in expenditures will reduce the revenues of local retail, service, and other establishments and result in layoffs and reduced hours for private sector employees.

Members of my union believe that Bill 22 is a particularly reprehensible piece of legislation for which no justification has been provided, and for which no justification can be provided. If in fact the government is faced with a fiscal situation that warrants an extraordinary response, and we have seen no evidence of this, the appropriate thing to do would be to request the unions to reopen their collective agreements for the purpose of renegotiating certain of the provisions. Other public sector institutions, the Crown corporations, universities, health care facilities, et cetera, could have done this on their own without enabling their employees to take wage cuts.

We believe this is still the appropriate course of action and we would suggest, therefore, that Bill 22 be withdrawn.

If the committee and the Legislature are not persuaded of the wisdom of this proposal and proceed with Bill 22, then we would suggest that three of the more objectionable aspects of the bill be amended. Specifically, we would propose:

(1) the elimination of the retroactivity of the bill, i.e., have it take effect the date it is proclaimed rather than making it retroactive to April 1, 1993; and

(2) the creation of an onus on employers invoking Bill 22 to show just cause; i.e., an onus to provide employees with rationale and evidence demonstrating that the fiscal health of the institutions do indeed necessitate the clawback of six (or however many are designated) days of pay.

(3) the exemption of employees earning less than \$30,000 a year from the provisions of Bill 22, as is proposed under the Ontario legislation.

The Government's Economic Plan

Before I conclude my presentation, I would like to offer one final observation.

On June 8, Premier Filmon released a document, Framework for Economic Growth, calling for a long-term economic strategy that will ensure Manitoba's place as one of the best locations in North America in which to invest and do business. I have not yet obtained a copy of the complete report, so I have to rely on the information in the June 8, 1993, news release.

Now, as I read this release, it seems to suggest that the Manitoba government intends to repudiate its past approach to economic and related issues and adopt an entirely new strategy. Thus, on page 1, Premier Filmon states that the most successful economics have replaced the short-term, quick-fix solution of the 1970s and 1980s [sic] with strategies that are based on long-term sustainability and the creation of wealth.

Bill 22 is, of course, a short-term, quick-fix solution. The implication of the Premier's statement is that there will be no more Bill 22s—all the more reason for withdrawing the current Bill 22. As well, the statement implies that the government intends to abandon its reliance on market forces to achieve satisfactory economic outcomes—growth, full employment, et cetera. Reliance on the market will be replaced with a plan, an industrial strategy, which presumably assigns to the state a pre-eminent role in putting together the conditions, resources, et cetera, required to achieve important economic objectives.

According to Mr. Filmon, a central part of the strategy will be the creation of corporate arrangements involving the key players in the

Manitoba economy—government, labour, industry, et cetera.

Presumably, it is within the context of such arrangements that the province will set economic and social goals and devise concrete proposals for: (i) generating and co-ordinating investment expenditures; (ii) channelling co-ordinating growth in ways that create decent jobs, jobs that pay high wages and provide opportunities for skills acquisition and advancements; (iii) training and retraining workers for skilled jobs in Manitoba; (iv) a restructuring of the tax system to make it fair and equitable, which will require increasing reliance on taxation based on personal income and corporate profits; (v) improved transfer, training and work opportunity programs for the poor to allow them to share in the benefits of economic growth and regain employment in decent jobs; (vi) improving the infrastructure of major cities and towns with growth potential; and (vii) improved employment standards legislation to enhance the employment situations of nonunion workers.

If the government is indeed committed to such an approach, then I welcome it. I believe it would

represent a cost improvement over the authoritarianism and unilateralism that have characterized the government's actions to date. There is, however, a potential obstacle to creating these kinds of arrangements, which is that the actions of the government to date have alienated organized labour, especially public sector workers who have been adversely affected by changes to labour legislation, tax changes, et cetera, people in low-income groups, members of aboriginal communities, et cetera.

I would suggest that the government must act quickly to achieve a reconciliation with these groups and their organizations and get them involved in deliberations on the future of Manitoba. A good place to start this process as far as organized labour is concerned would be to scrap Bill 22. Thank you.

Errol Black, Arts Representative, Brandon University Faculty Association Executive Committee.

Brandon, Manitoba