

**MINUTES OF 21<sup>st</sup> BIENNIAL CONVENTION  
OF THE NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR ASSOCIATION OF  
PUBLIC AND PRIVATE EMPLOYEES  
HELD AT SHERATON NEWFOUNDLAND HOTEL, ST. JOHN'S  
OCTOBER 22, 23 AND 24, 2015**

**PROUD. UNITED. STRONG.**

**THURSDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2015**

**CALL TO ORDER**

J. Miles, Western Vice President, stated good morning brothers and sisters, I would like to call the Convention to order, and I would like to welcome everyone to the 21<sup>st</sup> Biennial Convention.

The Convention was called to order at 9:10 a.m.

**INVOCATION**

J. Lacey (Eastern Vice President) stated good morning brothers and sisters. Welcome. It's a pleasure to see so many people. It's my pleasure to introduce Reverend Bob Earle to provide the invocation to the Convention. It's a tradition that goes back a long time. An invocation is an appeal to a higher power for help such as a prayer for serenity or a plea. Reverend Bob Earle is a music director and Deacon at St. Augustine's Church on Westerland Road in St. John's. Please join me in welcoming Brother Earle to our Convention.

Rev. Earle stated good morning. I would like to thank you all for inviting me here to be with you this morning to help start off your Convention. I don't pretend to believe that we're all the same religious persuasion and that's fair. But when I think of the role Unions play in our society, I can't help but think about the ways that Unions in their truest sense reflect the lessons taught to us by Jesus. Lessons about fairness and equality as we work towards equal pay for equal work. Lessons about supporting care for one another as we endeavour to create working environments that are both safe and which deflect the diversified needs of all the people that work there. Lessons about fellowship and working together as we partner with organizations outside of our own and try to make our world a better place, not just for ourselves, but for those who will come after us as well. So, it is with that in mind that I would like to offer this prayer.

Gracious God, we give you thanks for the gifts, talents, and skills that you have given each one of us, and for the work for which we have been called. We prayer for this Convention and for all who take part, for discussions that will take place and for the decisions that will be made. That they may continue to reflect those ideals of equality, social justice and fellowship, to the benefit of your people, and in deed, all of creation. Amen.

**SINGING OF SOLIDARITY FOREVER AND THE ODE TO NEWFOUNDLAND**

J. Lacey (Eastern Vice President) stated so without further adieu, we will get this Convention underway in the great spiritual. I am actually going to ask some volunteers out there, brothers and sisters, if you could come forth as our choir (Vina couldn't make it) and we're going to start off with Solidarity Forever and the Ode to Newfoundland. So, I ask some volunteers to come forward.

J. Lacey led the signing of Solidarity Forever followed by the Ode to Newfoundland.

READING OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY

A. Sedlickas (General Vice President) stated good morning everyone. It's my pleasure to read to you the Sexual Harassment Policy of NAPE. Sister Sedlickas proceeded to read the Policy.

A. Sedlickas stated at every Convention, Conference or Seminar we read the Sexual Harassment Policy. We want you to have a great Convention. We want you to respect each other, and for that reason, we want to ensure people realize that you have rights. At any Convention or Conference we also make sure we have Sexual Harassment Officers. If there is an incident and you need to talk to somebody, we have two people who are at this Convention that you can speak to - Sister Viva Pittman and Brother Jimmy Lacey. Thank you and have a good Convention.

MINUTE OF SILENCE FOR DECEASED NAPE MEMBERS

J. Miles (Western Vice President) stated brothers and sisters, at each Convention we take the time to honour those members who have passed since our last Convention. It is an opportunity to pay respect, remember and thank them for their service to the people of this Province and their Union. We must also use this moment to reflect on NAPE members who have died as a result of workplace accidents. In the last four years alone, three NAPE members tragically lost their lives as a result of workplace accidents. We pay tribute to those workers and the staggering number of people in this Province who have lost their lives or have been injured on the job. We must all work together each day to ensure that our workplaces are safe because one life lost is one too many. Please join me in a Moment of Silence for deceased NAPE members. Please stand.

B. Blundon assumed the Chair.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

MOTION: W. Thompson (3301)/F. Pittman (7001) - the adoption of the Agenda as presented.  
CARRIED.

APPROVAL OF CONVENTION COMMITTEES**FINANCE COMMITTEE**

Earl Hann, Local 7104 - Chairperson  
Lisa King, Local 1104  
Wanda Flannigan, Local 7852  
Junior Bursey, Local 6206  
Jeff Quilty, Local 8602  
Beulah Evans, Advisor

**CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE**

Mary Myles, Local 9201 - Chairperson  
Jennifer Bartlett-Churchill, Local 1105  
Mona Matthews, Local 7813  
Aiden Donahue, Local 6208  
Terry Carroll, Local 7004  
Trevor King, Advisor

**RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE**

Scott Dwyer, Local 7701 - Chairperson  
Diane Murdoch, Local 3603  
Vicki Laing, Local 5213  
Leo Drake, Local 2201  
Janet King, Local 6204  
Arlene Sedlickas, Advisor

**OFFICERS & COMMITTEES REPORT**

Cynthia Thorne, Local 7104 - Chairperson  
Gloria Peddle, Local 5853  
Brian Abbott, Local 6236  
Walter Meadus, Local 6901  
Krista Newell, Local 6207  
Jimmy Lacey, Advisor

**SERGEANT-AT-ARMS**

Bev Alcock, Local 6901  
 Lisa Burt, Local 3311  
 Robert Fudge, Local 7104  
 Brenda Keough, Local 3102  
 Kim Normore, Local 1809  
 Chris Simms, Local 7701

**HARASSMENT OFFICERS**

Jimmy Lacey  
 Viva Pittman

**CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE**

Jacquelyn Wakeham, Chairperson  
 NAPE Clerical Staff

MOTION: D. Byrne (7002)/K. Oake (3102) - the approval of Committees as listed.  
 CARRIED.

LATE RESOLUTIONS

MOTION: T. Kelly (7104)/A. Squires (6240) - that we accept Late Resolutions.  
 CARRIED.

ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES OF THE 20<sup>TH</sup> BIENNIAL CONVENTION

MOTION: A. Squires (6240)/F. Pittman (7001) - the adoption of the Minutes of the 20<sup>th</sup> Biennial Convention.  
 CARRIED.

CREDENTIALS REPORT

J. Wakeham (BofD) presented the Credentials Report:

Delegates	328
Observers	22
Board of Directors	31
Fraternal/Guests	<u>5</u>
TOTAL	386

MOTION: J. Wakeham (BofD)/K. Oake (3102) - move adoption of the Credentials Report.  
 CARRIED.

READING AND ADOPTION OF THE RULES OF ORDER

B. Blundon read the Rules of Order.

MOTION: A. Squires (6240)/S. Roach (5207) - to accept the Rules of Order as read.  
 CARRIED.

B. Blundon stated just a short introduction to our President. Jerry Earle came to NAPE in the early 90's on our Provincial Board of Directors and served as one of our Executive Officers, I believe as Eastern Vice President. Jerry has been around since, obviously since 1991, and he was part of the difficult 1990s when you may recall we were under substantial attack by Governments, by Employers. We had Collective Agreements torn up, legislated away, and Jerry Earle was part of all of those fightback campaigns. He comes to us with valued experience as we move into this decade, mid decade, when in a few weeks time we are facing the possibility of a brand new

Government, with a brand new agenda, and we will be facing collective bargaining in some four or five short months. The scene is much the same as it was in the 90s with debts and deficits and Government arguing that we have to control those debts and deficits. You all remember the debt and deficit made us do it. In the mid 90s, in one of our most difficult times in NAPE's history I would suggest to those of you who haven't been around, myself and at the time Austin Deir was serving as the President of NAPE, and our Board of Directors elected me to come in and help out, at that time we hired a number of EROs and one of them was Jerry Earle. I can say without hesitation that he became one of our better EROs, one of our better negotiators, and excelled at arbitration. It is my pleasure today to introduce your President, my President, Brother Jerry Earle.

#### PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS - JERRY EARLE

Good morning sisters and brothers. It gives me great pleasure to address you at this great event - our 21<sup>st</sup> Biennial Convention. The last time I addressed delegates such as this, as Bert indicated, I was seeking the position of Eastern Vice President, which I sought at that Convention and was successful in obtaining after serving on the Board of Directors previous to that. On June 1<sup>st</sup> of this year, it was my honour to proudly assume the presidency of this great Union - your Union. I do not take lightly the trust thousands of members have placed in me. Before I proceed further, let me express my sincere gratitude for the support given me by members throughout our Union, by placing their trust in me in leading your Union for the coming years. For the next three years I will do my utmost to entrust, to represent you and to have this Union stand strong and proud. The next three years will not be about me, but will be about the women and men that make up this great Union. It will be about issues that affect your workplaces, your working conditions, the services you deliver and the products you make for the people of this Province. Each and every day thousands of NAPE members go to work providing vital public services and creating world class products right here in Newfoundland and Labrador. This Province works because we work. Despite this fact, many know of the work that you do, the migrate of services that you provide. To help combat this, we will be talking about and educating the public and even the politicians as to what public sector employees do and the value of your work. We will talk about our Conservation Officers who are responsible for the protection and enhancing of our environment, fish and wildlife for future generations. We will talk about our Highway Enforcement and our Maintenance and Operation workers who ensure that our highways and roads are safe for the traveling public. About Laboratory and X-Ray - our members who provide diagnostic services allowing other health professionals to do their work. LPNs and PCAs who provide high quality care in the long term and acute care facilities. We will talk about Social Workers, our Home Care workers who protect the public and provide invaluable care and support our Province's most vulnerable. Correctional Officers who protect the public from incarcerated criminals and help provide an environment of rehabilitation for offenders. We will talk about Home Care workers allowing seniors and youth alike to live with dignity in their own homes, in their own communities. We will talk about our Student Assistants, our Faculty, our Support Staff, our School Board employees who are responsible for supporting and nurturing our most precious resource, our children and our youth. And of course, we will talk about the NLC employees. Well, just say, our Province thanks you, I thank you and certainly the delegates thank you for last night, thank you.

My sisters and brothers, these are but a few of the many classifications this great Union represents; invaluable employees and services that we represent. If you take away any one of these groups, our communities are less safe, our economy is weakened and the people of our Province will suffer. Make no mistake. We will make it a priority and ensure that not only are the public aware of the crucial work that you do, but the Union will stand united against any attacks on public services. We will promote our members of NAPE locally made products. Employees who work at companies such as Purity, Pepsi, Country Ribbon, Labatts, to name but a few. We will remind the public that if you buy locally produced products, they are supporting local workers in these

industries, their families, the local economy and good local jobs. We are a proud Province and proud people. We can tap into sediments to promote the locally made products that our members make right here in Newfoundland and Labrador. Our Union will also stand for those without a Union voice and speak out on issues that affect our communities, from Nain, Labrador, to Port aux Basques to St. John's and all communities in between. When issues arise that affect our Province or members' services that we provide, NAPE will be there fighting the good fight.

There is strength in our Union, but we are only as strong as our collective will to stand together. That's what the labour movement is all about. It is incumbent on us over the next few days to learn from one another, to plan for the road ahead that Brother Blundon alluded to. We are into a difficult time in the coming months and years, and to leave this Convention stronger and more united than ever before.

When I announced that I will be seeking the presidency of our Union, I committed to ensuring NAPE is your Union. Over the past few months I have worked hard to keep that commitment and is one that I will continue to keep in the coming months and year ahead. This is not a cliché for me. I want to have members not only belong to this Union, but truly feel they are part of this Union. How do we do that? Well, we've already begun. Upon taking office it was important for me to hit the ground running. With the help of NAPE Staff, the Board of Directors, the Secretary/Treasurer, and rank and file members, we took stock of where we were, where we needed to be in the short, the medium and the long terms, and we began to tackle the most important issues that were time sensitive. The Board of Directors, Staff and I rolled up our sleeves and got down to the task at hand. Consultations began immediately with Component Board Members which resulted in the confirmation of Component Convention dates thereby allowing Staff to book hotels and put out Convention calls. I am proud to say that for the first time in our history, two of our Component Conventions will be held outside of St. John's, both being held in Gander, which are two of our larger Components in this Union. A formal Biennial Convention Committee was struck immediately to again lay the groundwork for a successful Convention. I would like to thank the members of that Committee for their efforts. You will see their tremendous work firsthand before you over the coming days.

On the negotiating front, we have worked hard to complete all outstanding sets of negotiations. While all negotiations are important to this Union, the one that stands out for me in recent months are those of Home Care workers. Home Care workers play a vital role in this Province, in this health care system, providing care and support to some of the Province's most vulnerable. Home Care workers allow both young and seniors alike to live in their own homes, to live in their own communities while reducing the stress, the strain, the financial burden on the health care system. In this round of negotiations NAPE was very clear. Those workers should be treated with dignity and respect that comes with the role and the responsibility they carry. After several months and a long set of negotiations, we finally reached a deal with the Group of 17, as we refer to them, in September representing over 3,000 Home Care workers alone. This deal provides a big step forward for Home and Youth Care workers in getting fair pay and recognition and benefits for the work that they do. We have since reached a deal with several other Home Care Agencies and only a few remain at this point in time. I want to say a thank you to the Negotiating Teams for their commitment, determination, patience and resolve. I want to say a thank you to the Negotiators that led those negotiations, and I want to say a thank you to Brother Bert Blundon who was instrumental in helping attain those deals. Because of your efforts, Home and Youth Care workers, today and into the future, will receive compensation they deserve for the vital services they provide.

A key plank in my campaign and the commitment that I made to members of this Union was to improve the overall communications strategy of NAPE. In this day of age, communications is an integral part of any successful organization, especially an organization as large and vast as ours.

Providing members, Shop Stewards, Local Officers, the media, the Government, and the public at large with timely and important information and updates about the Union is crucial to achieving our goals as a successful Union that stands up for its members. I am happy to report that a formal communications strategy has been created, approved and implemented. There has been considerable movement on the communications front, but let me assure you, we are not done yet. NAPE is now connecting with members via social media, which we had not been doing. More and more of our members are depending on social media to receive and share information about their workplace. Having a Facebook page provides another way for us to interact with members, but more importantly, for members to interact with us. It allows us to provide important information and updates about NAPE members with our membership. It also means members across the Province can more easily communicate with one another and provide feedback to their Union which is most critical. Also, NAPE launched a Facebook specifically for Home Care. These workers, as you have to understand, have no fixed workplace. They are disconnected from one another and because of this, and in some ways, disconnected from their Union. We felt that creating this Page specifically for this group would be beneficial in terms of communicating with them and for them to be able to communicate with each other. We have also made a concerted effort to improve communications with front line activists of NAPE, our Local Officers and Shop Stewards. Frequent updates, memos and alerts are sent to those members via an email list on a regular basis. This has proven to be an effective tool in communicating with a group in a timely and effective manner. Ensuring a message gets to Government, Employers and the public requires significant media and public relations. In recent months, we have been front and centre. Let me assure you, and let me assure those out there, that I will not take a backseat to anyone when it comes to speaking out whenever, wherever, on behalf of our members, our Union and the public services we provide. In just the past few months I have conducted some 75 media interviews, speaking issues, budget cuts, attrition plans, privatization, red alerts, staffing shortages, highways and many others. We will work to ensure our Union is constantly in the public eye talking about issues that are most important to you and your loved ones. Let me assure you that we will have no fear in being front and centre advocating on behalf of our members.

Another area that we will be focusing on in the coming weeks and months is education. Old adage rings true - Knowledge is power. We cannot be fearful of sharing information and informing our members and educating our Local leaders. A strong Union has education as its backbone to ensure that its members are able to share information, analyze situations, develop their skills, gain new insight and knowledge and organize for action effectively. I think we can. We must do better on this front. Not only do we need to educate our front line activists, our Shop Stewards and Local Officers, we need to do a much better job in educating and empowering our general membership about their rights, their benefits of Unionization and what their Union is doing for them. We have begun this work, and you will see improvements on education and training early starting in the new year.

One significant issue that has raised its ugly head in recent months is a threat of further privatization of public services. Of particular importance, the Government announced they will be moving to a public private partnership commonly referred to as P-3 Model for Long Term Care. This is nothing short of an attack on the overall public health care system and on public sector workers that currently provide this vital service. I have a message for this Government and for any future Government. NAPE will fight them to its fullest ability on this and any future plans of privatization. My sisters and brothers, we will stand together within our Union and we will stand with our sister Unions to push back against this agenda. An agenda championed by employer groups who stand to make huge profits from this P-3 Model. NAPE believes, its members believe, the care of those who contributed to this Province should not be placed in the hands of those who put profit before people. Not today, not tomorrow, not at any point in the future. This is not NAPE saying this won't work. This Model diminishes levels of care and costs more. Listen to what others have had to say

and it's not NAPE that's saying this. First of all, a quote from March 10, 2015 from The Independent - "30 years of research has revealed that the private sector is all too often in fact clumsy, greedy, inefficient and wasteful, especially when it comes to providing public services and infrastructure. Moreover without the firm supervision of Government it offers poor and sometimes dangerous services while lining the pockets of a few greedy business people". We go then to the Auditor General of Ontario who released a damning report last year of some 74 public private partnerships in that Province. He determined that it cost \$8 billion more than if it was done by the public sector as it was originally done. We then go to BC, the Auditor General there confirmed that a project was done on time, but it cost 29% more or \$28 million more. The Parkland Institute and the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives conducted a study just last year. It compared Saskatchewan's publicly run liquor system with Alberta's private sector system. And once again, the public system came out on top. More choice, less cost and better outcomes. Again, let me assure you that we will fight this Government and any future Government if they continue to foolishly walk down this path and we have one clear, simple message - Public services are not for sale.

While the threat of privatizing public services in long term care has been in the limelight in the recording period, NAPE has also fought back against the privatization in other agendas. Here is one example. If you recall, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business did this poll of their own membership, a group of about 114, made up of small and medium sized business owners, to argue for the privatization of Liquor Stores in the Province. We are hopeful that the current Government and the Opposition parties see through this ploy for what it really is - an attempt to transfer public funds into the pockets of private employers. Experience in other parts of the Country has shown that privatization has led to lower Government revenues, higher prices for the public and increased social harm. Now, it's no surprise that the CFIB is lobbying the Government to privatize Liquor Stores as they are the ones who reap the profit. One of the biggest issues however is on the other side of the equation, the loss of revenue to the Province coffers. In the last five years alone, the Province has realized \$700 million from the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation. These funds are used in such important services as education and health care that the people of this Province depend on every day. Why would Government even consider with the facts that are again available. Again, not facts that NAPE are putting out there. These are facts from other jurisdictions. Alberta has given up \$1.5 billion in tax revenue despite a per capita increase in alcohol consumption. A revenue in Alberta, BC and Saskatchewan found prices increased in two privatized Provinces of BC and Alberta, but did not increase where the public Liquor Stores remain. Research also shows privatization of Liquor Stores has a profound social and public health consequences. Let me assure you again, our Union will do everything in its power to confront such self-centered, profit driven groups such as the CFIB. If they think the NLC is an area for privatization, they are sadly mistaken. Again, my sisters and brothers, you will see NAPE at the forefront fighting privatization of these established public services. NAPE will continue to fight the privatization agenda and let me be crystal clear to Government and those aspiring to form Government - if privatization of public services is in your plans, your best bet is to reconsider because we will be there to fight you every step of the way.

My sisters and brothers, this Convention takes place in a pivotal time in our history, at a time when we are just five weeks before a Provincial election. We have representatives from every bargaining unit, most workplaces, most communities throughout Newfoundland and Labrador, and we have all come together just five weeks before we determine the next Government. We thought we would be innovative and not only present you with great information about privatization from such great speakers as James Clancy, the President of our National Union, or from Diana Gibson from the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, but we would do something not done before. You will be given the firsthand opportunity to hear directly from the Leaders of the New Democratic Party, the Liberals and indeed the Premier himself. All three will be addressing the delegates to this

Convention. Each will be given a time to speak to you, then each will be asked the same four specific questions on matters that matter most to the members of our Union - the economy, health care, privatization and child care. Their answers will be a matter of record, heard by each and every one of you in this room. What we want you to do is take the information that you hear, the information that you learn over the next few days, go back to your workplaces, discuss it with your co-workers and help them make an informed decision in just five weeks time.

Let me turn to the next issue on the minds of many of our members - the expiry of the Collective Agreements in the public sector affecting some 12,000 of our members. In less than six months contracts that expire on behalf of the groups include, School Boards, Student Assistants, Health Professionals, Laboratory and X-Ray, Faculty, Marine Services, Air Services - this is just a list of a few that will expire. Let me assure the members, this is something that we take most seriously - and internal processes have commenced, with some Component Conventions already occurring and more to conclude after Christmas. Negotiators, for the most part, are assigned to their applicable collective bargaining and once all negotiating teams are elected by their peers, we will arrange a joint session to discuss and attain each bargaining unit's priorities. Prior to and during bargaining, negotiating teams will be effectively communicated with, as will membership, to the degree that we possibly can. Negotiating teams elected, the Board of Directors, the Staff will be kept fully informed. This will be a united team effort, because as Brother Blundon alluded to, we are going into a very difficult round of bargaining. Our message for Government whenever that may be, and for the Employers that will be involved in upcoming public sector negotiations, NAPE will come to the bargaining table fairly. We will come respectfully. We will come collaboratively. But we will not come to the table with our benefits and rights that we've fought for decades to attain up for the taking. That is not on.

Not to take from Brother Blundon's address tomorrow, because he will give you great detail on where we stand and the great shape we are in fiscally, but we're in the best financial position that NAPE has been in for decades and we will not hesitate to use the resources and support to defend our members. We will do everything in our power to avoid getting to that point, but we will need the Provincial Government to come to the bargaining table with the same resolve that we have at the bargaining table. Let me assure you, I have no fear in supporting members of each and every bargaining unit on any decision they make for it is theirs to make in each bargaining unit.

Let me take a minute before I conclude to talk about the next three years. It's the mandate that myself and Brother Blundon share which we are really in the beginning of. I campaigned on and committed change. I referenced communications which we are already on the way to enhancing. I've talked about the need for advanced education tools that will support our Local activists in ensuring members are represented to one's fullest abilities. That's the next area that we will focus on. Servicing has to be one of our priorities and discussions have started with our Staff in this area on which we must place greater emphasis. This is an area that reflects greatly on our Union. We will be ascertaining from the public its opinion of NAPE and the services we provide. We will do a complete member census in the coming months. Every member will be given an opportunity to provide feedback and have input into a comprehensive survey. From this initial census, we will have a good yardstick to measure where we go in the coming year or two. We want to hear from you. I want to hear from you.

Beginning in the new year, as I committed, you will see me in your workplaces and in your communities. I want to talk directly with members, in their workplaces, in their home towns. I want to not only be seen, but I want to hear from the members who make up this great Union. I want members to see and feel the strength of this Union and to be proud of the Union they are part of. As the world changes around us and moves forward, we too must adapt and change to ensure our members are getting the services, protection and advocacy that they need and they deserve. I am

committed to change, but change for the sake of change does not get us anywhere. The change required will not be from the top down. We will consult with and solicit feedback for members to ensure that we are always heading in the right direction. My sisters and brothers, the work of NAPE is not done by the President and Secretary/Treasurer only, it is a collaborative effort of so many. It's our Local representatives, you are the backbone of this Union. It's our Board of Directors that you will elect at the Component Conventions and this Convention to lead this great Union for the next period of time. It's the Staff that we have in place that service the members right across the Province, and it's the members that make us what we are - a strong and powerful agent for change in our Province. Our collective strength must be used to protect and enhance benefits, make our workplaces safer, fuel our economy, strengthen our communities, and ensure a brighter future for our children. Sometimes we need to take a step back and realize that the workplaces and the workplace standards, the pay and benefits that we enjoy today, are because of the work of countless trade Unionists who came before us, the sacrifices they made, not only for themselves and their families, but for the future generations of workers, for us. We stand on the shoulders of giants. We owe it to them to honour their tireless efforts by continually pushing the agenda forward, to ensure that the workplaces and the world that we leave behind is better than the one we inherited. That is our task. This is a great responsibility that we have been entrusted with. The challenge is great. The road ahead as we said is going to be difficult, but sisters and brothers, I have no doubt that united and strong we will succeed.

I want to thank you for your time, your energy, your determination, your strength, and your commitment to your Union, and most importantly to each other. Let us all work together to have a great Convention. Solidarity sisters and brothers and thank you very much.

#### CHRISTIAN CHILDREN'S FUND OF CANADA

J. Earle stated my sisters and brothers back in 2011 the 19<sup>th</sup> Biennial Convention made a decision to sponsor the Christian Children's Fund of Canada. I want to provide you with an update as to where this stands today. Today NAPE continues to sponsor two children via the fund. For just \$1.25 per day, NAPE is able to provide the services you see listed, for example - school fees, school supplies, after school activities, and such. One of our sponsors lives in Nicaragua, currently 12 years old. This information is provided to us. Favorite school subject is Math. Wants to be a Police Officer when he grows up. This funding also provides funding for school uniforms, access to primary health care and other supports that are most critical to these children. On the screen before you now, this is actually a letter that NAPE most recently received from one of our sponsors. These are some pictures that will span from 2010 to 2015. You can see from the support that you've given how this child has progressed. And with your support, great news - this child now no longer needs our support and we will now be moving this support to another child.

Our other sponsored child lives in Ethiopia, is 9 years old. Again, the favorite school subject is Math and wants to be a teacher when she grows up. Funding provides school supplies, and the same benefits to this child. Again, you will see the pictures of this child progressing from 2011 to 2015.

Another one of our sponsored children also lives in Nicaragua. This child is 5 years old and loves to draw and do crafts. Lives in sub-standard housing and again the funding provides education, access to primary health care and training. This funding is so vital for these children. You will see a picture from 2013 and current.

This is truly a labour of love for us and we will continue doing this. This is something that we do in communities, not just in Newfoundland and Labrador, but for other parts of the World. This is something we need to do as a Union, to step up to the plate and help out where we can.

Point of Information - W. Thompson (BofD) stated the NAPE Privatization Committee got a questionnaire on the table in front of every delegate and we would like for you to fill it out and put it in a box that will be provided in the lobby. Out of that box we will be drawing a name for a prize.

### DAFFODIL PLACE

J. Earle stated continuing on that theme, in relation to Daffodil Place, a local project right here in Newfoundland and Labrador. A few months ago NAPE was approached by a close friend of the labour movement, former NLFL President Reg Anstey, about a potential charitable opportunity. Shortly thereafter, Brother Anstey gave a presentation to your Board of Directors about coming a high level donor for cancer near and dear to his heart - Daffodil Place. The Board was in unanimous agreement. NAPE would step up to the plate and help support this worthwhile cause. For those who aren't aware, Daffodil Place is a 20-room facility here in St. John's, operated by the Canadian Cancer Society - Newfoundland and Labrador Division - for cancer patients and caregivers who must travel to St. John's to receive cancer treatment. I don't think there is a person in this room, in our entire Union, in our Province, or beyond who hasn't been touched by cancer in some way. We are hopeful that our donation will assist the Canadian Cancer Society and Daffodil Place in helping to ease the burden of those visiting St. John's fighting this dreadful disease. It is a small gesture but every bit counts. Today I would like to welcome Al Pelley, Vice President of Philanthropy with the Canadian Cancer Society, and on behalf of our Union, I would like to present Mr. Pelley with a cheque in the amount of \$25,000 on behalf of NAPE.

A. Pelley stated thank you Jerry and thank you members of NAPE. Reg Anstey came up with a slogan that has been used many times - Daffodil Place is the only facility that was ever built inside the overpass for people living outside the overpass - and it's so true. Going through a journey with cancer is probably the most difficult journey that one will go through in their lifetime and the Canadian Cancer Society, part of our mission, is to enhance the quality of life for people living with cancer. Daffodil Place is a very important part of that mission. Since we opened our doors in 2009 over 4,000 people from 368 communities in Newfoundland and Labrador have stayed at Daffodil Place. Today we are currently at full capacity and throughout the year we operated at about 93% capacity. So the need is great. This year alone in this Province 3,500 will have been diagnosed with cancer, many of whom will turn to us for help as they go through their cancer journey. Daffodil Place is a facility that offers affordable accommodations and a homelike atmosphere that is so important to someone who is going through a cancer journey. We provide all of the amenities of home while they stay with us so that they can focus on getting well and we get a lot of feedback from people who have stayed there, that they have never stayed anywhere as close to home as they have at Daffodil Place. This is not my first Biennial Convention. Back in 1974/75 I was a proud member of NAPE Local 6205 - Janeway Hospital and I've attended many of these Conventions. So I know firsthand the tremendous work and the important work that you do for the people of our Province and as a citizen of our Province, I just want to say thank you for making our Province a better place to live through the work that you do and for cancer patients through this generous donation that you've made today. It is truly appreciated. Thank you so much and I wish you every success with your Convention and the future that you have ahead of you with I'm sure is going to be some difficult negotiations, but I think you will get through it just fine. Thank you so much.

J. Lacey (BofD) stated as somebody who actually works in the field, Monday to Friday, I spend my eight hours literally in the Cancer Centre, and to watch those patients, particularly those out over the overpass, and to see the comfort in their eyes and the struggle that they have being away from their families, but knowing that they actually have a room to go back to, a place to lay their head, and more important, to be able to congregate and lean on the shoulders of others who are sharing the same journey and experience and the ability to lie down at night knowing that when you wake

up the following day there will be a breakfast and those same people will be there and essentially will become your second family, to have that support and mechanism in place is invaluable and I'm sure I speak for every one of those patients/clients and members of our general public, and on behalf of them I am sure they would say thank you to NAPE and every member here, it's undoubtedly, there are no words that can express and to Reg and AI and all those people who are involved to do what they do. Thank you so graciously and it's a moment that we should all be proud of. Thank you.

Point of Order - T. Kelly (7104) stated could the Chair make sure that speakers note their Locals when they speak.

### NAPE VOLUNTEER RECOGNITION AWARDS

J. Earle stated my sisters and brothers, I touched earlier on the importance that Local activists have to this Union. Well earlier this year during Volunteer Week NAPE sent out an email, posted a simple message thanking NAPE members, particularly the front line activists, for the work they do for their Union, for their volunteer efforts. The response was incredible. This got us to thinking. Everyday in workplaces and communities across this Province, NAPE members are not only providing valuable services and goods to the people of this Province, they are giving back to their fellow workers and communities via volunteerism. It is the volunteer members on the front line of the Union movement, like you here today, who make or break this Union. We are the first line of defense of working men and working women across this Province. You embody the values of this Union each and every day giving freely of your time to improve the lives and working conditions of others around you. Make no mistake. Your efforts to improve the lives of your fellow brothers and sisters by protecting their rights, enforcing their Collective Agreements, and ensuring our workplaces are safer and more equitable. Every day NAPE members like you step forward for their fellow Union members. They step up for their communities. They step up for causes and organizations that depend on their time and energy to do the most important work that they are tasked in completing. We want to recognize the indelible mark that NAPE members are making through their volunteer work. Today, I am pleased to launch the 1<sup>st</sup> Annual NAPE Step-Up Awards. Each year a maximum of 10 awards will be presented, one for each NAPE activist and one for community volunteer, in each of the five geographical regions - St. John's Metro, Eastern, Central, Western and Labrador. The awards are broken down into two categories - the NAPE Activist Step-Up Awards will be given to those NAPE members who embody and exemplify the spirit and goals of the Union through their Union volunteerism. The NAPE Community Step-Up Awards recognize the exceptional contributions of NAPE members for their volunteer work in the community. The Step-Up Awards will be open starting the end of this Convention. The nomination deadline will be February 19, 2016. Winners will be selected by a sub-committee of your NAPE Board of Directors. The winners will be presented during a special event during Volunteer Week of 2016. Winners names will be displayed at NAPE head office. Winners will also receive a plaque and a distinguished lapel pin. NAPE will also make a donation to an organization or charity of the winners choosing. Nomination packages will be available on our website following the Convention. Posters and promotions will be available and sent out in the coming days. We know volunteers aren't in this for fame or glory but we felt it's important to recognize the amazing efforts of NAPE members right across this great Province of ours and their efforts.

As I said earlier, NAPE members do so much in the communities. Our activists do so much for our members. We cannot function without the volunteer network that we have across this great Union and that includes your Board of Directors, which are like yourselves, all volunteers members. We thought it would be a time for us to recognize what people do across this Province and allow their peers to nominate them for their recognition. This is something that we will be starting to do, something that we are proud to do and something that will give some recognition back for what

NAPE activists do for their Union and for their communities to let the people know just what we do in the various communities across this Province and the various workplaces. You will see the notices go up. These will be available for you to take back to your workplaces and the information will be on our website, on our Facebook page, and will be accessible to our members right across this Province.

### BREAK

The Convention broke at 10:25 a.m. and reconvened at 10:40 a.m.

B. Blundon assumed the Chair.

B. Blundon stated delegates, we have a slight change in our agenda. You will notice that we were expecting greetings from our President of the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Labour, Sister Mary Shortall. Unfortunately, Sister Shortall's mother is gravely ill and at the last minute, she had to cancel this engagement. I'm sure all of our prayers go to her as she is dealing with this. However, Sister Shortall did have a prepared speech and asked if we could have our General Vice President deliver her speech on her behalf. Most of you may know Sister Arlene Sedlickas. She has been around the labour movement for a long time. She is NAPE's General Vice President and has been for a number of terms, but she also sits as the General Vice President elected a number of times by her peers by the broader labour movement as the General Vice President for the Federation of Labour. She is obviously active in the women's movement, a feminist, a true trade Unionist. She has served on many negotiating teams. It is my pleasure to introduce our own Sister Arlene Sedlickas.

### GREETINGS - MARY SHORTALL, PRESIDENT - NLFL

A. Sedlickas read the speech prepared by Mary Shortall, President of the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Labour.

Good morning sisters and brothers. I want to thank your President Brother Jerry Earle, and your Executive for adding me to your agenda to bring greetings, and tell you what your Federation of Labour has been up to. I also have to thank them for always being available to assist the Federation of Labour in its work. No matter what I ask of them, (and I ask a lot) they are always there. In fact, Brother Bert Blundon also serves as our Secretary-treasurer, and without his support and assistance, the work of the Fed would not be complete. Bert, and our executive VP Arlene Sedlickas, and Affiliate VP Earl Hann, along with the rest of the Executive Committee, make that the issues which our 65,000 members feel are important, get addressed and carried out between our conventions. NAPE is a huge part of those 65,000 and they are great representatives for you.

One of the best parts of being the President of the Federation of Labour is when I get to stand before you at your convention and tell you how proud I am of our movement and the huge part that you play in it – as NAPE members and leaders, as NLFL board members, committee members, Labour council executive members and delegates, social justice activists, political activists – no matter where my work takes me – I find NAPE members there. I wanted to take the time to say thank you so much for your work. Not just your Union work, but everything you do every day; which makes a huge difference. Those of you who work in the private sector – your labour, and only your labour, is what creates profit that gets put back into our economy which benefits all of us. For those of you in the public sector – you provide services which keep us healthy, and educated, and look after our most vulnerable citizens. You also make our economy and our society work – and NAPE members take such pride in doing that. I am seeing that first hand right now. The reason I cannot be with you this morning is because my mom has cancer and is in palliative care at home,

and we are with her now. Her last days will be peaceful and dignified – largely because of the care and compassion of NAPE members and other health care workers who have been caring for her. At every level of her care, NAPE members have made this journey the most decent and most comfortable that anyone could wish for. And you have made it a whole lot less scary for us. Thank you so much! When the palliative care folks visited her the other day – she thanked them for their “great service” as she put it. Yesterday morning – she said “I am so lucky to have been so well looked after”. I think that was right after she rolled her eyes at my sister and me for not being able to turn her as well as the trained folks! So from a labour perspective, and from an activist perspective, and most importantly from a personal perspective – thanks so much not just for looking after Mom, but for making our world a better place for all of us.

NAPE is like many of the other Unions that are part of the Federation of Labour – a Social Union. Social Unionism means we understand that bargaining good collective agreements is a very important part of what Unions do. But as you know – the best collective agreements in the world can be wiped out by one stroke of a legislator’s pen. We’ve seen it happen. Governments can make laws and policies that impact our lives and our communities. That means that Unions play an important role outside of collective bargaining as well. What happens after work hours to you is just as important. We have an obligation to be political. We have no choice. That’s why we spend a lot of time talking to Government about laws and policies that benefit workers. We present briefs and submissions on a whole host of issues from fracking, to family violence, to the importance of public education, to statutory reviews of Workers Compensation, Health and safety and labour legislation, labour market and employment issues, and more. And let me tell you - It’s a lot easier when those people we talk to in Government support workers’ issues. And quite frankly, that has not been the case. Every thing we have ever achieved as Unions has been won through struggle. Everything! Federally, we have seen how the Harper Government tried for the past 10 years to destroy Unions and other like minded organizations. His vision of Canada was one that catered to the rich and corporate interests – at the expense of working people in Canada. And the people responded. It was very clear from Monday night’s election results that people no longer trusted or wanted Stephen Harper and the Conservatives in power. So no matter what else – we need to celebrate the end of Harper. How good is that? We heaved Steve big time! I am so very glad that the Harper Government has been given their walking papers - many many Canadians made that abundantly clear. Good riddance to a Government who disrespected their electorate in such an arrogant way.

I have to say though that my heart breaks for my comrades in the NDP like Jack Harris and Ryan Cleary among others who failed to keep their seats. They stood by workers in their strikes, and campaigns – they were great spokespersons in Ottawa on our behalf. They were great constituency politicians and we will miss them dearly. I think that people wanted rid of Harper so badly that they felt safer supporting the Liberals who had surged in the polls in the last few weeks of this long campaign. I wish we had been able to convince more people that the NDP could easily represent a better world for all. After all – they are the party that was born from the labour movement and the party who has always supported labour’s issues. We have not always faired well under the Liberals either. Cuts to health care, EI and Veterans began under Liberal Governments. The proof will be in the pudding I guess for this new Government – and in the ongoing political work of Unions and others. We will encourage the NDP opposition to work with the Liberals and to hold the new Liberal Government accountable to the workers and their families that they have promised to look after. They campaigned on many of the issues we have been lobbying for – so it’s important that we follow up on this, and keep their feet to the fire – bringing the retirement age back to 65, stopping the EI cuts, as well as the cuts to door-to-door delivery at Canada Post, enhancing CPP and GIS. Expanding training and apprenticeship opportunities to help Canadians – particularly young Canadians – find and keep good jobs. Immediately launching a national public inquiry into missing

and murdered indigenous women. Significantly increasing infrastructure funding, reinvesting in health care, and important to us - repealing the Conservatives' anti-labour bills (C-377 and C-525??)

The personal is political and politics is part of everything we do. We will not stop our desire and our fight to bring equality and fairness to all. Thanks to all the sisters and brothers who worked so hard over the past several months in so many ways during this very very very long federal election campaign.

And here we go – in a week or so, the writ will be dropped for the provincial election which we know happens on November 30. We need to be involved. We have no choice really. We have a great opportunity to make a real difference provincially too. At the Fed, we have already begun working really hard already on how we are going to talk to our members about making an informed decision at the ballot box about those issues that really matter to us and our families. We have a committee in place from among our affiliates, including NAPE of course, that is putting together information on 4 issues – public services, education, health care and the economy. We are going to produce leaflets and electronic post cards which talk about why these issues are important for us and ask you to the candidates where they stand on those issues. Then we'll let you know what each party's position is on those issues. That way you can vote for the candidate and the Party that best represents your issues. The records also speak for themselves. This Government under Paul Davis has clearly cow-towed to the employers. They have already cut our public sector twice, and is now hell bent on privatizing long term care and other public services. I am honoured to be in a place where I can continue to work with you publically and politically in whatever way I can to ensure that our public services stay public and that Governments and other decision makers in our society keep their hands off our public services. They are not for sale. This Government does not have a mandate to privatize or in any other way interfere with our public services. You have been very clear about that. There is no mistake that this Government understands where the labour movement is on this issue. This is a battle we will continue to wage until we are successful. Any politician who supports the putting people before profit by privatizing the services that our public holds dear does not deserve to be elected. Any candidate who refuses to clearly articulate their opposition to privatization, public-private-partnerships, or the cutting of public services does not deserve to be elected. And we have the power to ensure they aren't.

We are reminded that this Government, along with the Liberals, voted against minimum wage increases and against card based certification – which makes it harder for workers to join a Union. The only Party who has consistently stood up for workers and their Unions has been the New Democratic Party. You will hear from the NL NDP leader, brother Earle McCurdy during your convention. They have candidates running in this election who come from our very own rank and file – like Brother Bert Blundon, and others. They are workers and they understand workers issues. Can you imagine Bert in the House of Assembly? He will be an amazing member. He will do us proud just like Earle and the other wonderful candidates who support labour and our issues. We need to ask the questions, see where each party stands and make our vote count on November 30. We have the power to make change happen. When Union members speak up, and act up – we make the world a better place for all workers.

You have had a very busy two years. Your Union has grown because people understand the benefits of belonging to a Union like NAPE. You have supported your Union through tough discussions around pensions, through bad budgets and attacks on public services. You are committed to your Union, and to Union education, to women's issues, human rights issues, and political action. I recently attended your women's conference, and I was so honoured and humbled to receive the Athena award. There were so many sisters at the conference who give so much to our movement. And just like at your school this year – there were an amazing number of first time participants – a sign of your strength as a Union now and heading into the future. Well done!!!! You

understand so well that the bookends of a strong Union are organizing and education. I am looking forward to seeing many of you at our Health and Safety convention next month as we discuss how we can work together to ensure employers always put workers health and safety before costs and profits. NAPE members participate in the broader labour movement at every level. As you head into negotiations I know your strength and solidarity will ensure that your Union will achieve the collective bargaining gains that you deserve. The Federation of Labour is proud to support you in whatever way we can. And I thank you for your solidarity and support as well. Good luck with your deliberations over the next few days.

J. Earle assumed the Chair.

J. Earle stated thank you Sister Sedlickas. It's difficult enough to deliver a speech, let alone deliver someone else's speech.

My sisters and brothers, as I indicated during my speech, you will have an opportunity to hear from two Party Leaders and the Premier. It is indeed my pleasure to welcome Brother Earle McCurdy to our Convention. As I indicated, Brother McCurdy will have twenty minutes for remarks followed by four questions with a five minute response time for each question. Earle is a former President of the Fish Food and Allied Workers' Union - Unifor. Prior to that Earle was the Union's Secretary/Treasurer and was also an Executive member with the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Labour. Earle was elected as Leader of the Newfoundland and Labrador New Democratic Party just this past March. Earle grew up in St. John's and attended Prince of Wales College. He is a graduate of Memorial University of NL where he obtained a Bachelor Degree of Arts in 1972 and worked as a reporter for the St. John's Evening Telegram in the 1970's covering the labour beat before becoming involved with the Fisherman's Union. Earle is running in the Provincial District of St. John's West in the upcoming provincial election. Please join me in welcoming, and I'm proud to say, Brother Earle McCurdy.

#### EARLE MCCURDY, LEADER - NL NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Thanks very much everybody. I really appreciate the opportunity to be here. My name is Earle McCurdy and I'm running to be the next Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador. I want to start that I've been speaking to a lot of different groups, including some that I thought I would never darken the door of - the Chamber of Commerce, service clubs, and you name it, but man is it ever grand to be back speaking to a group of trade Union activists! I'm proud of my background in the trade Union movement that I bring to my attempt to seek the top office in this Province. I think we need people with trade Union backgrounds to understand what it's like for people who get up in the morning and work hard for a living trying to keep things together. You need more of that! Government is not something for the elite; Government should be something to represent a cross section of people in our Province. I will touch briefly on this later on about our team who do just that.

I would like to congratulate NAPE on the tremendous role you play in public life in this Province. Newfoundland and Labrador is a better place because NAPE is here. I would like to particularly congratulate Jerry on his election as President of NAPE. I know only too well that it's a tough job but it has to be done and I admire anyone who stands up and says count me in, I'm there to do it. Good luck with your relatively new duties. I think you're off to a great start and I'm sure with the support of these people in the room that you will continue. I was delighted to eventually convince Bert Blundon to join our team of candidates. I'm kind of looking forward to seeing what kind of new shoes Bert will get when he delivers his first budget. I would also like to acknowledge Mary Shortall. I know she has been going through a real struggle with her mom and I wish her and her family all the best in the difficult times they are going through.

I come here from a position of having a deep rooted respect for people who haul on their work boots or their uniform or whatever clothing they wear, and go to work, day in and day out, and do the hard often unglamorous work that makes our economy tick. We need those people and those people need to be represented in the corridors of power. I am going to talk in the course of my few minutes of the Federal election, about our Party's values, about issues going into the Provincial election, about the value of the public sector, about our aging population, about the need to provide opportunities for youth, and about the link between the X you mark on a ballot and your job and your livelihood. Because it's very easy to lose track of that. Speaking about ballot boxes, the other day I voted in the Advanced Poll and just to be clear I voted for Ryan Cleary, when I walked in there was no other voters in the room only two or three Returning Officers, and one of them said hello Mr. McCurdy, how are you getting on?, and I said just fine thanks. He said lovely day isn't it, now Sir, I'm going to need a photo ID. The rest of the election didn't go quite as well as certainly I had hoped and certainly others had hoped. There was a disappointing result in Jack Harris and Ryan Cleary, we lost two very strong MPs who represented our Province with distinction and stood up to speak for working class people in our Province in the debates in the House of Commons. I would have much preferred to see a minority Government than the majority Government that transpired. Having said that, there is a new expression that we can now use that I don't think we can ever overuse - Former Prime Minister Stephen Harper! Because Canadians have had enough of his mean spirited divisiveness, and unfortunately, so many Canadians were so determined to get rid of him at whatever cost that we ended up with a kind of reverse result like losing a Jack Harris or losing a Meghan Leslie, or losing some outstanding MPs that really deserve to be re-elected because they did an outstanding job. But sometimes in politics, the outcome isn't fair. We shouldn't forget the Federal level. I am absolutely glad there is a change, and I sincerely hope that the new Government governs well and fairly. Having said that, we shouldn't forget that it was the Federal Liberals that absolutely dismantled the Unemployment Insurance Program. They used, as a reason for doing so, I remember very well 20 years ago, Lloyd Axworthy was the Minister, but Jean Chretien was the Prime Minister and Paul Martin the Minister of Finance, and they clashed the program on the grounds that we were in deficit and we had to get out of deficit. Several years later we had a healthy surplus and they brought in, they didn't reinstate the cuts in the UI program which would be the logical thing to do, they brought in \$100 billion worth of corporate tax cuts, and that resulted in what the Governor of the Bank of Canada, because the argument was, you give them tax cuts and they will invest in the economy and create jobs. It didn't work that way. You know what they did with the money? Put it in their pocket. The Governor of the Bank of Canada called it dead money. Something like \$600 billion worth. So you give them tax cuts, they shove it in their pocket and meanwhile laid off workers have to do with less. We've got to put the Federal Liberals under close scrutiny. One of the problems with the outcome, the absolute sweep of Liberals in Atlantic Canada. The question I would pose is who is going to get up and challenge Government and push Government to do better on behalf of the people of Atlantic Canada. The answer in the House of Commons is nobody. The only conclusion I can draw from that is that we better get a Provincial Government that will stand up to the Federal Government, will push them, not go looking for a fight, looking for a fair deal, but will push them as and when necessary to make sure we get that fair deal.

Fundamentally, the Provincial election will be about provincial issues. Who has the best plan to lead the Province, manage the economy, the best platform, the best leader, and so on. I have some modest comments to make in that regard. I'll start with some general observations. We need to approach our challenges with optimism. Gloom and doom is not fertile ground for good decision making. We can't shrink our way out of financial difficulties. We need to build on our strengths, our natural resources, and our people and our environment. Too often what we do with public policy is address symptoms without getting at the root cause, and if you only address the symptoms, you might clear them up for the moment, but they will be back, and they'll be back, and they'll be back. We need to get at the root cause. Social economic and environmental issues are

inexplicitly interwoven and the challenge to Government is to somehow dovetail financial management objectives of Government with quality of life objectives of the population. The amazing thing is how often it's possible to do that. You'd think that at first they're always in conflict, but that's not necessarily the case, provided that you see the big picture. It's been demonstrated many times that austerity doesn't work, that when times are tough you just cut back, and cut back, and somehow the problems will go away. Because you know what the real choice usually comes down too? Pay now or pay more later. Too often in this Province and in this Country, the decision was made to pay more later.

We all have to be aware of the siren song of privatization. There is no private sector solution for mental illness. There is no private sector solution for dementia. There is no private sector solution for domestic violence. We need Government to be active in defending the rights of the people in addressing those types of challenges. We need a vision in society centered on fairness of opportunity, lessening of inequality, sustainable use of natural resources, respect for the environment, treating our seniors with the dignity and respect they deserve after a lifetime of working, and determination to provide opportunities for our young people to put down roots and settle and build a family in our Province.

Since Confederation we have spent a 66 year slow motion ping pong game of going back and forth and back and forth between the Liberals and the Conservatives, and I think it's time for a real change. We don't need to keep doing it that way. You don't fix big problems by tinkering at the edges. I believe we have the team to convey hope and optimism to the next generation of Newfoundlander and Labradorians and to rebuild morale. We have to really challenge ourselves. A very bright young person that I know pretty well said to me one day, my generation is screwed. And I understand why he thought that way, and you know something, we can't just say I guess that's just the way it is, that's okay. That's not okay. We owe it to that generation, those of us who had a pretty good crack at it, we owe it to that generation to provide every opportunity that we possibly can and that has to govern all of our considerations. An excuse is often used, you know we'd like to help here but we have to cut public services because we can't pass on the debt to the next generation. How many thousand times have you heard moralistically going on about that? What about the deficit in opportunity that young people are experiencing? What about the deficit in the environment that we will pass on if we're not more careful about how we use our environment?

In order to keep young people, they need job opportunities, but they also need what's fundamental as a child care policy that actually makes it possible for people to raise a family on an affordable basis. With respect to the rapidly growing population of seniors, and the number will virtually double over the next 20 years or so, that's huge challenge, but you know it's also an opportunity. It's an opportunity to provide stable and decent jobs in large communities and in small communities. We can't build enough institutions to look after all of the seniors that we're going to have in this Province over the next number of years. The starting point for providing dignity to our seniors in their retiring years has got to be to provide the supports that would allow them to live in their own home and in their own community for as long as is reasonably possible for them to do so. To do that, we have the Home Care sector as a huge part of that solution. I'm told the current work force in that sector are largely made up of workers who have a few years left in the workplace. So, we know that we have this huge number of seniors coming at us, some call it a seniors tsunami, and that we have a workforce that only has for the most part, a few years left, we either tackle that now and say here's a plan, or we wait for that tsunami to completely swamp us. We can't sit back and say well let's see how it works out. We know about exactly how many seniors we're going to have and we need to have a plan for it. To do that I believe it really needs a comprehensive approach, working with NAPE as a bargaining agent for Home Care workers, to professionalize the sector, to provide appropriate training, make it a sector with benefits and a

decent pay that will attract young Newfoundlander and Labradorians to live in their own communities and provide the supports necessary that allow their parents and grandparents to live in their own communities.

We also need to invest in our health care system. When you hear about public sector spending, I look on that as public sector investment. The health care system, a doctor described it to me in the following way, we're stuck in a system that doesn't work. Public sector workers have a key role to play in our society. I think it's under appreciated. From talking to people who work in the public sector, particularly in the direct Government services, it appears to me to be a considerable decline in morale and I think the reason is that you need clear direction from the people who run the Province, and that direction has to have a measure of hope and optimism to it. It can't always be the long face. I think we need more co-operation across departmental lines at the operational level, not just at the Minister and Deputy Minister level.

Some people say well in Newfoundland our per capita expenses on health care and education are higher than in other Provinces. Check the map. We have a very small population scattered over a huge area. If you, for the purpose of the comparison, just put Labrador aside for a second, just the Island of Newfoundland alone, compare that to Nova Scotia, we've got half the population and double land mass. Now you tell me how you can provide the same per capita expenditures? Well, there's two ways to do it I guess - really lousy service and really lousy wages for the people who are delivering that service. Otherwise, it's going to cost more because of the great big Province we live in and the population. But that great big Province has whole lot of natural resources and they should be used to allow us to provide the services that people need and deserve. Equal access to health care and educational opportunities can only happen through a public system and this goes to the heart of NDP values. We need to expand the Home Care service for a universal public system. The infrastructure for that is already in place, it's called people's homes. Don't need to build them, they're already there.

Now when it comes down to this election, the Liberals will say the election is about getting along with Ottawa. I think it's about challenging Ottawa myself. The PCs will try and defend their record. Well, I would like to touch briefly on a couple of matters in the record of oath, and I know that time is short. Minimum wage. The NDP proposed in the House of Assembly a Private Members motion to increase the Province's minimum wage to catch up with lost years and then to index it annually to keep up with the cost of living. The Liberals and Conservatives voted as one to defeat that motion. Bill 22 was brought in by the Conservatives for the sole purpose of making it more difficult for people in the workplace to form a Union to represent them. The Liberals and Conservatives voted as one in support of that legislation, even though we pointed out to both. We, in the labour movement, with Mary Shortall and Lana Payne, met with the Premier at the time, and the Minister of Labour at the time, who coincidentally happens to be my opponent in the District of St. John's West, and said we had a rough meeting, how to you defend the 70% rule. The Premier had no idea what I was talking about. I explained to him that they took out card check and they said every application to form a Union had to go to a vote, but if fewer than 70% of the members of a bargaining unit participate in that vote, then those who don't vote are deemed to have voted against the Union. Can you believe that? If that rule was in place, Tom Marshall would not have been elected, if they were subject to that standard. Dwight Ball wouldn't have been elected. Paul Davis wouldn't have been elected, none of them would. But that's only a rule for Unions. Our approach is different. We strive for a society for which nobody is left behind. There are issues that I would like to go on about, but time doesn't permit, but I would in the course of the campaign talk about the huge electricity bills when Muskrat Falls comes on line; about municipal assessments and the wallop people got suddenly in the municipal assessments, and the need to do something about it; about gender equity where women still only makes 73% of the average wage of men and where women often live out their lives alone in poverty. Is that a good enough way for us to treat our

mothers and grandmothers? I don't think so. And finally, the link between your job and your vote, and I'm straining over my time, I apologize, but I think this is crucial. Do you really think your job is really safe? I believe with either the Progressive Conservatives or the Liberals in this upcoming election, that public sector jobs will be made precarious, be transferred to the private sector, and who knows where. The Liquor Corporation, that's what they did in Alberta, privatized it and they're run by mom and pop shops. Snow clearing, believe it or not, in Ontario, the Auditor General said there are more lives lost because of inadequate snow clearing as a result of privatization. So you name it. They seem to be on a privatization binge lately, the Provincial Government, in long term care and then it sounded to me what I read on ambulance services, the dispatch services, what they got in mind, they didn't say that, but it sounds like privatization to me.

When you mark your X, it's not just a matter of whether orange or red or blue is your favorite color, or whether you like me or you like Paul Davis or you like Dwight Ball, I really encourage you, and you're workplace leaders and opinion leaders, because you are the people who make your Union tick, and your workplace tick, think long and hard about, because if you read between the lines, and some cases you just have to read the lines, of what the other Party stands for, and I think a lot of jobs of NAPE members are in significant jeopardy. Think about that one, think about what leader and party and team has the credentials, the track record to understand the kinds of issues that are important to your workplace, and I trust you will vote accordingly. Anyone who wants to help to get there, we would more than welcome it because we have a big task on our hands. I really appreciate the opportunity to be here and thank you very much for your attention and for being who you are.

### **Question #1 - Economy**

As you are aware, the recent decline in the price of oil coupled with other strains on the provincial economy has had a negative impact on the Province's current fiscal situation. If your Party is elected, what role do you see the public service and the public sector playing in a New Democratic lead Province facing conditions like these? In your answer we would expect you to specifically address cuts to public services, additional revenue streams, upcoming public sector negotiations and diversification of the economy.

### **Response -**

My experience in the private sector, where our Union was involved, certainly reinforced in me an understanding of the need for private sector investment in the economy. That has to be buttressed by a strong, vibrant public sector. There is some aspects of our society and our economy that lend themselves to the profit motive and the private sector approach and there are some that are service oriented that really lend themselves to a public sector approach. I believe, and our Party has always believed, in the importance of the public sector. There will be arguments. I was president when the Minister of Finance, Ross Wiseman, delivered a press conference just before the budget announcing 1,420 layoffs by attrition. They use that word as if it's some kind of benign concept when what it really means is lack of opportunities for young Newfoundlander and Labradorians, but in any event, he made that announcement and then they interviewed Cathy Bennett, the Liberal Finance Critic, and said well, what do you think about that. She said well the Government has a terrible track record. Then they said well what would you do if you were elected, would there be layoffs and if so, how many? And then she said Government has a terrible track record. And then they said will it be 1,400 or less than that or more than that? And she basically wouldn't answer the question. They asked me the same thing. I said I think attrition is what I just said, a loss of opportunity for young people. And they said, well what would you do to prevent it. I said I think it would be irresponsible not to look at both the revenue and expenditure side of the ledgers in term of how we run our economy. Upcoming bargaining, all I can say to that one is that I'm use to tough bargaining. I've been through it for just about a lifetime and I'm use to doing it in tough economic times and I think it's all about respect. If people at the table approach it with respect, they can

usually find a resolution. On diversification, there is some who shall remain nameless, that if you just say that word over and over and over again, somehow that makes it happen. That doesn't quite do it. I think we need to focus on sustainable industries. Our research and development efforts in the Province, in recent years, has been focused almost exclusively on oil and gas and I think we need to broaden that. I think the ingenuity of the people of our Province needs to be tapped and I think if it is, then we will be able to diversify and that includes social enterprise as well as traditional private enterprise. It includes our culture industries who are so much a part of our identity but also are economic drivers in our provincial economy.

### **Question #2 - Child Care**

Lack of high quality, affordable child care is a concern for many families in this Province. It also acts as a barrier to young people, predominantly women, from re-entering the work force. Some are delaying starting a family due to high cost of child care. What would the New Democratic Government do to address this quality, affordable child care?

### **Response -**

One of the things that I've experienced, I've knocked on a lot of doors in St. John's West in the last two-three months, and there is a number of things that keep coming up - seniors living in pretty impoverished circumstances is one for sure. Another very, very disturbing one, I've had a number of people, this includes men and women, but mostly women, say to me I had to quit my job because I was taking home less money than what it cost me to provide child care for my kids. There is something wrong when that's the equation. That included single moms and single dads who quit and then the end result of that for them is income support and poverty. That's because of the lack of child care coverage. Just think about it. In only just a few years time those same demographic trends that are telling us we're going to have all of these buddies for Ralph Morris, all these seniors, we're also going to have insufficient numbers of young people to drive the economy and do what's needed. So, what we should be doing is encouraging people, make it affordable for people to have kids, not make it almost impossible for them to have kids. Don't put them in that dilemma. I have had others tell me they would like to have a family but at the moment we just can't afford it. Young people told me that at their doorstep. They are living in pretty basic circumstances; they weren't living high off the hog; they just said they can't do it with the income they have and the cost of child care. A single woman said I can't afford to quit my job, but that's what I'd have to do if I had a baby because child care is too expensive. So, that is disturbing.

Our Party stands for universal, publicly funded and administered early learning and child care programs, but we have a patchwork and we need it to be unified and cohesive. It needs to be affordable for parents with qualified educators who gets salaries and benefits which makes it an attractive occupation or it's not going to work. Needs of children don't suddenly start at age five or whenever children go into the school system. They start much earlier than that. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada called child care the ramp to equality and a universal child care program is bedrock of economy and offers a basis for equality. With child care, children start off in the school system on a much more equal footing than without it. That would lead to more people doing well in school, graduating and having better employment opportunities at the end of the day. Our child care rates in the City of St. John's, I understand, are the second highest of any major Canadian city and we have to address that.

Again, I think, like so many others, it comes down to addressing group causes instead of addressing the symptoms. For too long we've been addressing the symptoms. When we look at our demographics, in other words, the age of our population and how that projects out over the next 20 years, that has to be a focus for practical every policy decision and part and parcel of that has to say what can we do to encourage our young people to have families, to settle in Newfoundland and Labrador and stay here and, among other things, look after all those seniors, but also to do

what the economy requires to make the place tick. Child care is a pivotal part of that and our Party has always been the forefront of that, that's one of the many reasons why I was disappointed that today we're not talking about Prime Minister Tom Mulcair because he was going to address it.

**Question #3 - Health Care -**

The health care system in Newfoundland and Labrador is under incredible strain due to a number of factors including an aging population and poor health determinants. Oftentimes front-line workers in the health care system bear the brunt of this strain mainly as a result of staffing shortages. What concrete actions would an NDP Government take to improve the health care system for both the patients and those delivering the health care services to the people of this Province? Will you commit to including NAPE in planning and discussions on this work?

**Response -**

Yes. But I can elaborate if you'd like. In answer to that, let me tell you the startling result, the information, that came out of a massive study of about 50,000 people that was done by the University of Toronto among others, a research institute in Ontario. They found that in that Province the top 5% of users of health care accounted for 67%. We can shut down hospital wings, lay off doctors or LPNs, shut down clinics, until we're blue in the face, and we can't achieve nearly the savings that we could get if we could say let's see what we could do about addressing some of the root causes that lead those people to be heavy users of the system. Now some of it is people with conditions that there's nothing you can do about it. But a lot of it goes back to poverty, it goes back to not giving people a fighting chance, it goes back in some cases to mental illness, which in a lot of cases goes back to a lack of affordable housing. If you get at those and give people a fighting chance, then they will make a go of it.

A good example, while this may not be directly on health care, I think it's really interesting to know about. I heard an interview one night with the Mayor of Medicine Hat, Alberta, and he talked about they had just come out with a program, the municipal Government, that they would eliminate homelessness in Medicine Hat. I thought now how would you do that, that's interesting. They have a guarantee that anyone who comes to the attention of the authorities as being homeless, within ten days will have proper housing. Not a shelter, housing. He said, more or less words to this effect, I didn't go into this for humanitarian considerations or anything like that, as a matter of fact my attitude was I worked two jobs to put a roof over my head, what's wrong with the rest of them. He said I was never convinced on those grounds; I was convinced on the grounds of financial considerations and wise use of tax dollars. It cost a lot less to house somebody than it does to pay for the consequences of them being homeless. Incarceration costs, acute care costs, hospital costs - all those kinds of things. He said if you have someone not in a home, how are you ever going to give them a fighting chance. How will they ever contribute to the economy if they don't even have a roof over their head? How will they ever cope with addictions if they don't have a roof over their head?

So, I think attacking that, the approach of cutting back and cutting back, is altogether the wrong way of going about it. We have to go at it and say why are people in this situation and what can we do up-front. We have to have interventions there that will intervene. If you took those 5%, if you took one out of every five and said we can improve their circumstances to be equivalent to the remaining 95%, that would be huge, huge savings in our health care costs. We have to attack it at the right end. People's basic health needs must be met regardless if we're in a deficit or not. Across the boards cuts don't improve efficiency and often costs more financially in the long run and with poorer patient outcomes. The key part of it is moving to private health care. There have been recommendations around for how we manage our health care system for years and years. The Premier did a so-called summit earlier this year. The results of that were essentially the same as a report that was submitted by the Provincial Government 13 years ago as to how to more

effectively use the dollars we have to deliver better health care and to have better patient results, better outcomes. The time for studies has past, the recommendations are there, they need to be acted on. What we need are action plans with clear time lines and clear deliverables and we need to avoid the mistake of rebuilding the system on top of the flaws of the current system.

Our Party is a party of Medicare. We commit to work with you to get the job done and of course we will work with NAPE and others who are part of the health care delivery system. I think, people tell me because I don't know a lot about health care with regards to expertise, but the people who work in that sector tell me they think with the dollars that are there, could be spent much more wisely and do a better job.

#### **Question #4 - Privatization -**

If elected, will you commit to protecting public services from privatization? In your answer, we would expect that you be specific to a full range of public services, not just health care, including such as those as the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation or education.

#### **Response -**

Short answer again is yes. I think this whole business of selling off public services to the private sector that's being done willy nilly lately in this Province is all about ideology and is about catering to the business interests and has nothing to do with good management of the Government's financial resources. I listen to the Premier say when they announced the long term care homes, P-3 Long Term Care Homes, we won't be responsible for the cost of construction; we won't be responsible for the cost of maintenance, repairs and upkeep of these facilities. Who is he trying to fool? Of course we will. When private contractors bid on that business, anyone thinking that they will actually say well out of the goodness of our heart, we're going to build this building and we will only charge the cost to run it? Of course they are going to and they are going to charge for it and they are going to want to make a buck. But in addition to all of that, the lowest interest rate that is possible to get for building a long term care home or hospital or school or anything else is what the Government can get by the sheer size of the Government. It's two or three percent more if it's done by the private sector. Well, anyone who has ever costed out a mortgage, try to figure out if they could afford a mortgage or not, can probably tell you pretty quick that two or three percent makes a huge different in your cost. So, I don't buy it on those grounds.

But in addition to that, I don't buy it on the grounds of quality of life for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. I don't think our seniors will be well looked after. If that goes to one of those international conglomerates that run private sector long term care homes across Canada, if it's a public traded company, they not only want to maximize their profit, but management has a legal responsibility to their shareholders to maximize, it's called the fiduciary duty to maximize their profits, and that's not good for us. The Liberal party when they talked about it, tried to make it sound like they are against privatization sort of, and they use terms like, Paul Antle was on a TV interview one night and he said we will look at alternate service delivery. Well folks, I will tell you what that is. That's code for privatizing and selling things off to the for-profit sector. What's their model? Would you send your aging parents or grandparents to Humber Valley Paving and Long Term Care Incorporated? I'll tell you what they're all about. Gimmicks like P-3 are all about hiding the public debt. I heard the Liberals talk about we can't afford to build these buildings, but if we did it through one of these arrangements, then we could afford it. Well, you're talking about a 25-30-40 year contract where Government commits to pay down that cost. It's kind of like somebody, a family, who just got approved for a mortgage, and decided instead to sign a 25 year rental agreement for higher monthly payments than the mortgage would have cost and at the end of 25 years you don't even own the doorknobs. It just doesn't make any sense. The Ontario Auditor General and the BC Auditor General have pointed out very, very clearly that the cost of P-3 arrangements, public private partnerships, otherwise known as "pick the public's pockets" that they

would cost, in the case of Ontario a bunch of transportation ones, ended up costing \$8 billion more than if they were done in the traditional way. I guess I will summarize by saying out of the two parties that I and my colleagues are up against on November 20<sup>th</sup>, the Conservatives would privatize Signal Hill, the Battery not included, and the Liberals would throw in the Battery at no extra charge.

Thank you very much and keep up the good work and when you pick up that pencil with that little enclosure around you, really think about it, think about your jobs and think about what that votes mean. We're going to need every vote we can get and thanks a million for doing what you do.

J. Earle stated I want to thank Earle very much.

J. Lacey (BofD) stated I would like to take the time before we further advance in this Convention and show some gratitude and rightfully so to the people that nobody really sees that put this together and works so diligently, not only for this Convention but each and every day of their working lives, they work to bringing this Union together, and I'm talking about the men and particularly the women, at NAPE Office - in Membership, Accounting, all our Clerical staff and as Jerry and Bert and everyone else can attest to, whenever something is needed the call goes out and they are there. Further to that I would like to recognize the fact that those who represent you on the labour relations basis, your EROs are actually present thankfully in this Convention so you get to see them, to find out who the face really is. But the real reason I am standing here today is one particular lady who, in her true spirit of fighting and her true spirit of Unionism, actually came back to this Convention to be with us and I would like to recognize our ERO, Rowena Best. It so warms my heart to see you. Welcome and all the best. Thank you.

S. Fitzgerald (6216) stated our Local raised some money for the Kids Eat Smart program so I would like for Joanne Miles to come and accept this money.

J. Earle stated thank you so much brother and please convey our thanks to the members on Bell Island.

F. Pittman (7002) stated I would like to thank Brother Jimmy Lacey for those very kind words. It's been a long time since all of us have been here together and I mean the Employee Relations Officers who represent you. I thank this Convention, and at the last Convention, I thank you from the bottom of our hearts that you voted to do that. And I say to Sister Rowena Best and we've had many, many times on the Board together, she beat me to death for Eastern Vice President when we ran against each other. I had her on the first ballot, but couldn't get her on the second. She's a true Unionist, a Unionist to the core, and I tell you what, I am really happy to see you here as well. I will say the importance of this, and Brother Earle and I talked, he went to see another Brother of ours who is retired and very, very ill last week, and that's Hubert Sutton, in Grand Falls. He said if I only could walk here in this Convention again, that's what I want to do. Anyway, he's not and he couldn't be here, it's just so nice that we're all back together in this Union hall and I thank the Convention for that.

G. Smith (5104) stated I have a donation to the Kids Eat Smart program.

C. Dalton (1852) stated I also have a donation to the Kids Eat Smart program.

T. Carroll (7004) stated it's only my second Convention but I'm impressed. I'm proud of the work that I do. I'm proud of the people that I work with and I'm proud of the Union that I'm a member of. We went through some difficult times. I work for Labatt's for anyone who doesn't know me, and we had support from all of the people across this Province and across the Country and in Countries

around the world and it's a very humbling experience. We look for a way to try and give back and help out. We're going to commit as well to the Kids Eat Smart foundation to donate \$500 from the Local towards to kids. And to say again, a very heartfelt thank you to each and every one of my brothers and sisters here.

J. Earle stated this clearly demonstrates what NAPE members in the communities across Newfoundland and Labrador do. We give to each other; we give to those in need and thank you very much.

J. Earle stated I call on Sister Arlene Sedlickas to welcome some dear friends with NAPE within the Province and certainly across the Country.

A. Sedlickas stated it is my pleasure to introduce:

James Clancy - President of our National Union - NUPGE  
 Susie Prouix-Daigle - President of New Brunswick Union  
 Eliette LeBreton - 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice President of New Brunswick Union  
 Debbie Boyer - President of PEI  
 Kevin Gotell - Secretary/Treasurer of PEI  
 Terry Gauthier - 3<sup>rd</sup> Vice President of PEI  
 Stephanie Smith - President of BCGEU  
 Steve Porter - AAHP  
 Pam Toope - AAHP

Welcome delegates and guests.

### LUNCH BREAK

The Convention broke at 12:00 noon and reconvened at 1:55 p.m.

Video Presentation - The Privatization Zombie

J. Earle stated it is indeed my pleasure to welcome our National Union President of NUPGE, Brother James Clancy, a long time ally of NAPE I can assure you. Brother Clancy is the National President of the National Union of Public and General Employees, better known to us as NUPGE. First elected in June 1990, James was re-elected at NUPGE's June 2013 Convention and is serving his eighth term as National President. He is also General Vice President of the Canadian Labour Congress. Under his leadership the National Union has gained a strong reputation over the past two decades for its aggressive defense and promotion of labour rights, of Union rights, here in Canada and internationally. In recent years, James has also ensured that one of our major focuses of the National Union has been to raise awareness of the causes and consequences of one of the major challenges facing Canada today - rising income equality. The National Union has been actively promoting four key solutions - achieving greater income equality in Canada, respect for labour rights, tax fairness and quality public services in a modern industry strategy that puts nature and people first. It is indeed my pleasure to please join with me in welcoming Brother James Clancy.

### GREETINGS - JAMES CLANCY - NUPGE PRESIDENT

Good weather - good people - good proud strong united Union! What could be better? That's true; I was elected in 1990 right in this Hall. It's also sweet coming back to Newfoundland and Labrador because the people are great, they can tell a funny story, they have fun but they are serious about the task at hand. I think you are off to a great start in this Convention when the slogan talks about

a Union that is proud, united and strong. I can feel it. When you walk in here from away as I am and you come here, you can feel it. That makes me proud. I was granted an honorary membership in NAPE in about 1991/92 so for me it's returning to family. For the new delegates who are here, I am the President of NUPGE Canada, and NUPGE is a family of Unions. We describe it as a family of Unions. A Union just like NAPE in BC, or Alberta, and so on, right across the Country, we came together almost forty years ago because we realized that in working together and by standing together and not reinventing the wheel when one of us was in a crisis, figuring out how somebody else had dealt with it or borrowing ideas, or borrowing people, or borrowing monies when we were running strikes, we figured that was a better way to do it. I stand before you on behalf of our leadership and activists across the Country and I bring you greetings and solidarity from them. They know you. They know what you're going through and I'm here to represent them. Stephanie is here with me from BC; Susie from New Brunswick; Debbie is here from PEI. The last time I saw those three together here with me was two years ago when we were in the Labatt's strike. That was a hell of a racket!

I wouldn't be remiss if I didn't say this, because I'm that type of guy. I want you to pass on my best wishes and Stephanie's and our Board Members' and our activists across the Country, to Carol Furlong who is not here. Four years as Secretary/Treasurer, ten years as President, I mean I have to tell you, she carried the NAPE message pretty clearly and often quite loudly to us across the Country. She was an effective spokesperson for NAPE and we appreciated her work, her commitment and her dedication to the work and also to Newfoundland and Labrador and your membership. I say that and at the same time I got the opportunity to work with Jerry in his new capacity as President of this great Union, and I must say, it's been a delight. Solid trade Unionist, a guy that has a clear idea of where we have to go, how we're going to get there, and I want to say to you Jerry, on behalf of our leadership and activists across the Country, how much we're going to enjoy working with you. Thank you very much.

This morning I did an early morning interview with VOXM, a radio interview, and of course it was about privatization, public services, but what they really wanted to find out was what I thought about the election. So, I'm going to tell you what I told them and what I've been telling people for the last few days. I have to admit, the day after the election, Tuesday morning, I didn't have a blessed drink on election night, I was watching the Blue Jays and the election, and I was up until 2:00 in the morning and then I had to get up at the crack of dawn, and I felt like shit. I felt like I had the worse hangover that I've ever had in my life, and I moped around all morning, and I met the staff at the office and debriefed the election but I just didn't feel good about it. It wasn't until that afternoon that I finally figured it out - We've spent nine years, nine and a half years, turfing that bum out. Stephanie, Susie, Debbie, the leadership that I worked with, and the activists, the staff, over the last nine and a half years, he was a real mean spirited guy. He was a divisive man and their public policy was not based on facts, but it was based on fear and that was really destructive for this country and this nation. I say that here today and I said it two years ago, six years ago, seven years ago and eight years ago, that man did us a disservice as working people. I was happy about that and the people wanted a change, man did they want change, so we have a Liberal majority Government now. Now some of you as I look around the room are as old as I am, and you will recall that we have been through majority Governments before, and we've been through Liberal majority Governments before, so that accounted in part for the feeling that I had. It's because I'm scared that we're going to have another Liberal Government that runs on the left and then governs on the right. Having said that, the people have spoken very overwhelmingly, so our job, it seems to me, is to keep their feet to the fire. We have a huge task ahead of us to make sure that the promises that were made to us as citizens in this last election are honoured and that means reforming CPP, long overdue. It means getting at the question of Old Age Security and moving it back from 67 to 65, and the guaranteed income supplement. It means that the anti-labour Bills that Government passed and rammed down the throats of the Senate and the House are removed.

It means the promise of an electoral reform has to proceed. This Country in 2015 doesn't deserve a electoral system that was built in 1867. It's simply not fair that we could go through eight years of that type of Government who enjoyed about 30% of the population support. It's overdue. And of course, there are other things. The child care - there's no reason why we're one of the last nations, the 30 richest nations in the world, and we're one of the last two that don't have a national child care system. It's simply wrong in this day and age. So, these are the promises that have been made and our job is to hold their feet to the fire.

My last point on the election is simply this - I said this morning and I've said repeatedly in the past day or so - the NDP deserved the better. They stood in that House, particularly in this last majority Government, and they were the party of record. The other party was in disarray for the last eight or nine years. They stood up and took principle positions; they defended labour rights at every turn; they defended human rights; they defended the citizen's liberties, and I thought that Tuesday morning, I think that's what bothered me. It just didn't seem fair that their showing was so poor relative to the others. I wanted a minority Government I must admit. I wanted an NDP minority Government. I just thought they deserved it. We deserved it as citizens. That's why I was a bit glum, but as my grandmother used to say, don't be glum chum. You have to pick it up and go out there and go to work. You can't mope around. We have to pursue these guys and make sure they live up to their promises. Will you help us do that? Yeah, let's do it.

What I want to talk about briefly is the election, it really hasn't changed anything. Is there something changed? Have all of those things been done? No. One of the issues that I want to talk to you about is an issue that has really guided our work, the leadership of the Unions, through Conventions, we've adopted it, and I want to share with you. Some of you have seen this framework before, new delegates perhaps haven't, but that's where we start, this framework. The issue is income inequality. In this Country, around the world indeed, the most pressing problem that we face as peoples around the world and indeed in this Country, is the growing gap between the have not's and have ought's. It is absolutely obscene what has happened in the last 30 years. You can trace it almost to the date 30 years on. This gap keeps growing and growing each year. Because it keeps growing, this income inequality, I describe it as the canary in the coal mine. This is the way that we make sense out of everything that is swirling around us all the time. What the hell is going on out there with the world? Where is it all going? Why is it we have so many problems that are emerging that we can't seem to grapple with or get our hands around? If we look at income inequality and if it keeps rising, there lies the problem. Because when income inequality rises, health outcomes are poorer, mental health outcomes are poorer, there's a whole bunch of things happening to our community as income inequality rises. The trust between people breaks down. People are more fearful, suspicious, they're not trusting. The state, Governments become more authoritarian, they pass laws that restrict your liberties, it restricts your rights, they want to know what you're watching, who you're listening to, who you're talking to. And as you open up the newspaper everyday, you can see it. Not only here in this Country, but indeed in countries around the world. Income inequality is the scourge of the last years, rising income inequality and the concentration of wealth in a few hands, financiers and so on, people who are dictating how the democracy works in this Country and in countries around the world. So, we start with this framework, this income inequality, and it helps us to sort it out. When I've talked to groups over the last while, I think of it as a murder mystery. If income inequality is the body on the floor, I want to know who did it. Why does it keep rising? We talk about three things - the first thing is the attack on Union rights. Union rights from 1945 to 1980 were extended, broadened, more workers became Unionized and so on. But from 1980 to the current date, the density of Unions, that is how many members of societies belong to Unions, has increasingly been driving down. In Canada, since 1982, 212 pieces of labour legislation brought in by Provincial Government or Federal Government. Of the 212, 204 have been take aways. 204 out of 212 have taken away the ability of working men and women to not only organize the trade Unions, but to engage in collective

bargaining. As the Union density is dropped, income inequality is rising, and we now have social scientists and academics and others that suggest that 15 to 20 percent of the rise in income inequality is directly related to the attack on trade Unions. I love talking to my right-wing friends about that. I like talking to the right-wing Chambers of Commerce. I like talking to the public about the fact that Unions are not the problem; Unions are the solution.

The second reason why income inequality continues to rise is because in this Country we don't have an industrial strategy. In this Province 30 and 40 years ago when there was a Federal election, there was a serious discussion about the strategy that we had to ensure that we had prosperity; to ensure that we had decent jobs. But you know, I know, everybody knows out there, that if you're a young person in this Country, you're scrambling to get decent work. You're putting two, three or four jobs together just to make ends meet. Ten dollars an hour minimum wage, 40 hours a week, \$1,600 a month. Are you going to live in St. John's on that? Don't think so. Of course not. That story is being repeated in towns and cities from coast to coast across this Country and in other countries. We need in this Country an adult conversation about what we want to be when we grow up as a country. What do we want the country to look like in 20 or 30 years from now. Other countries have done that. We can look at many countries around the world where they've actually sat down - business, labour, Government, involving the public - and they have had a discussion about how do we want to build an economy. The only difference between today's discussion on income inequality and the discussions that use to take place in the 40's and 50's and 60's when it was a subject for discussion in elections, is that today we have a keener appreciation that the purpose of an economy at this very centre of why we want to discuss an economy has to be people and nature. The nature they were a bit light on back in the 50's and 60's. I think now we recognize this old thing that's hanging out there called the earth, it doesn't grow. So there is a recognition today that we need to build an economy whose purpose is the well-being of people and the well-being of this planet and the earth which we live on. The purpose of the economy isn't to serve pastry, it's not to serve as the New York stock exchange, it's not to serve financiers in London or Tokyo, the purpose of an economy is the well-being of the citizens of the country. So people and nature is what drives us. In the absence of having a discussion about economy, in the absence of living in a country where by the way you have to make stuff, successful economies make stuff, you can't keep pulling it out of the ground and hope all is going to be well, because as you know here and we know so well in this country, the price of commodities go up, and then it goes down, and then it goes up and then it goes down. And when it goes down, people get hurt. We can't have a jobs economy like we have. We have to get our heads together and insist that there be a proper industrial strategy. In the absence of an industrial strategy when you have jobs economy what happens is income inequality rises.

The third answer is that we have no tax fairness in this country. I'm not going to spend a lot of time on this because in the last 30 years the tax system has become so skewed that some people do very, very well in terms of paying taxes. That is to say they pay very, very little. Well - little. The tax system is not fair and we have been leading a discussion in this country, the first Union to do it - public sector Unions never talked about taxes. We're the Union that said we have to have a discussion about taxes in this country. We have to have a fair tax system and the reason that's important to us is because taxes pay for quality public services. They don't want to have a discussion about taxes, they've done very well in the past 30 years. We have the lowest corporate tax rate of the G20 countries now in Canada after 8 or 9 years of Harper. They don't want to talk about taxes. The very wealthy don't want to talk about taxes. But taxes are what provides us the revenue to ensure that people have a fair shot at life and that's through quality public services. So, when quality public services are diminished, are degraded, why do we have Medicare, why can't we pay as you go, all of that crazy stuff that generations before us get out of here we don't want that and they fought for it and they forced politicians, they want to return to those old days. The way they get us is by gutting the tax system so that the pressure is on the public services and as

this short video says, we get into the privatization playbook. They squeeze the money to the services, the services get a little ragged around the edges, the workers are trying to do more with less, and then they say oh well, the ABC corporation can do it cheaper and more efficiently and more effectively, that's bullshit. It's simply not true and they've carried on with that in 30 years. My point here is that public services, the absence of tax fairness, pushes pressure on the public services so we have to talk about taxes and we have to talk about public services. That's the answer to the question why does income inequality keep rising. I've spoken to many audiences, Union audiences, and I occasionally speak to audiences that are not Union, not very often, I don't get invited to a lot of them. When I talk to them about this analysis, I know, and when we ran our big green bus across the country, talking to citizens across this country, they get it. People get it and they are looking for an answer. They want to know what's happening and they get it.

I want to spend a few minutes on the far side of that slide - the attack on public services - and I want to narrow in on one small piece of it which is the question of privatization. Privatization is the notion where we take public monies, which have come out of all of our pockets in the form of taxes, we put them into a pot and then we spend them on public services. What they are trying to do with privatization is to, put it in simple terms, they want to get their hand in that pot. I know it sounds simple. The reason they want their hand in that pot is because you don't have to chase somebody down to get the bill, Government is good for the bill. There is nothing sweeter in getting a Government contract. You're not wondering if the bill is coming in every month. They want their hands on that money. What we witnessed over the last ten years is increasingly all of those air brained schemes that they have to get their buddy's hands on that money.

Privatization has all sorts of names - alternative services delivery, individualized funding, public private partnerships. All you have to remember is one thing - it's a new name but it's the same old game, these schemes that they come up with. Today, what I'm pleased to say to you is that many more citizens is catching on to the scam, the shell game called privatization. Many more people are recognizing that, and I think they're recognizing this when we were fighting it 20 years ago, boy when you talked to people about privatization, the public's eyes would glaze over and say gripes, this is going to be more efficient, business can run more effective than Government, remember that. It's been a drum beat of business being more effective, business is more efficient. But what's happened in the 20 years is that there is just too many examples that exist out there today that point out the fact that it's simply wrong. That it's a scam. That some people are making off very fabulously with public monies and not delivering on the goods, on the services. When we are fighting it in the trenches 20 years ago, even 15 years ago, 10 years ago, our polling showed us and our focus groups showed us, that the public still bought into the idea that privatization was good for them as citizens and was good for them as taxpayers. But the polling we've been doing with the focus groups over the last three and four years, we're seeing a huge shift in that. If you can believe this, last year some polling we were doing, amongst declared fiscal conservatives, 87 percent of them said that privatization, there needed to be more transparency and openness about what these Governments and companies were doing. Well, knock me off the stool. Finally, I'm saying to myself 20 years later, finally the public is starting to recognize that there is something amiss here.

Well, that's what I want to capitalize on. That's what our last Convention said. They said okay, it's starting to shift, it's up to us to exploit that, to kick that door open and to bring more people on side, not simply us as front-line workers and trade Unionists, public sector workers, but more members of the public who are outside of our family, who recognize this thing is a bit of a scam. So, what we're doing is building on - at the 2007 convention in Fredericton, the theme was "Common Wealth - Common Good". It's a simple idea. It's the notion that my father's generation, my mother's generation, her mother and father's generation, going back to the coming out of the depression, that citizens across the country said if we could spend that much money going to war, we could

surely spend some money on Medicare, on Canada Pension Plan, on Old Age Security where we lifted millions of Canadians out of poverty overnight, using our common wealth through our taxes for the common good. It is good for people. It was good for the economy. It was a good idea then; it's a good idea today. But it's falling out of favour because of this relentless baffle gab coming from the right, this constant barrage of Government's bad, public services are bad. We talked about common wealth and common good and the values of sharing and caring and solidarity between and amongst peoples and citizens. We talked about that at our convention and it formed the foundation that resulted in the All Together Now Campaign coming out of our 2010 convention and this analysis on income inequality.

Then at our last convention, one of the key things we talked about was privatization and we adopted what I call the twin track strategy. In other words, if we're going to beat those people, and we are, we have to be smart and we have to work collectively. That definition of solidarity. We have to stand beside and with one another. In Ontario, OPSEU, has spent a ton of effort. All of our Components are really geared up to fight this privatization, but no one Component is going to win it on its own. The forces arranged against us are simply too great. Every Component has a responsibility to act, but we have to act together. If we act together, we will beat those guys. We can beat this. We can turn this. I believe that to my very core.

We're talking about the twin track strategy. And the twin track strategy really has two tracks, two roads - the first road is the collective bargaining road. What we're asking, and we have training sessions that are being run right across the country. I've talked to Jerry about the training sessions that we want to do here when you guys are ready. We're offering a training session that talks about the language that we have developed that has to be on every bargaining table around privatization. It doesn't matter how small a bargaining it is, it doesn't matter what sector it is. We're asking, and the convention adopted at our last Convention, is that everybody put that language on the table. Now people said to me, well, we won't win it. No, we may not win it the first time around. We may not win it the second time around. When we were fighting for Union leave, we never won it the first time. When we were fighting for maternity leave, we never won it the first time. When we were fighting for health and safety, we never won it the first time. It wasn't a local demand, it was a Union demand. Every table, every contract, every Province, coast to coast to coast puts on the table contracting no privatization language. That's not enough though. Because while we're doing that, we have to build up our capacity to act in the public arena. In other words, the legislative track because when they say to us at the bargaining table we're not going to give it to you here in the contract, then I say the heck with you, we want it in the legislature then. We're convinced that citizens, and our polling and focus groups are telling us, that if we have a real effort to get language in the legislature that outlines basic principles that have to be followed before they can consider privatizing anything, we know we can get that through legislatures. Will we get it the first time - no. Will we get it the second time - no. But remember this, because we're a family of Unions, if we bust through in Saskatchewan, we will whipsaw them over in Manitoba. If we bust through in Manitoba, we will come around to make a breakthrough in New Brunswick or Newfoundland and Labrador or BC, because we're a family. We're all driving in the same direction. If you get the leg up, we're going to come piling in behind you.

In terms of the contract table, the contract strategy track, it goes on every table and it's what I call a Union demand. When we were fighting for the rights for the GLBT community, when we were fighting for a woman's right to choose, those debates we had on the convention floor, it became a Union demand. It wasn't just my demand from my local. It became the Union demand. In privatization it has to be a Union demand, so when a local comes along and says oh well, they're never going to privatize us, then I say come with me and I will show you a city where they ended up privatizing the whole police force. Don't tell me that they don't privatize. The difference today in privatization, if it moves, they want to privatize it. That's what is happening. Every sector is

vulnerable to it. Even those in our membership who say, well it's not going to happen to me, I think they're dead wrong, it could happen to them. If they don't even agree with me, then I say if you're a trade Unionist, if you understand what solidarity means, then it will be on your table.

My colleague that I worked with, who works with us on our National Board, Andrew McNeil, says that privatization is like a maggot. He says when it's exposed to daylight, to sunlight, it withers up and dies. And so the principles that we're following in this and based on our polling, the proposed language that we have ready to train people on, the proposed legislative bills that we're writing, a bill that somebody could take, a member could take and present to the House here, a bill that we have to organize around on and call on citizens to push, part of our public campaign, part of our legislative side of this, they both follow the same principles. Public interest takes priority over corporate interest. Public service workers, those who use public services and the general public, have to have a say. Don't start privatizing my service and denying my Union the right to come in and ask you what the hell you're doing. Don't do that because we're going to have a racket, aren't we. I think we should be having strikes over service, not strikes over wages. We will have strikes over wages, we will take care of wages. We know what to do about wages, we've done that before. I think we should have a racket over services; that's the way it's going. That's what is going to be happening in this country over the next five years. Public accountability, transparency and public control are paramount. Again, the polling and focus groups overwhelmingly, even amongst the most fiscal Conservatives say there are way too much secrecy around those deals. They are privatizing Ontario Hydro as we speak, publicly owned, publicly built for years. They are privatizing it and it is all shrouded in secrecy. People have had enough of that. It's 2015, not 1815 or 1915. Access to financial details relating to any privatization scheme must be guaranteed and made public. You will run into this. We've spent \$50,000 taking the Ontario Government to court over a privatization scheme because we wanted to look at the contract and you know what happened? The court upheld the company's right not, and the Government's right, to refuse to share the details of that contract that had been signed because they said the business interests trumps the public interest. That's simply wrong. Those are public monies that are supposed to deliver public services. Surely, that has to be in the public interests.

The last thing is the protection of rights, wages and benefits of workers has to be guaranteed. Don't even start going down the road. Don't even think about it unless one of the first principles has to be that if a worker who is working in that service doesn't have to worry about his/her job, wages, pensions, if you're going down this scheme. But as Andrew says, privatization is like a maggot. As soon as you expose it to light, as soon as the people see the details of it, they fail. When we're working with our colleagues in Australia, New Zealand, Europe, the States, wherever they've been successful in letting the public actually see what's in these deals, they fail and don't proceed. Why? Because the public administration and public delivery is more efficient, it's more cost effective and it's accountable to the citizens. Once it moves off there, you can't see them. They're raising the rates, you can't do anything about it and is sold off. The reason it dies when it's exposed is because it can't stand the light; it can't stand the scrutiny. The challenge for us is can we work together on this. Can you commit, can your Union commit, can you as activists commit? I'm a happy warrior, I love it. I believe we can turn this around for ourselves and our communities, because really it's about our communities. I want to work with a "can do" crowd, I don't want to work with people who say we can't do it. If you feel we can't do it, then don't sign up. Don't come to Jerry and say I want to work when you really don't. We need everybody in our family to be pulling hard and saying we can do this. I'm asking you to join Susie, Stephanie, Debbie and all the leaders and activists we have across the country as we try and pursue and push this twin track strategy around privatization. Will you join us?

Let me end by saying this, who you elect to Parliament makes a difference, and when I came out here, and I argue about privatization, I'd love to have some local members, you have an election

coming out, I'd love to have a member in there that's bright, who understands how Unions work, that understands public services. Oh yeah, and understands privatization. I'd love to have a member like that. Please, please, give me a member like that, and then blow me over, I come out here and hear that Bert Blundon is running! Let me end by saying I'm going to do everything I can to help Bert Blundon and I'm asking you to do the same. Thank you very much.

J. Earle stated thank you James very much for sharing that information from across the Country and internationally about a very important issue and it's indeed a pleasure that you could come and spend some time with us. I understand James will be around until at least tomorrow evening and hopefully you will enjoy your time here. You will have an opportunity certainly if you want to approach him and have a chat. And anytime James you are certainly welcome to our House of Labour.

B. Blundon resumed the Chair.

### RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

Scott Dwyer (7701) - Committee Chairperson - stated our Resolutions Committee includes Diane Murdoch (3603), Vicki Laing (5213), Leo Drake (2201), Janet King (6204) and Arlene Sedlickas (Advisor).

#### Resolution Number 1: (Local 1207)

BE IT RESOLVED that NAPE lobby the Newfoundland Government to increase the number of Arbitrators so that grievances can be resolved in a more timely manner.

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

#### Resolution Number 2: (Local 2852)

BE IT RESOLVED when conducting a vote, no results to be released until all Locals have voted.

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

#### Resolution Number 4: (Local 7104)

BE IT RESOLVED in the event that a member brings forth a late resolution to their Board member and the Board member views the resolution to be of value to the membership, the Board member can then, as a delegate, submit the late resolution to the Convention on their behalf.

NON-CONCURRENCE.

B. Blundon stated I should also point out for the benefit of the delegates that I did confer with the President, who is the final interpreter of our Constitution, and he is of the opinion that it is also unconstitutional. With that interpretation I don't believe there is any need to vote on the Committee's recommendation of non-concurrence.

#### Resolution Number 5: (Local 7104)

BE IT RESOLVED that the Education Committee hold a full weeklong Labour School each year to allow for the education of Union activists. NAPE shall make every effort to accommodate all applicants who apply.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that NAPE shall provide all transportation to and from Labour School.

NON-CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Late Resolution Number 1: (Local 7104)

WHEREAS across Canada many defined benefit plans are being eroded and in many cases dismantled; and

WHEREAS much of the talks today center around targeted benefit plans instead of a guaranteed income and guaranteed indexation to protect retirees from inflation, these plans could potentially reduce pensions and remove indexation after people have retired, drastically changing the level of retirement income expected around which people made plans for their retirement;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that NAPE, in conjunction with NUPGE, fight to maintain true defined benefit plans to ensure retirees live in dignity with the respect they deserve.

CONCURRENCE.

DISCUSSION:

R. Morris (7002) stated I support the Committee in their recommendation of concurrence. Brothers and sisters over many past years we have spoken at this Convention in relation to what was happening with our defined benefits plans across this Country, and we saw a major attack a little over a year ago on the pension plan that we had here and with the help of this Union and many other Unions that were stakeholders in that plan, we have finally come up with a plan to protect the pension plan that we had at that particular time. While it may not be all the things that all of us wanted, I think it is safe to say what came out of here was certainly the best of a bad job that we could have gotten ourselves into. I would like to thank NAPE for the support that they gave me and others that were part of that Committee in getting the plan as it exists today. But since that time, and through the talks that I've had with many people and pension groups across this Country, I have come across a new beast that is being raised that first started with the public sector in the Federal Government, and I've talked to others since, and it's what is called a targeted benefit plan. It's not a defined benefit contribution plan, it's not a defined contribution plan, it's a hybrid of both. What that plan means is that your plan can change from one to the other at a whim of Government or at the whim of where it's going according to market conditions. What you can end up with is actually as bad a case as if you had a defined contribution plan whereby your pensions are worthless in value and in fact you would have them completely eroded financially and you would lose your pension. So, we ask you to support this resolution and maintain the right for the defined benefit plans that we have and that we will maintain them so that retirees, and each and every one of you in this room will meet that some day, and hopefully when you're there you will have a pension plan that you can live with the dignity and respect that you so rightfully deserve in having built this Country. I thank you for your support.

QUESTION CALLED: CARRIED.

Late Resolution Number 2: (Local 7002)

WHEREAS many NAPE members who are diabetic patients and are on an extensive regime of treatment and supplies; and

WHEREAS many of those members (retired and active) are on low income and therefore having problems keeping up with those referred supplies; and

WHEREAS many of those supplies (needles and strips) required for to be paid up front and then reimbursed; and

WHEREAS this causes financial hardship on those diabetics;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that NAPE lobby Government to change this policy to have it direct billing like other supplies and medications.

CONCURRENCE.

DISCUSSION:

F. Day (7002) stated sisters and brothers, I agree with the Committee's recommendation of concurrence. I have spoken on this issue numerous times over the past Conventions, but appears no one is listening. Maybe with the change in leadership this will change. Think about it, sisters and brothers, especially if you are a diabetic like myself. Tests strips to check your blood sugars, as one example, costs around \$100 a drum. If you check your blood sugars four or five times daily, they don't last long. There are members who have to come up with that \$100 at least two or three times a month, and then wait two or three weeks to be reimbursed, leaving them short for such things as heat or food. Why can't the system be similar to physiotherapy and vision care be set up where the patient pays 20% up front and the business collect the remainder. Thank you.

QUESTION CALLED: CARRIED.

Late Resolution Number 3: (Local 6207)

WHEREAS Section 55 of the Labour Relations Board Rules of Procedure requires that Applications and Notices to the Labour Relations Board be signed by the President and Secretary or by any two officers of an employee organization or by a person authorized for that purpose by a resolution duly passed at a meeting of the employee organization; and

WHEREAS documents filed at the Labour Relations Board are often time sensitive and officers authorized to sign said documents may be unavailable;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the following persons are authorized to sign Applications, Complaints, Replies, Responses and Notices to the Labour Relations Board:

Jerry Earle  
Bert Blundon  
Ed Hogan  
Sheila Greene  
Paula Schumph  
Trevor King  
Paul Foley

B. Blundon stated I don't want to appear to be too over technical on this issue, but for the same reasons as Resolution 4 was declared unconstitutional, this Resolution is declared unconstitutional too because it wasn't submitted through the Local, through a Local meeting. That being said, I think we can have a process if Convention agrees, that I think it is appropriate for the Hall here, because this is just a process wherein NAPE, a legal process, that someone can make a motion

to accept those individuals to be available for signing in the matters in this resolution. Again, I don't want to sound too technical, but it's just process and we obviously have to respect our Constitution. So, if I can simply have someone make that motion from the floor instead of a resolution.

MOTION: J. Wakeham (BofD)/S. Mercer (BofD) - that the people listed in the resolution would be eligible to sign any applications, complaints, replies, responses, notices to the Labour Relations Board.

DISCUSSION:

C. Bixby (3101) stated, just a point of clarification, does it really make sense to have people's actual names listed instead of their office. Otherwise, if you said it has to be Ed Hogan, what if something happens to Ed Hogan tomorrow, God forbid, then you have to come back and put another name on it. Why not have their positions and say the people in these positions can do it. Otherwise, we're going to be going back and forth like a ping pong table, every time someone changes position. That makes no sense to me. Even though I agree with the attempt of what you're doing.

B. Blundon stated I appreciate your point sister, but this is really a legal issue that we have to deal with and for any of our applications we need two people, two signing officers, if I can frame it that way. So clearly, if one person dropped off, we would still have a list long enough to do the work of the Union and get us to the next Convention. But, it's pretty specific with some of the documents that we have to sign, the title of the individuals is not sufficient for legal purposes. What you need is the actual name of the person listed for it to be valid with some of the legal documents that we have to execute.

F. Pittman (7001) stated I am speaking against the motion, but I guess I'm asking the question now more than anything, why specifically are those people named on this resolution?

B. Blundon stated I think my explanation was that we have to specifically name people for certain documents that we have to execute, not their titles, but names of individuals.

F. Pittman (7001) stated that's fine, but I'm asking why would the Local specifically name the names that they have here?

B. Blundon (7001) stated as I said to you, I ruled the resolution out of order because it was unconstitutional. Clearly, our legal people, I'm not sure if Jerry was involved or if he was asked his opinion, we're just trying to deal with a legal process and asked the Local to submit a resolution unbeknownst to them I would suggest that I was forced to call it unconstitutional because of our constitution. What we're trying to do, and this advice is coming from our Solicitors, is make sure we have enough of people around our office when we're putting in applications for certification, appeals at the Labour Relations Board, that we have significant resources in the office and signing authority to sign those documents. But normally, it would be myself and Jerry who would sign.

F. Pittman (7001) stated I would agree that your interpretation that this is unconstitutional, so we shouldn't be having any debate because it is unconstitutional.

B. Blundon stated I'm not going to debate with you all day, it's unconstitutional, and that's why I asked the Floor to make a motion, not as a resolution, but as a motion coming directly from the Floor.

QUESTION CALLED: CARRIED.

B. Blundon stated thanks to the Resolutions Committee for their work.

J. Lacey (BofD) stated brothers and sisters, it is my pleasure to welcome Brother Daniel Reid to address our Convention and bring greetings on behalf of the St. John's and District Labour Council. Daniel has been active in the labour movement of our Province for many years holding various key positions. Currently he is the President of the St. John's and District Labour Council, sits on NAPE's Board of Directors as the Health Professionals/Laboratory and X-Ray Component Board Member. He is also Chair of the NAPE's Occupational Health and Safety Committee and is NAPE's representative on the Canadian Health Professional Secretariat, President of NAPE Local 6604 and serves as Chief Shop Steward and member of the Labour Management Committee for his Local. Daniel is also a member of the Board of Directors of the United Way as well as the Credit Service Council of Newfoundland and Labrador. Once again, it's more pleasure to introduce to you Brother Daniel Reid.

#### GREETINGS - ST. JOHN'S & DISTRICT LABOUR COUNCIL - DANIEL REID, PRESIDENT

Sisters and brothers, it gives me great pleasure on behalf of the St. John's and District Labour Council to welcome you to the City of St. John's for NAPE's 21<sup>st</sup> Biennial Convention. The St. John's and District Labour Council unites communities and Unions that are within his districts. The St. John's and District Labour Council has one of the largest geographic areas of any labour councils in the Country and we take in an area from Pouch Cove to Trepassey to the west side of Trinity Bay, Conception Bay North and all of Conception Bay South, thus giving us approximately 40,000 Union members within our district. District Labour Councils consist of many Unions and as such are considered the watchdogs for community issues and as such we work towards equality on such issues as human rights, health care and unemployment insurance, just to name a few, both in the community and in the workplace. We are proud to say the District Labour Council is working to make sure that those issues are heard.

The first District Labour Council started over 150 years ago in the homes of Local leaders where decisions were held about universal public education and into child labour and into the six day work week, in which many Newfoundlanders and Canadians were forced to work. Another big discussion at the time was health care. By the way, Newfoundland and Labrador has one thing to be proud of, we have one of the highest Union percentages of workers within the country. We're standing at 39%, second only to Quebec. The issues that we were discussing 150 years ago are still the same discussions that we are having today. Labour Councils are still helping to build communities by coming together and using their collective strength of all involved to achieve goals set. By working together we are a strong voice for all. We have involvement in the community; we help educate our members and the general public; we organize workers; we lobby Governments; we campaign for justice for both Union and non Union; we take political action when required; we support striking workers no matter what Union; and we build an alternative to the economic and social vision of our Province. We work with United Way; we host food drives and clothing drives; we provide school breakfasts and snack programs; we participate on community boards and agencies; and support shelters for women and children and provide resources and support for workers in crisis through the Union counselling program. We talk to and educate the public on the benefits of Unions and belonging to a Union; we assist like minded people in their elections to different levels of Government; and we also support and try to educate people on buying local, buying Union and buying Canadian.

Along with its affiliates such as NAPE, the St. John's and District Labour Council has organized campaigns that have lobbied on issues that affect all workers within our Province, not only Unionized workers. Some of those campaigns and lobbies are initiatives such as labour laws and social justices, minimum wage, labour rights and the list keeps going on and on. Many times the

people affected by those campaigns and lobbies are the most vulnerable people within our society and without the District Labour Councils and Unions such as NAPE, lobbying and campaigning for those people, they would have no one. In these days of greed and profit by large companies, it is very important that we stand to fight back. Corporate greed and Governments and mainstream media are trying to tear us apart more than ever. They are trying to break and divide us so we need to stand up to them and not allow for them to succeed. We have to show the Government that this plan to implement P-3s here in Newfoundland and Labrador, and cut staff, is wrong and needs to be stopped. We need to show all of our sisters and brothers everywhere, no matter what their Union, it could be you today that is being picked off, but it could be me tomorrow, or someone else the next day. I will compare it to Hitler during the 2<sup>nd</sup> World War, when Hitler went into Germany and formed Government, he started picking off one group at a time. The people were saying, well that's them, that don't affect me. Well, eventually it is going to affect you because eventually you're going to be the last one standing and there's not going to be anyone there to fight for you because everybody else will be gone.

The District Labour Councils, along with all of its members, are a strong voice. It allows that we all stay united and strong and focused on what we want. We're here for the future of our Province. We represent people from all walks of life, all ages, all races, religions and backgrounds. We are here for the future of our Province. Our children deserve as much or more than we have had. We shouldn't undersell our children for anything.

In closing, I will ask that each and every one of you help fight back, help stop the P-3s and any other cuts within Government that's going to affect our population and our families. Show the public just how important it is to have a strong workplace of Unionized labour and how much we contribute to the local economy. You start taking organized labour out of the economy and the economy folds because the money is just not there to spend. Most people spend money within their own areas. So dollars earned give spinoff industries, not only for Unions, but for non Union also.

On voting day, remember who will represent us best in the House of Assembly in St. John's and put in Government a party that will fight for our rights and rights of all workers and all people of the Province. I wish you enjoy the rest of the Convention and have a good debate and enjoy your stay in St. John's for those who have come in. After the Convention, go back to your area of the Province wherever that might be, find out who your Labour Council is, and start taking an active part in the Labour Council. You will learn a lot. As NAPE members you have a lot to contribute to Labour Councils and NAPE and our members should be proud because we are the only Union within the Province that got three Presidents of Labour Councils from our Local NAPE members. I'm here in St. John's; Sister Kathy Oake is the President in Central; and Brother Danny Quilty is in Corner Brook. NAPE has got something to be really proud of. We are out there first and foremost as NAPE members with Labour Councils. Thank you and have a good Convention.

J. Earle stated while we're waiting for the Constitution Committee, I just want to recognize a group of volunteers who work with myself and Bert to run this Union. I am hoping they're all in the room. This is your Board of Directors who is currently in place. You will see these people around the Convention over the next few days. These are like yourselves, Local activists, who have full time jobs and actually volunteer on behalf of the Union and assist the Union. I want to thank them very much for their service over the past term and wish them all the best for those who are up for re-election at this Convention. The others, the Component Board Members, will actually be up for re-election at their Component Conventions. Again, thank you very much.

CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE REPORT

Mary Myles (9201) - Committee Chairperson - stated good afternoon sisters and brothers, I will introduce members of the Committee - Jennifer Bartlett-Churchill (1105), Mona Matthews (7813), Aiden Donahue (6208), Terry Carroll (7004) and Trevor King (Advisor).

Constitutional Amendment #1: (Board of Directors)

WHEREAS Article II - Objectives, 1. (a) (iii) currently states:

any Crown Corporation as defined by Chapter 69 of the 1970 Revised Statutes of Newfoundland;

BE IT RESOLVED Article II - Objectives, 1. (a) (iii) be changed to read:

any Crown Corporation as defined by the Crown Corporations Local Taxation Act, RSNL1990, c. C-40, as amended;

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Constitutional Amendment #2: (Board of Directors)

WHEREAS Article III - Membership, 2. (c) currently reads:

any Crown Corporation as defined by Chapter 69 of the 1970 Revised Statutes of Newfoundland;

BE IT RESOLVED Article III - Membership, 2. (c) be changed to read:

any Crown Corporation as defined by the Crown Corporations Local Taxation Act, RSNL1990, c. C-40, as amended;

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Constitutional Amendment #3: (Board of Directors)

WHEREAS Article III - Membership, 2. (j) currently reads:

the National Union of Public and General Employees;

BE IT RESOLVED Article III - Membership, 2. (j) be changed to read:

the National Union of Public and General Employees (NUPGE);

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Constitutional Amendment #4: (Board of Directors)

WHEREAS Article III - Membership, 8. (c) currently reads:

The Discipline Committee shall be empowered to investigate and rule upon such written complaints of offenses against this Constitution as are received by it; provided, however, that no complaint may be investigated or ruled upon if it has not been received by the Discipline Committee within ninety (90) days of the date when the offense occurred.

BE IT RESOLVED Article III - Membership, 8. (c) be changed to read:

Subject to Article III, 8 (h), the Discipline Committee shall be empowered to investigate and rule upon such written complaints of offenses against this Constitution as are received by it; provided, however, that no complaint may be investigated or ruled upon if it has not been

received by the Discipline Committee within ninety (90) days of the date when the offense occurred.

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Constitutional Amendment #5: (Board of Directors)

WHEREAS Article V - Convention, A. 3. currently reads:

The President of each Local, or in his/her absence, the Vice-President shall be a delegate to the Biennial Convention if he/she so desires; additional delegates ,if permitted by the following formula, will be elected in the manner outlined: ...

BE IT RESOLVED Article V - Convention, A. 3. be changed to read:

The President of each Local, or in his/her absence, the Vice-President shall be a delegate to the Biennial Convention if he/she so desires; additional delegates ,if permitted by the following formula, will be elected in the manner outlined as per Article XII 7: ...

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Constitutional Amendment #6: (Board of Directors)

WHEREAS Article V - Convention, B. 1. currently reads:

Regular Component Conventions of the Union shall be held within eighteen (18) months but not less than seven (7) months before the Component's contract is due to expire. For Components that have more than one bargaining unit, Component Conventions shall be held within those time frames that the majority of Public Sector Components are to be held. Nothing in this Article prevents a bargaining unit, whose contract is about to expire, from meeting prior to a Component Convention, but the delegate formula will be consistent with a Component Convention. The President and Secretary/Treasurer shall be non voting delegates to all Component Conventions.

BE IT RESOLVED Article V - Convention, B. 1. be changed to read:

Regular Component Conventions of the Union shall be held within eighteen (18) months but not less than three (3) months before the Component's contract is due to expire. For Components that have more than one bargaining unit, Component Conventions shall be held within those time frames that the majority of Public Sector Components are to be held. Nothing in this Article prevents a bargaining unit, whose contract is about to expire, from meeting prior to a Component Convention, but the delegate formula will be consistent with a Component Convention. The President and Secretary/Treasurer shall be non voting delegates to all Component Conventions.

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Constitutional Amendment #7: (Board of Directors)

WHEREAS Article V - Convention, B. 4. currently reads:

Delegates to Component Conventions shall be elected by members in the Locals in accordance with a formula prescribed by the Board of Directors.

BE IT RESOLVED Article V - Convention, B. 4. be changed to read:

Delegates to Component Conventions shall be elected by members in the Locals at a duly constituted general meeting of the local membership and elected in accordance with a formula prescribed by the NAPE Board of Directors.

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Constitutional Amendment #8: (Board of Directors)

WHEREAS Article V - Convention, D. 8. currently reads:

The Board of Directors shall give notice of the date for the regular Conventions, in writing, to each Local of the Union, at least ninety (90) days prior to the Convention date.

BE IT RESOLVED Article V - Convention, D. 8. be changed to read:

The Board of Directors shall give notice of the date for the regular Conventions, in writing, to each Local of the Union, at least one hundred and eighty (180) days prior to the Convention date.

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Constitutional Amendment #9: (Board of Directors)

WHEREAS Article VI - Officers, A. 4. currently reads:

Subject to Article III 5. (b), Board Members referred to in Section 1. (c) of this Article shall be elected at the regular Component Convention of their respective Components and shall serve until the next regular Component Convention or until their successors are elected. Board Members elected at the Component Conventions shall report back to the Component Convention at the next regular Convention, outlining their activities since they were elected.

BE IT RESOLVED Article VI - Officers, A. 4. be changed to read:

Subject to Article III 5. (c), Board Members referred to in Section 1. (c) of this Article shall be elected at the regular Component Convention of their respective Components and shall serve until the next regular Component Convention or until their successors are elected. Board Members elected at the Component Conventions shall report back to the Component Convention at the next regular Convention, outlining their activities since they were elected.

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Constitutional Amendment #10: (Board of Directors)

WHEREAS Article VII - Meetings, 3. currently reads:

Notice of any meeting of the Board of Directors shall be given in writing, by telegram or telephone not less than seven (7) days before such meeting, provided that no notice shall be necessary in the case of a meeting held immediately upon the adjournment of a Biennial Convention, and provided further, that meetings of the Board may be held without further formal notice if all the members are present or if those absent have signified their consent to such meetings or their consent to the business transacted thereat.

BE IT RESOLVED Article VII - Meetings, 3. be changed to read:

Notice of any meeting of the Board of Directors shall be given by letter, email or telephone not less than seven (7) days before such meeting, provided that no notice shall be necessary in the case of a meeting held immediately upon the adjournment of a Biennial

Convention, and provided further, that meetings of the Board may be held without further formal notice if all the members are present or if those absent have signified their consent to such meetings or their consent to the business transacted thereat.

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Constitutional Amendment #11: (Board of Directors)

WHEREAS Article VIII - Executive Committee, 3. currently reads:

The Executive Committee shall meet at such times and places as the members thereof determine or as summoned by the President of the Union or when requested by a majority of the Committee. Meetings may be called on two (2) days' notice by letter, telegram or telephone, provided that meetings of the Committee may be held without formal notice if all members are present or if all give their consent to such meetings. A majority of members of the Executive Committee shall constitute a quorum.

BE IT RESOLVED Article VIII - Executive Committee, 3. be changed to read:

The Executive Committee shall meet at such times and places as the members thereof determine or as summoned by the President of the Union or when requested by a majority of the Committee. Meetings may be called on two (2) days' notice by letter, email or telephone, provided that meetings of the Committee may be held without formal notice if all members are present or if all give their consent to such meetings. A majority of members of the Executive Committee shall constitute a quorum.

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Constitutional Amendment #12: (Board of Directors)

WHEREAS Article XI - Committees, 2. (c) (I) currently reads:

examining existing or legislation relating to relations, and other matters in the welfare of the Union;

BE IT RESOLVED Article XI - Committees, 2. (c) (I) be changed to read:

examining existing or proposed legislation relating to labour relations, and other matters affecting the welfare of the Union;

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Constitutional Amendment #13: (Board of Directors)

WHEREAS Article XI - Committees, 2. (g) currently reads:

An Occupational Health and Safety and Environment Committee, consisting of at least one (1) Board member and three (3) members as selected by the Board. This Committee shall be responsible for:

- initiating an occupational health and safety and environmental education program for NAPE members;
- encouraging occupational health and safety and environmental working Committees in NAPE supported workplaces;
- establishing occupational health and safety and environmental language for contracts;
- providing occupational health and safety and environmental guidelines for NAPE offices;

- drafting a set of occupational health and safety and environmental NAPE; and
- supporting the Board of Directors in taking public positions on occupational health and safety and environmental issues.

BE IT RESOLVED Article XI - Committees, 2. (g) shall be changed to read:

An Occupational Health and Safety and Environment Committee, consisting of at least one (1) Board member and three (3) members as selected by the Board. This Committee shall be responsible for:

- initiating an occupational health and safety and environmental education program for NAPE members;
- encouraging occupational health and safety and environmental working Committees in NAPE supported workplaces;
- establishing occupational health and safety and environmental language for contracts;
- providing occupational health and safety and environmental guidelines for NAPE offices;
- drafting a set of occupational health and safety and environmental principles for NAPE; and
- supporting the Board of Directors in taking public positions on occupational health and safety and environmental issues.

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Constitutional Amendment #14: (Board of Directors)

WHEREAS Article XII - Locals, 7. currently reads:

The Biennial meeting of a Local shall be held not less than two (2) months prior to the Biennial Convention, and the following business shall be transacted; ...

BE IT RESOLVED Article XII - Locals, 7. be changed to read:

The Biennial General meeting of a Local shall be held not less than two (2) months prior to the Biennial Convention, and the following business shall be transacted: ...

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Constitutional Amendment #15: (Board of Directors)

WHEREAS Article XII - Locals, 14. currently reads:

The fiscal year of the Local shall be December

BE IT RESOLVED Article XII - Locals, 14. be changed to read:

The fiscal year of the Local shall end on December 31<sup>st</sup>.

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Constitutional Amendment #16: (Local 2201)

BE IT RESOLVED each President of his/her Local have option of attending his/her Component Convention.

WITHDRAWN BY LOCAL.

Constitutional Amendment #17: (Local 7104)

## Article XI - Committees:

BE IT RESOLVED that each Committee shall have one (1) NAPE Board Member and in the case of the Finance Committee, the Secretary/Treasurer and one (1) NAPE Board Member. All other positions on the Committees shall be filled from the general membership.

WITHDRAWN BY LOCAL.

Constitutional Amendment #18: (Local 7104)

WHEREAS it is in the interest of the membership of the Union to have immediate access to proposed amendments to the Constitution of the Union;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Article XIV (3) read as follows:

3. Copies of all proposed amendments to the Constitution shall be forwarded to the Locals and posted on the Union website at least thirty (30) days before the date of the Convention at which the amendments will be presented.

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Constitutional Amendment #19: (Local 7104)

WHEREAS Local 7104 elects a Board of Directors with a representative for each Government Department chosen at a general meeting of the Department; and

WHEREAS the Board of Directors routinely consults with the membership on matters affecting the members;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED to amend Article XII (7) to read as follows:

- 7.1. The Biennial Meeting of a Local without a Board of Directors shall be held not less than two (2) months prior to the Biennial Convention, and the following business shall be transacted:
  - (a) Local Officer Reports;
  - (b) Treasurer's Report;
  - (c) Auditor's Report;
  - (d) Committee Chairperson's Report;
  - (e) Election of Officers;
  - (f) Election of delegates to the Biennial Convention;
  - (g) Nominations to the Board of Directors;
  - (h) Resolutions to the Biennial Convention.
- 7.2. A general meeting of a Local with a Board of Directors will be held not less than two (2) months prior to the Biennial Convention and the following business shall be conducted:
  - (a) Local Officer Reports;
  - (b) Treasurer's Report;
  - (c) Auditor's Report;
  - (d) Committee Chairperson's report;
  - (e) Election of Officers;
  - (f) Election of delegates to the Biennial Convention in accordance with Article 5 (3) where each member of the Board of Directors will be deemed elected based on their election at a general meeting of each Department and any additional delegates will be elected at the meeting of those present;

- (g) Nominations to the Board of Directors;
- (h) Resolutions to the Biennial Convention.

WITHDRAWN BY LOCAL.

Constitutional Amendment #20: (Local 7804)

WHEREAS Article VI - Officers - A. 1. (e) currently states:

The President of the Union, Secretary/Treasurer of the Union shall be elected at large by the total membership. The General Vice President shall be elected at large by the delegates at the Biennial Convention. The order of precedence of the Executive Members shall be determined by the Board of Directors at its first meeting after Convention.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED Article VI - Officers - A. 1. (e) be changed to read:

The President and Secretary/Treasurer and their alternates shall be elected at large by the delegates at the Biennial Convention. The General Vice President shall be elected at large by the delegates at the Biennial Convention. The order of precedence of the Executive Members shall be determined by the Board of Directors at its first meeting after Convention.

WITHDRAWN BY LOCAL.

J. Earle stated I want to thank the Committee members for your work.

FIRST CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

Kelly Roche stated good afternoon brothers and sisters. I am the Regional Representative for Newfoundland and Labrador with the Canadian Labour Congress. For those of you who don't know what the Canadian Labour Congress, it is the umbrella organization across Canada for all the Unions, for which NAPE is a part, and we present 3.3 million members across this Country. I want to thank President Earle for asking me to come here today to help out with your elections and for those of you who don't know, I was a former NAPE member, and I did sit on NAPE's Board of Directors. I am very happy to be here to help out with your elections. Brother Blundon read out the Rules of Order earlier so that process is done. I am going to now open the floor for nominations.

**General Vice President**

Nominated: Arlene Sedlickas (7404)  
Jacquelyn Wakeham (6206)

**Eastern Vice President**

Nominated: Jimmy Lacey (6206)  
Robert Thomas (6237)

**Eastern Area Board Member**

Nominated: Kathy Gliddon (7813)  
Eleanor Byrde (6207)

**Central Vice President**

Nominated: Betty Goodyear (4851)  
Kristal Rice (4206)

**Central Area Board Member**

Nominated: Sonya Hickey (3202)

**Western Vice President**

Nominated: Joanne Miles (1852)  
Brenda Eldridge (1104)

**Western Area Board Member**

Nominated: Karen Gillard (2202)  
Rhonda White (1857)

**Region 5 Board Member**

Nominated: Steven Roach (5207)  
Vicki Laing (5213)

**Region 6 Board Member**

Nominated: Scott Mercer (6207)

**Region 7 Board Member**

Nominated: Goldie Porter (7104)

**Region 3 Board Member**

Nominated: Kathy Oake (3102)

**Region 4 Board Member**

Nominated: ---

**Region 9 Board Member**

Nominated: Wade Kelly (9302)

**Region 1 Board Member**

Nominated: Daniel Quilty (1809)

**Region 2 Board Member**

Nominated: Viva Pittman (2201)

Gary Bolger (2101)

**Region 8 Board Member**

Nominated: Trent Decker (8203)

ADJOURNMENT

The Convention adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

**FRIDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2015**

CALL TO ORDER

The Convention was called to order at 9:10 a.m. by Chairperson, J. Earle.

J. Earle stated good morning sisters and brothers.

J. Miles (BofD) stated I would like to thank Local 6216. They donated \$600 from the Bell Island Hospital.

J. Wakeham (BofD) stated in everyone's room who is staying at the hotel, they supply toiletries. If you don't use them, I ask that you bring down any unused toiletries from your room for us to donate to the Women's Shelter here in St. John's.

D. Byrne (7002) stated on behalf of the Local, we would like to donate \$250 to the Kids Eat Smart Program.

A. Donahue (6208) stated we would like to make a donation to the Kids Eat Smart Program as well.

J. Earle stated thank you very much for your donations.

First of all, wasn't that a great evening! Now that everyone is in the room, it is my great pleasure to introduce to you the next speaker who is going to be talking this morning, your Secretary/Treasurer. Bert indicated yesterday when he met me first coming on the Board of Directors, but when I came on the Board of Directors actually in the early 90's when I ran for Eastern Vice President in 1997, but prior to that I went on the Board of Directors and one of the Board members who was already on the Board at that time was Brother Bert Blundon and it was a pleasure to work with him and many other activists. Bert came up, like yourselves and myself, through the rank and files. Got involved with the Union like myself, and I think from the first day he was involved and has been involved every day since. He, too, was there in the 90s when we had very difficult times. We faced significant challenges and together, along with other Board Members, we worked with the leadership and the members to do the best that we could, and we came out of that pretty good. Then Bert ran for the position of Secretary/Treasurer and took from those difficult times that we were into in the 90s and took on the role of Secretary/Treasurer when we had gone through a significant battle and the funds that we had in our organization, I can tell you, were pretty much non-existent. He took from there and he has built now with the work of other trade Unionists around him, a defense fund that we could say that we have no fear saying to any employer and Government that we can defend our members anywhere, anytime, because of the financial position that we are in. It's not about using that for a defense. It has been able to say to employers that we can. It's like having money in the

bank. It's nice knowing that it's there for when a time that you need it. Brother Blundon has taken us through that difficult time to where we are today. As I commented yesterday, and not to take from him, but we are probably at the best financial position that we have ever been in and that is certainly attributed to Bert's leadership in the role of Secretary/Treasurer which he is today. I am sure he is going to mention, and you already know, that he's seeking the position and whichever way this goes, we win. Not that I don't want him to be successful in Trinity North because if he's not successful there he continues with us. Whichever way this goes, I want to wish him all the best and I want to ask for the support of the delegates. Without further adieu I want to call upon Brother Blundon because he's not like some of the politicians, you give him 30 minutes and he don't take 25, but will take 35.

#### ADDRESS - SECRETARY/TREASURER - BERT BLUNDON

Thank you Jerry and good morning delegates. Everybody is on deck and this is one thing that we've noticed over the years that people enjoy themselves but they certainly come to Convention prepared to do the hard work of the Union.

Sisters and brothers, it gives me great pleasure to present my fifth report as your Secretary/Treasurer. Before I begin, let me say thank you to all those who participated in NAPE's election process. It truly is a great exercise in Union democracy. Special thanks to those of you who worked on my campaign and those of you who voted for me. It is truly a humbling experience and a privilege and an honour to be elected as your Secretary/Treasurer for the fourth consecutive term. I also want to extend my congratulations to your new President, Brother Jerry Earle, on his election. At the same time I think it's important to recognize those who have come before us and those who have departed. I want to extend special thanks to our former President Carol Furlong for her tireless work on behalf of NAPE members, her Union and the broader labour movement.

Today I want to talk primarily about two issues - one being of course our financial position and what has historically been a sensitive issue and that's politics. Not partisan politics, but rather how we position ourselves politically to protect your jobs, your collective agreement, your health care, your public education system, your public services and the list goes on. The finances of the Union and whom we elected in November 30<sup>th</sup> provincial election will have a profound affect upon you and your Union. We cannot and we should not ignore that reality. I know some of you may have heard me speak of NAPE's financial problems when I was first elected in 2007. I do so because we can never forget how close we were to financial ruin severely impacting our ability to properly represent members and I suggest to you to return to those troubled times would jeopardize our ability to bargain effectively, and would jeopardize our ability to represent you and protect your collective agreements. With over \$9 million in debt and with only \$1.1 million in our defense fund and only \$800,000 in our general fund, we were a financially crippled Union in 2007. We still had to prepare for collective bargaining in 2008 knowing that a strike in the public sector at that time would cost us at that time about \$3.5 million a week. Today that cost has grown to about \$5.5 million per week. Notwithstanding the dire financial position of 2007 we implemented a financial plan that has resulted us in being debt free today while allowing us to build substantial financial resources to support our membership, regardless of any attacks that may come. For the eighth consecutive year we have delivered surplus budgets, but more importantly our general fund and defense fund balance sheets are the strongest that they've ever been in NAPE's history. We achieved this significant milestone, not by increasing Union dues, in fact we've decreased Union dues, but by negotiating some of the best collective agreements in the Country with significant wage increases, sometimes in direct wages and other times by way of monetary increases hidden in the collective agreement, such as shift differential and weekend premiums, to name a few. Additionally, we continued to

organize increasing our membership since I took office by about 6,000 members. We organize, not because we want Union dues, but because we had sectors such as Home Care that was significantly undervalued and underpaid. When I took office, Home Care workers were making a minimum wage at that time at about \$6 something an hour. But with the latest collective agreement, the majority of members in this sector will reach \$16.55 an hour and with classifications even higher. Make no wonder that groups like Tiffany Village continue to seek out NAPE to represent them. As of March 31, 2005, our cash assets in our general fund excluding the Staff Benefits Account, has grown from \$800,000 in 2007 to \$6.7 million with our total assets growing to \$11.5 million.

During my first term of office in 2007 I had paid particular attention to your defense fund. As I have said many times, I believe the greatest defense to a strike is the financial ability to have one. Employers understand instinctively that we are weakened at the bargaining table without substantial financial resources. We also understood that members cannot engage employers without the financial capacity to do so. That is why we increased strike pay by fifty percent since we last met in Convention and made allowances for additional strike pay during Christmas and additional strike pay after a certain period of time. I firmly believe that we must increase strike pay again before the next round of public sector bargaining. We cannot, and we must not, and we must be able to support our members if we are again forced to the streets. We have grown our defense fund from \$1.1 million in 2007 to \$26 million by this fiscal year end. Your defense fund stands ready to defend you against any attack from Government or by any employer. Our total assets has grown to \$40 million with almost \$36 million in cash and cash equivalents. Our combined retained earnings have grown from a deficit position of \$1.9 million in 2007 to a surplus position of over \$29 million today. Notwithstanding this remarkable achievement, with the vast majority of our members now paying maximum Union dues, our ability to grow revenue through increasing members wages is not limited. Like all organizations, our expenses and liabilities continue to grow and we have experienced a loss of \$448,000 in revenue during the last two fiscal years. With that said, I still see no need for an increase in Union dues during my term of office. Fortunately, my financial plan from eight years ago was designed with all of this mind. As expenses increase we are able to rely more upon recurring investment returns from both our general fund and our defense fund. This is possible because we, unlike Government, built up our financial resources during the good years resulting in sizable investment returns each fiscal year. For example, notwithstanding that we have reduced our expenditure to the defense fund to the general fund from \$1.5 million to \$850,000 in this year's budget, investment gains in the defense fund will mitigate those reductions and along with the committed \$1.65 million going directly to the defense fund, we will in the fiscal year grow a defense fund by about \$3 million again.

In short, we have positioned NAPE's assets to offset increased cost relying upon investment gains for future use instead of increasing Union dues. All part of the plan crafted in 2007. I think too it's important for you to think about that at a maximum of \$12 per week your Union dues remain among the lowest in the country, if not the lowest, of any public sector Union. I would challenge any of you to find a Union with lower Union dues in our own Province. I can say with absolute confidence that we have positioned NAPE financially and that you can be assured that as collective bargaining approaches in the public sector, we are on the eve of a new Government who will feel empowered to attack public services, health care and education. We have never been so prepared financially.

I suggest to you that finances is but one tool that we must consider for the upcoming challenges that certainly await us. However, there are other tools that we must not hesitate to use. That is our political voice. Our political power. Our political strength. The subject matter, quite frankly, that delegates in the past have refused to discuss or incorporate into their collective thinking. If

we are to defend health care, our public education and our public services, or if we're going to be able to defend our collective agreements, our work, we are going to have to use every tool at our disposal. We have never used our political reach or influence to maximize capacity, but instead we have typically skirted around the edges. But I'm afraid sisters and brothers, that we need a bolder approach. We need to engage in the heart of the political process itself. We must influence in a more direct way who we elect to the House of Assembly on November 30<sup>th</sup>. I'm not necessarily speaking about partisan politics, but rather lending support to any individual that supports our vision of a just and equitable society. We have to decide for ourselves who opposes the privatization of health care, who opposes the contracting out of public service, who opposes the privatization of our crown corporation, and who is prepared to stand up for and defend free collective bargaining, the right to organize without interference, who is prepared to fight for gender equity, for our seniors and our retirees, and for those who can't speak for themselves. I don't particularly care which part they belong to, but I can tell you that even a cursory view of history will show that the Liberals and the PCs have not treated public sector workers, or indeed labour itself, fairly.

Yesterday I asked how many first time delegates were here. By my estimation, the vast majority of you. I bet most of you don't remember the successful health care strike of the early 1990s where health care workers fought for, and received, substantial improvements in wages and benefits only to have the Liberal Government legislate it away some short time after. MOS may remember that we signed a collective agreement on one day and a week later, the Liberal Government legislated it away also. You may also recall a strike by Nurses where the Liberals legislated a new Collective Agreement. Our members were so demoralized that they lost faith in their Union and it took almost a decade to recover. More recently in 2004 after a three week strike, a Progressive Conservative Government legislated a new collective agreement for all public sector workers ushering in the era of two-tier bargaining with legislated two-tier sick leave.

Brothers and sisters, our past is riddled with regressive labour legislation of both parties that have denied us the fundamental right to strike, forcing reliance on essential employees, forced back to work legislation on us, legislated members out of the bargaining unit, and legislated agreements, and the list goes on. I ask rhetorically can you ever remember a time in our history where we have had a change in Government, when the public sector was not attacked, not only our jobs and our collective agreements, but the very core values that we cherish as citizens. We have seen the playbook one too many times. We have a change in Government and the financial books are worse than they thought. The past Government left them with no choice and bang, we have massive layoffs, privatization, 3Ps, the tax upon Unions, workers and their collective agreements. And of course, they all have this sense that in four years time we will all forget. Unfortunately, we have the same perfect storm on November 30<sup>th</sup>. A sure change in Government with the PCs losing most, if not all of their seats, and if you believe the polls, a new Liberal Government, a Liberal Government supported by the business community - the St. John's Board of Trade, the Employer's Council, and Chambers of Commerce. Who do you think they will owe their success to? It won't be the public service or the people who work in it. None of us attended the \$10,000 fundraising dinner in Toronto with Dwight Ball and none of us forgive the Liberal's debt to the banks. I believe we must raise political issues that affect our communities and its people. We cannot stand idly by as seniors and retirees are potentially forced from their own homes because of new municipal assessments or because of pending increase in electricity rates once Muskrat Falls is completed. By some estimates, increases of about fifty percent in light bills.

If you want to know where all of our money went, you should look no further than Muskrat Falls for most of it. Many of you live from payday to payday and those two issues alone would place

a substantial burden on your pocket books. Do I need to speak to you about our youth who see no hope, and are leaving in droves for better opportunities. The world has become their playground. Their skills are demanded worldwide, while our own Government and potential future Government fail to react to the crisis that is already here. I see no alternatives. I see no hope with the current Liberals or the current PCs. Many of you will be led to believe that the Liberal tide in the recent Federal election will take hold. Maybe - maybe not. I think we all agree Dwight Ball is no Justin Trudeau. Secondly, the ballot question as Sister Lana Payne quickly observed on VOXM was how do we get rid of Stephen Harper? Most here would agree that the Tories will be lucky to have any seats after the next provincial election. So the question of how do we get rid of them has already been answered. The real question I submit is who do we replace them with? Maybe I'm overly optimistic, but media thought that way in Alberta but Rachel Notley proved that with the right campaign, the right platforms sprinkled simply with optimism and hope, the most right-wing Province in Canada can be awakened. Remember, she started with three seats and a PC Government projected to win. I believe we can do the same here. I'm fearful sisters and brothers that if we don't elect people to the House of Assembly who represent our values, we will have missed an opportunity to favorably impact the future of our great Province. We need a voice from the people and of the people. We need MHAs who will stand up for all the things we want for ourselves, our children and our grandchildren. Things like strong and accessible public health care, great public education, and dependable public services, job security, improved pensions, a provincial daycare system, and accessible and affordable home care. We need MHAs who have a solid commitment to our people who are willing to fight to ensure that all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians benefit from the vast riches of this Province. Anything less, I suggest, is not acceptable. And just in case you haven't heard, I'm running for the NDP on November 30<sup>th</sup> in the great District of Terra Nova.

Let me end by saying that together we have built a great and powerful Union with those of us currently here and those of us who have come before. One not afraid to take on the challenges, one with leaders who cannot and will not be afraid to tread where others have feared to traveled. To those who may believe that we can't protect members and influence decision makers, just take a look at NLC. A pane of glass in many cases is all that separates their workplace from that of the private sector, but it's not the symbolic pane of glass that separates them, it's their collective agreements with wages and benefits that those on the other side of the pane of glass oftentimes never hope to achieve. Without NAPE, and without its members, and without members in the House of Assembly to fight on your behalf, that pane of glass can easily be crushed. Remember to vote for those to best represent you on November 30<sup>th</sup>. Secondly, keep NAPE proud, united and strong. Thank you for listening.

### CREDENTIALS REPORT

J. Wakeham (BofD) presented the Credentials Report:

Delegates	334
Observers	22
Board of Directors	31
Staff	30
Media	1
Fraternal/Guests	<u>9</u>
TOTAL	427

MOTION: J. Wakeham (BofD)/A. Squires (6240) - move adoption of the Credentials Report as presented.

CARRIED.

FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

E. Hann (7104) - Committee Chairperson - stated I would like to introduce the other members of the Committee - Wanda Flannigan (7852), Lisa King (1104), Junior Bursey (6206), Jeff Quilty (8602), and Beulah Evans (Advisor). Brother Blundon just went through a lot of highlights of where we are today compared to where we were in the past. I really want to throw a bouquet to Bert, our Secretary/Treasurer, but also the NAPE Board, the Staff, as well as our members who help put us in the position we are currently in. We have a long road ahead of us and those resources are going to be needed.

Report of the Secretary/Treasurer

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Report of the Finance Committee

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Report of the Audit Committee

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

2013/14 Auditor's Report - General Fund and Defense Fund

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

2013/14 Audited General Fund Statements

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

2013/14 Audited Defense Fund Statements

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

2014/15 Auditor's Report - General Fund and Defense Fund

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

2014/15 Draft General Fund Statements

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

2014/15 Draft Defense Fund Statements

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

2013/14 Auditor's Report (J. V. (1983) Limited

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

2013/14 Audited Statements on J. V. (1983) Limited

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

2014/15 Auditor's Report (J. V. (1983) Limited

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

2014/15 Draft Statements on J. V. (1983) Limited

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

NAPE Proposed Budget - 2015/16

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

J. V. (1983) Limited Proposed Budget - 2015/16

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Resolution Number 3:

WHEREAS monies available to Locals should be increased on a per staff basis to reflect the increase costs of managing the affairs of the Locals. Costs have risen dramatically over the last few years but funds have not. There is hardly enough to cover the expenses of active Stewards, let alone contribute to events/deceased members, etc.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED there should be a minimum amount of money available to small Locals so they can actually participate in the meetings/conferences/activities of the Union.

NON-CONCURRENCE.

## DISCUSSION:

A. Donahue (6208) stated could the Committee please state why the decision of non-concurrence on that particular resolution.

E. Hann stated the rationale behind that is it wasn't specific. It needed to be more specific in regards to the amounts identified.

A. Donahue (6208) stated so there's no debate based on just the notion that things should be improved. So it had to have a particular point of how much it should be.

E. Hann stated it would have to be specific. That's the rationale. The Committee can't change the resolution brought forward even if we'd like to change it. We can't change the resolution to reflect that.

J. Earle stated any other discussions on the mics?

B. Strowbridge (9854) stated I'm just wondering can we bring forward a motion here to add an amount to that on the floor? Can we make a motion to add an amount to that resolution? I think especially for small Locals, the amount is very low.

J. Earle stated you can certainly make an amendment.

B. Strowbridge (9854) stated we're just making an amendment for the price at this point? Is that the only change we would be looking at? I'm just wondering now from their point of view because that's my understanding, they just need an amount.

J. Earle stated if you need to amend it, you would actually have to make the amendment.

B. Strowbridge (9854) stated I would like to amend it to add an extra \$100 per year onto what's there now. So from \$800 to \$900 per year for the amount of each Local, the minimum amount. I believe the minimum amount right now is \$800.

B. Blundon (BofD) stated just so that people know what the numbers are, for members between 1 and 25 - there is \$700; Locals with members between 26 - 53 - it's \$15 per member with a minimum of \$800; anything over 53 members - it's \$15 per member. So, simply saying to increase it to \$900, you're actually saying to increase the minimum.

B. Strowbridge (9854) stated I guess my question for Bert would be, you're the financial guy, what would you consider a sensible raise?

B. Blundon (BofD) stated I'm glad you gave me the opportunity. There are a couple of things that's not in this that I don't think a lot of members know or see. One issue is there is policy provisions for big Locals, not necessarily big Locals, but big geographical Locals, to assist with travel and those sorts of issues. So, those numbers don't necessarily reflect the amount of money that's available to Locals. Secondly, we have, I believe Jerry you may know, about 4,000 members who haven't signed membership cards, and you don't get your \$15 unless members have signed their membership card. That's why it's important that all of you who are Local Officers and Shop Stewards, encourage our members out there to sign membership cards because it has a financial impact on you. So, many Locals out there aren't getting their rebates that they would normally be entitled to because until we get that card, we don't know that they are necessarily in their Local. We depend upon you for that information. The other thing that I suggest to you is because I looked at the financial statement, we have very few Locals, maybe none, with no money in the bank account, which says to me, yeah we all like to have more, but Locals seem to be doing just fine. Maybe they would spend more if they had more, because like me, I think they want to make sure they have money in their bank accounts too. I'm not overly concerned about a slight increase, but I would be overly concerned obviously with a large increase because we don't have it in our budget. If it's the group between 26 and 53, maybe your best bet is to increase the minimum but maybe move it slightly higher, maybe \$16 per member, which would give you a little more money to work with.

B. Strowbridge (9854) stated that sounds fair enough to me; that's a good start.

J. Earle stated to take a little bit of liberty here, so are you going to make an amendment?

AMENDMENT: B. Strowbridge (9854)/A. Donahue (6208) - to change it from \$15 to \$16 at this time.

J. Earle stated you're talking about the group under 53?

DISCUSSION:

A. Donahue (6208) stated I think the brother didn't go far enough. I would go from \$15 to \$20. To speak back to Bert, some of these smaller Locals, yes, I've spoken to several people here and they cannot participate in a lot of events and things because of the minimal amount of money they have. Expenses have arisen over the years and the amount that is coming to the Locals hasn't increased enough to offset those costs. We are a big Local, we're between 700 and 800 members right now. Last year we ran out of money, not only for what we do in assisting people or the benefits of children's programs and stuff like that, but the actual cost to the members themselves. I think we put enough brain power into this and I think the strain on the brain is enough, the strain on the wallet doesn't need to be there. We are the core, we are the activists, we are the foundation of this Union, and at times you can't get people engaged. I think we could help engaging younger people to come into this knowing that when they come in, they could be 40 kms away, as one member here who spends a lot of time coming here, it's 40 kms both ways for her. At the time it looks very expensive when you're trying to at least recover what you're putting into this. Again, I think it's very important that a little bit more. I don't know if I'm making one or suggesting one, but Jerry, I think there should be a floor, there should be a minimum amount so small Locals can participate in things, I'm thinking for \$1,500 or \$2,000. I don't know if I have to quote numbers here. That should be the minimum unless there is only two or three. The per capita basis I think it should go from \$15 to \$20. There's a number.

J. Earle stated brother what you're doing now is actually speaking to the amendment that's there which you have seconded the amendment already.

AMENDMENT TO AMENDMENT: A. Donahue (6208)/R. Clarke (6901) - there should be a minimal amount available to all Locals - \$1,500. The per capita should go from \$15 to \$20.

#### DISCUSSION:

J. Earle stated the amendment to the amendment is now what's on the floor for debate.

R. Clarke (6901) stated I'm speaking in favour of the amendment to the amendment. So Brother Donahue alluded to, some of the geographical regions which are hidden to such as Brother Bert attested to, sometimes when we come to Conventions because of our limit put on the distance between your home and where the Convention is, for example, the 70 kms limit here today for someone to be eligible for hotel expenses to come as a delegate, whereas the Local if they wanted to stay, would have to pick up the cost for that and with small Locals it is quite impeding on your financial ability to send any delegates when you have all of these expenses. If we increase that amount, it would enable the smaller Locals to be able to send more delegates to come to Convention. Thank you.

A. Sedlickas assumed the Chair.

B. Blundon (BofD) stated anytime you want to talk about finances, obviously it's a difficult issue when people are looking for increases. Much the same if I had to come and say I'm looking for an increase in Union dues. The reality of it is most of our Locals aren't necessarily in the situation that the brother just spoke about. And if they are, we provide all of the financial resources for people to come to Convention. We pay the \$70 that was just announced, or 70 kms, we pay for that travel. If you are entitled to a hotel room, we pay for that hotel room. We pay for meals for everybody who is here. So, the cost of attending Convention is no strain upon members or their Locals. Some people may want to send observers. Well, I tell you, there's a limitation on that somehow too because we simply don't have the space. If we could provide

enough finances and say bring whatever observers you want, then we wouldn't find a big enough place to hold Convention. But more importantly with this motion, and I think that you have to understand is what you're really saying is that with \$1,500 minimum, we have Locals as small as five people. Is Convention really suggesting that we should give five people \$1,500? I hardly think that's fair to the Locals that have 500 members.

So, there has to be some fairness and equity in our system too. Obviously, there is some resistance to combine some of those Locals, and we haven't found a way to manage that and a lot of it is because of geographic areas. Just on the number moving from \$15 a member to \$20 a member, my quick calculation is \$130,000. That's before you factor in the rest of it. Now, you look at the budget that I presented, and I told you in my budget speech that last two years our revenue had been reduced by \$500,000. You will have to tell me where you want to find that, because if this resolution passes, I suggest would be closer to a quarter of a million dollars. You tell me in the budget what you want to cut. I don't want to sound like the Finance Minister, but it's a reality that we've managed our finances and obviously, I'm not prepared to take money from our Defense Fund to support our day to day operations. We have policies in place that I think adequately, we have many many Locals, I know the finances of every single Local, including the two that just spoke, and I can tell you, there are Locals in this Province with \$50 to \$60 thousand in their bank account, and this motion will give them more. We have some pretty rich Locals here. I understand that they are able to participate better than somebody else, but that's the benefit of having big Locals. It does give you more power, but there's something fundamentally wrong when we have Locals as small as five people who are essentially going to get all of their Union dues back. I ask you to consider seriously and my recommendation is that you defeat this motion.

J. Earle (BofD) stated I want to rehash what Brother Blundon just said, but I too have to stand in opposition of the amendment to the amendment. Some people made reference, I've heard some conversation so that Locals can attend such things as the Biennial Convention. But as Brother Blundon correctly pointed out, there is no cost to a Local to come to the Biennial Convention, if you're elected as a delegate. There is no cost to go to a Shop Steward training if you're a Local Officer or a Shop Steward. There is no cost to go to Local Officers' training if you're a Local Officer in your Local. We're not structured like other Unions, we pay those costs. I can understand there are things that Locals would like to be able to do, but as Brother Blundon alluded to, we have some Locals with as little as five, we have Locals with two and three members in them. So, the amount that will be given to those Locals in comparison with some of the larger, I think would be problematic. You've already seen a budget that we have passed. We've already talked, heard myself and Brother Blundon talk about what we want to do to go forward. None of these comes without cost. We're talking about trying to improve education for the coming year. That's going to add additional cost to us. We're talking about doing some things as simple as a membership census. That adds additional cost. We have adopted a budget and the amounts that we are talking about, as Brother Blundon alluded to, is significant. We are talking about probably a quarter of million dollars. We have a budget now, and I hate to say it, but we're going to have to look at it and say what changes do we make now. Do we change our plan now for an education agenda for next year, or limit it? Do we look at some of the other things? That's the only reason that I'm concerned. I can understand, and again, when I saw this resolution earlier I asked our accounting department to run a list actually to see where our Locals stood. Brother Blundon is correct. The majority of our Locals actually have funds in their accounts. Our Locals, some of them, I wish it was my bank account because there is significant monies in the accounts. If there are some Locals that make issues, and some don't realize if there is a large geographic Local, it may be that the Local doesn't understand that they can come to us, there is a process that we can actually look at it. But if there are other concerns in Locals, you may want to talk to myself or Bert or our finance

department and look for some recommendations on how we could help to actually make your budget work. That may be some of the problems. Again, as Brother Blundon said before, I certainly suggest that we defeat the amendment to the amendment. Thank you very much.

B. Blundon assumed the Chair.

C. Bixby (3101) stated I am President of one of those smaller Locals. We have 55 members and we are certainly on the small end. We certainly feel the inability to do what other Locals can do. Just two or three weeks ago, it came out Canadian Labour Congress, or some such place, and said come on in but your Local will have to support you. It went in the garbage before we even finished reading it because we just can't support that. There are a lot of things that we hear other Locals being able to do to foster togetherness and a sense of community among their people that we cannot do. I have a Local of MOS, HP and GS. We're spread out over about 80 kms each way. For God's sake, don't suggest that we bring in someone else because I just got familiar with the new contracts. After saying all of that and recognizing there is a need to revise the formula for Locals like mine, there is an absolute need. Having said all of that, I do have to rise in opposition to the amendment to the amendment. Simply because we are just throwing around, with all due respect, there was no thought put into the number. If you're going to come up with something, it has to be thought out, it has to have a basis, it has to be fiscally responsible. Right now, we're just throwing out numbers. I understand where that comes from because the motion was put forward and you wanted to see some change. We're all like that, we want some change and we want it now! But you have to put some thought into it. For that reason, even though my Local would certainly benefit and Bert, hand me some money, I do have to rise in opposition for that reason.

R. Clarke (6901) stated just a point of clarification on my discussion on the amendment to the amendment, when I discussed the 70 kms issue I was making reference to those who have to drive 69 kms daily to come to Convention and to partake in the activities afterwards, whereas in my Local, for example, you have a member who doesn't qualify. While it's true NAPE does provide transportation cost to that member as a delegate, it does impede their ability to partake in some of the activities if you have to have more than .5 alcohol in your system and drive from here to 69 kms so the Local has to pick up the hotel cost to come here. Just for clarification, as to when I rose to support the amendment to the amendment, it wasn't so much as the dollar cost as to some adjustment needs to be made, maybe on the reasonable level as Brother Bert attested to. Maybe \$1,500 for five members is a lot, but some consideration the Finance Committee needs to have a look at and see can we make some adjustment to the smaller Locals so that they can be on a fairer playing field with the people who do have good bank accounts.

B. Strowbridge (9854) stated I agree with what everybody is saying. We need something fair but in saying that we just sat down and listened to you saying how great we are financially. I'm wondering, can we make, can the Finance Committee take that back tonight and report back tomorrow with something that makes sense to us? This is the time to do it.

B. Blundon (BofD) stated if Convention would allow me, I don't want to be seen as speaking on the motion, but are you okay if I make a suggestion? Why don't we defeat the amendment to the amendment, pass the original amendment that would give you a small increase and then direct me and the Finance Committee to go back and see if we can come up with a fairer rebate system for the Locals.

S. Mercer (6207) stated I'm also on the Finance Committee of NAPE and I want to basically speak against the amendment to the amendment. I understand because two Conventions ago

I put a resolution forward to go from \$13 to \$15 and we raised the minimum up for each level for the members. At that time, you do the numbers and it worked out, I believe to be somewhere around a quarter of a million dollars at that particular time. When saying that, when we're doing up budgets with NAPE, it's difficult because we're getting to the point now that we're trying to struggle to say how can we make this Union bigger and stronger. I understand when people are saying about like to do more things socially, but I think we have to put our numbers into making our strength in our Unions. We have difficult times coming up with collective bargaining. If we, God forbid, go on strike, and we deplete what we have there, then how are we going to build it up if we keep putting money into social events.

QUESTION CALLED: CARRIED.  
AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT: DEFEATED.

AMENDED MOTION: to increase from \$15 to \$16 for the 26-53 range.

S. Mercer (6207) stated I think we're omitting the part about the minimum amount. I think we should increase the minimum part as well. I thought the Brother said another \$100 on the minimum.

A. Donahue (6208) stated I agree with the increase but it doesn't speak to the issue of bigger Locals and with respect to speaker on mic two, it's not about socials. That's not where the money is going. It's not about attending events. It's about supporting people who actually do the work of this Union. At the end of the day if it's coming out of your pocket, you're going to be more disinterested in doing the work of the Local. That's not what it's about. I think the \$16, it shouldn't be specifically set at a certain group. If there's going to be an increase, it should be right across the board for everybody.

D. Reid (BofD) stated I wonder if we could get some clarification for the members here who are probably a bit confused. We're talking about a range but we're not talking about the smaller Locals that have like three members or five members. We're talking about little larger groups. Can we get some clarification?

B. Blundon (BofD) stated what the resolution is saying is for Locals who have 26 - 53 members, the minimum amount be increased from \$800 to \$900, and that you be rebated \$16 per member instead of the current \$15. That's what the amended motion is.

D. Reid (BofD) stated okay, so we defeated the amendment to the amendment. That's gone. But my concern from the membership point is the Locals with less than 26, and we have a few of those Locals out there, so I guess if we're looking at increasing the 26-53 by a dollar, I guess I would like to make an amendment to that amendment stating that any Local up to 52 members would get the dollar increase.

B. Blundon (BofD) stated your motion is in order, but if Convention would bear with me, I think part of my suggestion would favour with the delegates here, suggesting that we pass this motion as it exists, and then afterwards somebody come back with a motion to refer it back to the Finance Committee to see if we can come up with a better rebate structure and to implement it when we do so. That would examine all of that if we did that.

D. Reid (BofD) stated as long as that's on record because I wouldn't want that to get lost somewhere down the road and someone say that wasn't in the motion so that group isn't looked at.

QUESTION CALLED: CARRIED.

AMENDMENT: CARRIED.

MOTION AS AMENDED: CARRIED.

B. Blundon (BofD) stated I would now invite somebody to come forward and make a motion to refer it back to the Finance Committee to come up with a palpable rebate system and implement it immediately.

MOTION: R. Clarke (6901)/F. Pittman (7001) - that this issue be referred back to the Finance Committee to come up with a fair formula for all Locals.

DISCUSSION:

W. Thompson (BofD) stated I agree with the motion that was made. Something that I was thinking about when I was talking to my Vice President, smaller Locals and the Locals from 26-53, I can understand their concerns. And I was thinking about the banking fees that smaller Locals have, and I know, because I look at our financial statements every month, and we're being charged \$6 a month for banking fees. That's \$72 a year and for the Local that's getting \$700, they are now getting \$628. That extra few dollars, and if they write a cheque, there's a fee for that. To the Committee, when you look at this, look at the banking fees too as well for these smaller Locals.

MOTION: CARRIED.

J. Earle stated I ask the Finance Committee to stay for a moment. I know this goes without saying because I know we have a number of members in this room who are professionals, we have two other speakers today, I just ask that you listen as we indicated to you earlier as to what they have to say respectfully. If we don't agree with something they have to say, again, I just respectfully ask for you to do that for the next couple of speakers throughout the day.

B. Strowbridge (9854) stated just for a point of information, my Local deals with the Bank of Montreal and we have an account set up with them and we get charged nothing, they don't charge us nothing whatsoever. There's no monthly charges; it all free.

J. Earle stated thanks for the information, brother. The only reason I asked the Finance Committee to stay for a minute, not to embarrass this lady, but she's not one of our most boisterous among our staff, this may be the last time she sits before you as part of our Finance Committee. I just want to say, Beulah thank you very much. We will be certainly doing something official along the way, but from rumors I'm hearing, she may not be here at our next Convention to be a part and she has contributed over 43 years.

B. Evans (Staff) stated thank you Jerry. It's been a wonderful career.

J. Cooper (7016) stated, I work with the Public Service Credit Union, re the banking fees, I put a little plug in yesterday, and as well a couple of my co-workers have a booth set up outside if you want to have a little chat about our service charges.

W. Thompson (3301) stated for the brother that mentioned about the Bank of Montreal, we do business with the Bank of Montreal and we do get charged \$6. I guess it's the banks that you deal with. You will have to go in and have a discussion with them.

J. Earle stated we are going to break a little bit early and I'm going to ask you to be back a little earlier. Be back here at 10:40. Please be back as the next speaker will be the Leader of the Liberal Party. Thank you very much.

### BREAK

The Convention broke at 10:20 a.m. and reconvened at 10:45 a.m.

A. Sedlickas (7404) stated I just want to take a moment of the delegate's time to let you know, we passed a resolution yesterday and there was a little bit of confusion as to the intent of the resolution, and it was Resolution Number 2 - BE IT RESOLVED when conducting a vote, no results to be released until all Locals have voted. I've spoken to the Local and what that means is that they have no problem if there is ten people voting in their Local, that they know the results of their own vote within their Local, but they don't want results of a vote, for example that happened in St. John's, when someone in Goose Bay hasn't had a chance to vote. The intent is that the people in St. John's wouldn't release the vote until everybody else has voted so that it would be a fair process. It in no way impedes them to know at their own Local meeting how they voted.

J. Earle stated thank you for that clarification.

S. Mercer (6207) stated just a point of clarification, I didn't mean to offend people when I said social, I meant that for us as a Union we should be taking that money and putting it into education so that leaves more money in their own bank account. The part that I wanted to clarify, I just looked at what the whole motion was as compared to I'm not against smaller Locals getting increases. I'm just looking at the larger Locals getting a huge increase.

J. Meadus (6206) stated speaking on the clarification of the motion that we had yesterday, unfortunately I think the premise that we were thinking about, not that we put in the motion, the last election we had we were having, whether it got out through social media or anything else, not necessarily NAPE letting people know what the vote was, but that information is still going to travel. It's still going to get there. We really needed to have nobody know. What was happening even here locally was that we had several votes and by the time it got to the third group, people wouldn't even show because they said it was going to be passed anyway even though they were going to vote no or yes. They just wouldn't even bother. I really think it needs to be withheld completely.

J. Earle stated brother you're actually speaking to a motion that has already come to the floor, has been voted on, accepted by the delegates. That Local has now given clarification of the intent and this Convention has accepted that resolution.

Thank you sisters and brothers for getting back on the Convention Floor and it is now my pleasure to welcome Dwight Ball to our Convention. Mr. Ball will have twenty minutes as we indicated previously yesterday and for each of the Leaders, followed by four specific questions with a five minute response time. Mr. Ball is the Leader of the official opposition and Leader of the Liberal party of Newfoundland and Labrador. Mr. Ball represents the electoral district of Humber Valley and was first elected to the House of Assembly in 2007. Mr. Ball was born and raised in Deer Lake. He left Deer Lake at 17 to attend the School of Pharmacy in St. John's. As a young entrepreneur Dwight began his successful career starting with the franchising of Deer Lake Pharmacy and acquiring the Community Pharmacy in Springdale. He has been named Employer of the Year in both Deer Lake and Springdale. Dwight has significant business interests throughout the Province, including Pharmacies, Real Estate development and venture

capital investments. For over 20 years Dwight has played a leadership role in the social economic development of the west coast area and has over 10,000 volunteer hours for a variety of organizations and initiatives. Dwight is a former President of the Deer Lake Chamber of Commerce and has served on the Board of Directors with Deer Lake Airport Authority. He was also President of the Canadian Pharmacists Association in 2009-2010. Dwight enjoys salmon fishing, golfing, snow shoeing and playing recreational hockey while spending time with his family. Please join me in welcoming Mr. Dwight Ball.

#### DWIGHT BALL, LEADER - NL LIBERAL PARTY

Good morning everyone. It's great to be here. Thank you for the invitation to your Biennial Convention. Nice crowd. I saw some of you during the week out doing your thing, visiting the City because of course I know there are people here from all over the Province. I am pleased to be here to speak about some of the key questions that you have raised and how our Party, the Liberal Party, would help address the issues and how we would help move our Province forward. I've met your President, Jerry, and many of your Executive over the last few years, both formally and informally, so I am very pleased to be here. Also, there are a lot of familiar faces as I was coming in. People I have met during my recent travels over the last four years going around the Province. I will want to say thank you before we move into the remaining part of this address because I see so many familiar faces here today that play valuable roles, not just in your work as a private sector, but as volunteers in your own communities and continue to do the great job that you are doing. Our communities need you to continue those volunteer efforts. It's hard to put a figure, as we all know what that means to the fabric of our Province, so thank you very much for doing that.

It was my pleasure, as I said, to be here and you have identified a number of questions. Questions like the Province's fiscal situation, the role of the public service, health care, child care and things like privatization. When I was coming into the room this morning I was asked a number of questions about that issue and we will get into the meat of that briefly. These are some important issues and I am happy to have the opportunity to speak to those here today. Today the intention is that you will walk away with more information on how our Party, the Liberal Party, will take on the biggest challenges that are facing our Province, as well as our vision for a better Newfoundland and Labrador. But I also want to leave you with something else - a message that underpins everything that I'm here to talk about. This is really the core of who we are as a Liberal party, the core of who I am as leader of this party. I am truly committed to engaging with Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. I am truly committed to engaging with you, listening to you, working with you. You have 25,000 members and all people in our Province, they do not only want to do things differently but they want, and what they're telling me, is that they want to do things better. It's with that commitment that I will address your questions today. None of the issues that you mentioned are easy issues. They are connected and interconnected and closely tied with our economy. Something that in itself has many contributing factors. But it is also something that impacts every one of us and certainly the over arching issue on the minds of the people all across our Province. Every day I hear from people who are concerned about their jobs, they're concerned about increase in taxes, they are concerned about affordability of the basic things in your life, things like housing, child care, electricity and food. We hear from front line workers, and you've told me this throughout this Province, that they feel they are overworked due to reduced staffing and the complexities that are occurring in your workforces. We hear from young people who are uncertain about the future, about their opportunities. And we hear from seniors who need more support in their own communities. My mother is a senior, so I know, seniors are telling us, families are telling us, that seniors want to stay in their own homes longer, they want to stay in

their own communities longer. We hear this from people who are concerned about the economy and we are concerned about that as well.

The people of Newfoundland and Labrador have been looking to this Government to provide that strong physical management, looking for economical stability, and the insurance that people have access to the things that they need to live and to be comfortable here in our Province. But they also feel that this current Government has let them down. That there has not been steps taken to stabilize our economy, that they failed to follow through on a ten year sustainability plan that was announced just two and a half years ago. They failed to plan for the future of our Province, for our children, for our students, for our work force, and for our seniors. With more money than any other Government in the history of our Province we have not been well positioned to weather this current storm. This would allow us to control our destiny, not the other way around. The people of Newfoundland and Labrador deserve a Government that can deliver that strong leadership, better management and long term planning. Leadership in Government that is focused on growing the economy, not shrinking it, creating jobs, not cutting them. I am very optimistic about the future of this Province and we have so much potential and so much opportunity before us, but we need to do things differently and we need to do things better. It means to address the issues and creating the right conditions to grow our economy to everyone's benefit. It means using innovation and solutions to overcome some of the biggest challenges including health care, child care and education, and delivering the most accessible systems in the country. It means following through on strategic plans to achieve long term economic strength and economic stability, and putting in place that strong physical management that our Province needs now more than ever. The current Government will claim that they have focused on the economy and they will promise us prosperity but that prosperity is just around the corner. They will say that they set the Province up for success; they will say that they did all of this in consultation with people across the Province, with communities, and together with organizations like NAPE. But we know that the reality is quite different where people are facing economic hardships, making tough decisions for their families and feel disengaged. No other Province in Canada has experienced a decrease in unemployment in the last year than we have right here in Newfoundland and Labrador. As a result we have almost 4,000 people, 3,700 people last month alone, that cannot find work, even with three large scale projects on the go in our Province right now. Training our working age people with the right skills to match those current and future jobs is critical because it's our workforce that drives the provincial economy and the future of our Province. If we don't do a better job of setting people up for the success to work and raise their families then we will lose them, we will lose them to other Provinces, we will lose them to other countries, and that's a story that we all know well in our Province. We need to take a serious look at the economy and the many challenges that we are facing so that we can get them right for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, so that we can become less dependent on oil with a focus on all sectors while also looking for new opportunities that are out there for our Province.

Newfoundland and Labrador is at a critical juncture in our history. One where we can do more of the same or we can do something different, or we can do something better. More of the same would mean letting Paul Davis and his Government continue to spend more money on plans that will fall by the wayside, fail to engage with stakeholders to approve access to services, or just to continue to waste money and resources that could otherwise be redirected to support opportunities for better health care, for quality affordable child care. You cannot spend those dollars twice. If the money is wasted somewhere, it means somewhere else we will do without. A Government, who after more than a decade of unprecedented opportunity and all that money, today we're fiscally worse off, not better. This doesn't make sense, and neither do, to me, doing more of the same. We need to do things differently. We need to do things better.

As Newfoundlanders and Labradorians you have told me that you want better management, you want better leadership, you want policy that makes sense and solutions that you can be part of. You've told me you want a Government that listens, that shares information and that engages with you, and you want a Government that you can trust. You've told me all of this and these are things that we can do differently. These are things that with your support we can do better. But we also know that these are not things that a tired Government can deliver and we have seen that firsthand. While other parties talk about job cuts and job losses, I can you one thing, that is not my idea of doing things differently. The Liberal party has rolled out more policy than any other party; commitments including the construction and replacement of the Waterford Hospital, establishment of the Office of a Senior's Advocate, in-home healthy living assessments, and reversing the HST. Also I mentioned the price of energy, the rising cost of our utility bills. We've made the commitment to using the revenue from the sale of surplus power from Muskrat Falls to offset rates for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. You are the people that paid for this, so that the sale of that power, the surplus power, will go back to offset those rates. We've also made the commitment to take the politics out of appointments by putting in place an Independent Appointment Commission, increasing the early learning and child care supplement for early childhood educators in our Province as well as many other policies. In the next few weeks we will release our full policy platform so that you can make that informed choice.

The people of this Province will then see why the Liberal plan is the only plan that will bring this Province past the challenges of today and onwards to a future that is better for everyone. It is an exciting time for our party and I am proud of how far we have come. It's because of the hard work that we've put into this, but also because of the opportunities that we have had to engage in many organizations and many associations like yours, like NAPE. I am proud of our incredible team of strong Liberal candidates who bring that kind of depth and the kind of breath, the experience that our Province needs now more than ever. In the next few days I will encourage you to take a look at the slate of 40 Liberal candidates and do your own comparison. I do respect the choice that you will make, but I am very proud of our 40 candidates that we will put to you in the November 30<sup>th</sup> election. This is a team that will apply evidence based decision making to everything that we do. We will identify targets so that we can be outcome focused and accountable to the people of our Province, be more innovative in our thinking so that we can address the biggest issues with solutions that will bring the economic benefits. The Waterford Hospital is a great example of that. We will stop the waste in Government and redirect those savings to areas that need it the most. Our team will have a strong voice, and this is something that we've been waiting for for a long time, we will have a strong voice at the Federal table, someone who is advocating for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, something that I've said has been missing for a long time. We will work together with Prime Minister Trudeau and the seven Liberal MPs that we will have in Ottawa, not just as colleagues, but these are people who are friends of ours. We will do these things only with the support of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

In closing, I want to thank you and NAPE for this opportunity to be here today for this discussion. It is a very important discussion because in 39 days everyone in this room and your families, and people across the Province, will have the opportunity to make a choice. That choice will impact the future direction of our Province charting the course for a long term, well being of our people and our economy. What I have presented here today will help inform that very important decision. With the support of the people of this Province, our Liberal plan will see Newfoundland and Labrador realize a stronger, more diverse economy, growing population and good well paying jobs. I have great pride in our Province. I have great pride in our people. We have so much to offer and in my estimation, and I'm sure you will agree, more to offer than most. We have a rich and wonderful culture and some of the best people on the face of this

earth. Now is the time for Newfoundland and Labrador to become self efficient, sustaining and strong. Let's keep our conversations going. Let's continue to work together because it is a collective effort and we all have an opportunity to play a part, to play a role, in those solutions. I thank you for this opportunity and I look forward to responding to your questions. Thank you very much.

### **Question #1 - Economy**

As you are aware, the recent decline in the price of oil coupled with other strains on the provincial economy has had a negative impact on the Province's current fiscal situation. If your Party is elected, what role do you see the public service and the public sector playing in a Liberal lead Province facing conditions like these? In your answer we would expect you to specifically address cuts to public services, additional revenue streams, upcoming public sector negotiations and diversification of the economy.

### **Response -**

Right now I will begin by saying, as you know the Province's fiscal situation, the current situation that we're into is as a result of a number of factors, and two of which most certainly would include oil, but also some external strains. There are other significant contributing to state of affairs that our Province and our Government's mismanagement of course of the resources, and their failure really to plan for this difficult time. As a result of all of these factors combined, what we see is job creation outside the public service has really suffered. In the context of all of this, what we saw is Government responded in 2013 to budget cuts and putting about 1,200 people, public sector people, out of work and in 2015, of course, it's yet to be determined. Creating uncertainty around jobs is not how you attract and retain people. Something that is very core to the issues that we are facing today. Without people and without people working, there is no economy. Today we have more than 60,000 people working in the public sector here in Newfoundland and Labrador. We have a tremendous, the Liberals have a tremendous respect, for the public service and the work that you do providing those valuable services in our communities. We understand the value of those good, well paying jobs and the contributions that you make in many other areas. We also know that stopping the waste in Government, exercising strong fiscal management, and addressing the issues that we face today with solutions that will bring the economic benefits will help better position Newfoundland and Labrador. You need look no further than the Auditor General's Report and you will see the evidence of much of Government's waste; 133 recommendations that have not been fully implemented because Government has not had the courage to do so. All of these represent opportunities for savings. The waste, including things such as external consultants for an example, who cost taxpayers tens of millions of dollars, and these are work that we feel could be done internally with the experience that we know is already inside of Government. How did this Government respond to this? What they did is they went out and there were questions of course about the price tag on consultants, so they went out and did what they always do and hired another consultant to determine the work on consultants. That's a bit bizarre but that was what happened. We see a way forward about fuelling our economic potential and it's tied to many of the strengths, many of the assets that we know are around the Province. So we know there are significant opportunities that can emerge.

As I mentioned earlier, we have a lot to offer but much of what we offer is around our natural resources and our communities. We see communities as a place of opportunity and a place of engagement for us as a party and our businesses that we have, some 16,000 in the Province, many of them are innovative, they're diverse by nature, and our public service, who is dedicated, they're hard working and strong. These are all opportunities that we see in our Province. Today, there is a clear disconnect between our potential and our current economic well being. This is where we stand today and these are the facts. By definition, we are in

recession. Our economic indicators are all moving in the wrong direction. Commodity prices like oil and iron ore, as you know, are weak, housing starts are down, unemployment is up - the highest in Canada right now, and this Government has no plan other than simply hoping that the price of oil will rebound and will just go up. That's their plan. Keep in mind that they've had more money than any other Government - \$25 billion more in oil money and that was the opportunity to diversify, plan or invest in the future of our Province, but simply there was a lot of complacency that set in and the economic diversification measures were not put in place. They responded by raising taxes, so this impacts every single person in our Province.

We will not give up on our front line workers and the hardworking public service that play such a critical role in our Province. The only cuts that the Liberals are focused on is waste, and the public service will not be compromised simply because of the price of oil and where we are with commodity pricing, that's not the way forward to stabilizing our economy. It's with that commitment we also approach the upcoming public service negotiations, knowing in good faith that in the end, we reach the same goal - fair compensation and a fair deal. Liberals know that with better management and strategic investments, money can be saved and so can jobs. That means managing our resources carefully, creating a plan and following through. It means better human resources, planning so that we can protect the vital public service workforce across all fields of your work, and it means finding innovative solutions to many challenges that we face today looking at and assessing the economic opportunities that we have. As an example, we've committed to an innovative approach to one of the biggest issues facing seniors - the delivery of in-home healthy assessments. These are assessments for seniors that are 70 years of age and older and it's this kind of innovative thinking that can take on one of the biggest issues that we face and help diversify our economy.

We all know that oil and gas will continue to be an important part of our economic future but we also need to focus on other industries. There is incredible potential, I've met with many of those industries, as an example, people involved in the fisheries, huge in rural Newfoundland and Labrador, aquaculture, agriculture, forestry and mining, as well as a potential growth in tourism, for example, innovation and technology and knowledge based industries in our Province. We will develop, the Liberal Government will develop a comprehensive human resources plan so that we can actually build a work force with the skills needed for the jobs, not only for now, but also for those into the future. We will also work with post secondary institutions through Adult Education and Apprenticeship programs, as well as improving our K-12 system. This is why we made a commitment to a Premier's Task Force on Educational Outcomes. These are just a few of the things I want to mention in response to your question, but also as we move along with our future to meet the challenges that we face as a Province. Thank you, and it also includes I will tell you, making sure that we are here to support a strong public service.

### **Question #2 - Child Care**

Lack of high quality, affordable child care is a concern for many families in this Province. It also acts as a barrier to young people, predominantly women, from re-entering the work force. Some are delaying starting a family due to high cost of child care. What would the Liberal Government do to address this quality, affordable child care?

### **Response -**

It really starts with creating those conditions for success. In order to grow an economy and our population, we need to start investing in families, because access to quality, affordable child care is critical to our work force and to the future of our Province. The value of child care can be measured in dollars and cents. As an example, how much would a parent lose in wages or how much work would they have to turn down in jobs simply because they can't take because they can't access child care options. I can remember being in Central Newfoundland this

summer and speaking to a young woman whose job was an eight to eight job, but she couldn't get child care after 4:00 so what happened was she essentially had to turn down work and she completely relied on family which therefore made it very difficult and the uncertainty even with her own child. It was difficult, her day to day life, because she did not have access to dependable child care. This same parent would then have to make decisions on what do I do, do I spend money on child care, how much groceries do I buy, and so on. The economic impact in our Province in our declining birth rate, an example right now we have 1.5 children per family, so it's the second lowest in the country. Not having anything available, child care services available, in your communities is affecting these decisions.

In a recent vital science 2015 report, Dr. Philpott from the Education Faculty of Memorial University, made this statement - investments in effective early learning programs produce benefits for children, for families and communities and to our society that far outweigh the cost. Families need and deserve access to high quality child care no matter where they live in the Province. Government says that they are addressing this, that they are doing this, but the proof as they say, the proof is in the pudding. Parents are telling us that they are on wait lists that are so long that their children will be in kindergarten before they get off the wait list. It's not just the availability of child care, it's putting the pressure on working parents, it's accessibility due to cost. Parents in Newfoundland and Labrador have two choices, it's either to pay some of the most expensive child care in the country or just quit their jobs because they can't access child care. Let's face it, right now in parts of this Province, paying between \$1,000 and \$1,500 per month for child care really is a strain on working parents and forcing people out of the labour market or making it difficult to return after having a child. It's not a fair solution to not have access to affordable child care. It impacts our families, as I said, impacts our economy and impacts our growth.

Currently we have 7,850 regulated child care spaces for 30,000 children under the age of five, so that accounts for about 19% of our children. After 12 years, what we've seen is this Government has failed to effectively address the issue of child care and how to help families access those services. They will tell you about a 10 year child care strategy and the number of spaces they have either created or they plan to create. Everyday we are constantly hearing from families and from parents and childcare providers and operators themselves about how very little this strategy has helped to address the issue that they face. Creating spaces without a plan is not the answer to improving child care in our Province. The spaces must be regulated so that we can assure the availability of quality, affordable child care. What we said is that a new Liberal Government would streamline all of the regulations associated with early childhood education so that all child care spaces are provided based on the same set of rules.

Liberals also recognize the value of child care depends on quality. The quality is determined by Early Childhood Educators, ECEs. ECEs in our Province are the lowest paid in the country. What we said as a commitment is that a new Liberal Government will address this by increasing the early learning and child care supplements for Early Childhood Educators in the Province. This will help operators to attract a greater number of qualified individuals to work in those regulated child care spaces contributing and increasing for putting in place better child care. Today in our Province, as I said, we have the second lowest amount of direct program funding to Early Childhood Educators. We will change that and this is the way. Starting in 2017 we would make a commitment that represents \$2.1 million in year two of the mandate, \$4.4 million in the second year, and \$6.6 million in year four, for a total of \$13.2 million which would go towards increasing the wages by \$1 per hour per year for Early Childhood Educators. The Save the Children Action Network says that we get a return of \$7 for every \$1 spent on early childhood education. If you look at what we're saying, that would equate about \$92 million in our Province by 2019. Added to that, Justin Trudeau, the new Prime Minister of Canada, has

committed to creating a new national early learning childhood framework. This is all part of the \$20 billion social infrastructure fund. This is the partnership with the Federal Government. If you support me as Premier of the Province, I will work with the Federal Government to develop that framework and this of course is based on research, evidence based policy, best practices and in consultation with you, the working parents. You deserve a Government that can deliver the better management, the better planning and the stronger leadership on issues like child care in our Province.

### **Question #3 - Health Care -**

The health care system in Newfoundland and Labrador is under incredible strain due to a number of factors including an aging population and poor health determinants. Oftentimes front-line workers in the health care system bear the brunt of this strain mainly as a result of staffing shortages. What concrete actions would an Liberal Government take to improve the health care system for both the patients and those delivering the health care services to the people of this Province? Will you commit to including NAPE in planning and discussions on this work?

### **Response -**

As you know, the demands on our health care system is growing, they're compounding and they are very complex. People are living longer and that longevity is putting pressure on our health care system. Nobody knows that better than front line workers. This is true from a patient perspective in terms of access to care, but also around quality of care. It's true from a human resource perspective when it comes to the care that's needed at the bedside at home and in our communities, but it is also true from a cost perspective where the care and treatment has become much more expensive. The face of health care has changed dramatically in the past 15 years. We have the fastest aging population in Canada. By 2025, 25% of our population will be seniors. Just 15 years ago we had 90,000 school aged children and 60,000 seniors. Well, today that is the exact opposite. While our working population is declining, those with the most complex health care needs are increasing. Changing demographics and where people are living longer leads to greater pressure on our health care system, but also greater demands on our health care workers. We need to deliver health care in a better way so that we can help alleviate that pressure. It's important that we address both the system and the need for outcome based care, but as well as how well we take care of the people who are taking care of patients. There are many opportunities to apply evidence based decision making and bring those essential improved outcomes.

In addition to our aging population, we have some of the worse health outcomes in our country and that's why last year we announced our vision for a better health care. As was mentioned in the introduction by Jerry I spent over 30 years in health care but more important than my experience in health care is the amount of dialogue and communication that I've had with front line workers over the last four years. The vision includes a youth wellness program to establish healthier lifestyles, a diabetes prevention and management program, and a diabetes database - that information is very key to making decisions for our health care workers - a mental health strategy, a dementia management program, a health promotion strategy, expanding the youth of primary health care teams, and introducing a chronic disease prevention and long care management plan. I am also pleased to announce that this summer our commitment to building a new mental health facility to replace the Waterford Hospital, a facility that was built in the mid 1800s, so health care professionals have told me there is enough money in the system, we just need to do a better job of managing it, the outcome focus, and be more proactive in our thinking. It was with that focus we announced that in home healthy assessment for seniors age 70 and over that I just mentioned. The program itself, by the way, would pay for just preventing 160 of the 1,200 falls that happen on an annual basis in our Province. Improving outcomes for

patients and spending our health care dollars in a more effective way is important but it also helps take care of our front line workers. We need to create the work environment that promotes a better quality of life because you are the caregivers that are the very core of our health care system. You deserve the predictability in your jobs, the opportunity to plan for family time and personal time. Things that are important to all of us. We know that's not what's happening today with the ongoing challenges of staffing shortages. With that comes fatigue, with that what we see is increased absenteeism, this impacts patient care.

For 12 years now this Government has failed to develop human resources plan that I just mentioned, and only in the last few weeks have we seen discussion around this. We are committed to working with front line workers to develop a plan that works for you. This must be a moving plan that evolves with the demands of the complexities in our health care system. In factors in demographics, in factors in geography, forecasting human resource needs for our health care system, so that you can make the informed career choices. This will give us as a Government a better return on investment in health care, and gives you more permanency and a better work life balance. I am asking NAPE, and we have had early discussions with many front line workers on this, so I am asking you to work with us on this so that together we can create those conditions for an outcome focused health care system that is better for patients and provides better health care services. We are beyond providing those services that you are also the advocates for our patients. We hear from workers who often tell us about, not about what's happening at your job during the day, but the impact it is having on patients. Working with you we can find those solutions and we can bring them around to better health care prevention as well. As I guess the only leader who truly has hands on experience in health care, I know just how important it is for us to be working with groups such as yours. Under my leadership, absolutely we will include NAPE in the planning and discussion around improvements in our health care system.

#### **Question #4 - Privatization -**

If elected, will you commit to protecting public services from privatization? In your answer, we would expect that you be specific to a full range of public services, not just health care, including such as those as the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation or education.

#### **Response -**

First of all, let me say emphatically Liberals will protect the services from privatization and these are services that we believe should be delivered publicly. We know that you are concerned about what Paul Davis and his Government has done, or is planning to do, or would like to do, with the 30 year commitment to privatize long term care. We're concerned about that as well. Nobody can say, just look around this room and look at this stage for that matter, nobody can say that the baby boom is a surprise. We have seen this coming for years, but they had 12 years to deal with this and there has been a complete lack of planning for where we are. We have seen that with the opening of the new long term care site in St. John's where there was a full wing that couldn't get opened after seven years simply because there were no workers to work there in the wing. Added to that we have also seen poor planning with extensions to the long term care site in Corner Brook because the beds were not built in the beginning to allow for what was needed when the place was opened. This clearly is an example of bad management, poor management and poor planning. So what happens, how did Davis respond to this? Really, what I saw was a complete admission of failure of his plans so he turned it over, would like to turn it over to a private operator, to build, own and operate a long term care site. This would allow complete control into the private sector, the cost of care, the level of care and even the location. Then the Deputy Premier, Steve Kent, came on to say they don't know the exact cost of their plan to privatize long term care, but he went on to say they were confident that it will save money. To date, we have not seen anything publicly that would

support that level of confidence. This attitude of trust us, not only alienates us as a Liberal party but obviously has been quite concerning to people in this room today, and many other people, I would say, around this Province as well. If it will save money, all I've said is put it out there. We're informed, you guys are informed, you would understand if there is indeed a savings there. They have yet to produce one shred of evidence. Liberals will protect the publicly delivered services.

I do want to talk about where we see partnerships second play a valuable role with communities, things like assets within communities, things like crown land, so you can use that crown land to work with our communities for economic development. These are partnerships with communities, partnerships with industries, and we will talk about how we partner with an industry, things like broadband and cell phone services, those types of things, and even partnerships with you. Much of the experience required for the solutions that are needed in health care exist in people like you in this room. There is also a place for partnerships in infrastructure projects like cell phone coverage, as an example. These are usually community and industry driven so these are the types of infrastructure projects where we believe we can create that level of partnerships.

With the Waterford there have been some concerns and questions about how do you really see the Waterford, \$325 million, where would that money come from in these challenging times. What we said we were hoping for, a performance based infrastructure projects, but what we would do is an assessment on the two options, the traditional approach and the performance based approach. This would be put out their publicly where the cost would be, but keep in mind all services inside those walls would be delivered by public sector workers, so that's the only difference. This is a commitment we made to start construction in 2017. We know that mental health is a huge priority in our Province, one of five people are struggling with mental illness and this, in my opinion, is not something that isn't nice to have, a building that was built in the mid 1850s is something that must be replaced. It adds, I will say when I talked about the economic benefits, \$749 million in economic cost associated with mental illness in our Province. These are not our numbers, these are numbers from the Canadian Mental Health Association. It's a facility that would cost \$325 million and certainly in a dire need to be replaced, but doing so, keep in mind, if there's one message that comes out of this today, is that we will be open and transparent with the information that will not be kept from the people of our Province when the decision is made on how we move forward.

The question that you asked Jerry on the NLC, right now that's a huge contributor to the budget of our Province, in excess of \$50 million, so quite frankly I have never put any thought into putting an asset that is contributing that kind of revenue to the Province and selling that off. That's not a discussion that we've had.

I guess I will conclude those remarks, and I'm sure we're getting close to our time now, ensuring that we have a strong public sector is important to the Province and to our people. We're not going to jeopardize those front line jobs and the services that you deliver. We will protect the public services from privatization.

F. Pittman (7001) stated I know this is not a question and answer period but while Mr. Ball is in the room, I would just like to put a bug in his ear, and I think that it's great that he's doing the Waterford Hospital for our employees who work down there in archaic conditions, I think it's great that he has committed to do that. I will say to him, I'm a retired Correctional Officer, in 1850 that building was built down there. I've been on two cross country tours and went to prisons from Newfoundland to BC in the last eight years. Commitment that they would build a new penitentiary - it has not happened. What those Correctional Officers, and even the

inmates themselves, I will even pick up for the inmates, got to live in down there and work in is unbelievable. I'll say to Mr. Ball, I don't know if he ever took a tour, if he's ever been down there, but I will personally take him around anytime. But I'm going to tell you right now, that penitentiary is an absolute disgrace for anyone to have to work in or live in - absolute disgrace. Something has to be done. In all things now, Mr. Ball will take power, the way things are looking, no doubt about it, and I'm going to tell you right now on his watch, if something is not done down there, we're going to have a major disaster, we're going to have a Correctional Officer killed, we're going to have inmates killed, and I'm going to tell you we need to do something about it. I just stand here to put that bug in his ear. I don't expect him to answer but I tell you what, that man when he takes power, something got to be looked at down there and we have to do something to protect all of us.

D. Ball stated thank you for the question. As you go around the Province, we are certainly very much aware of the state of that prison. I am certainly not happy with it either, but before I stand in front of the mic and make huge major commitments, I have to know that it is something that we can deliver and we can deliver on a timely basis. I know the issue. I am very familiar with it, and I do understand the complexity and you know when you look at somebody announcing that we've seen federally, of course I'm going to push and try and work with a new federal Government to get a better understanding and make sure that those are in place. It is a priority for us, but I'm not going to stand up at any mic and make commitments and put expectations up there, 39 days in front of an election, that you can't deliver. That's not how I'm made, it's not who I am. If I say things, I can guarantee you, my handshake and my word means a lot. I do understand the priority. I understand, as most people in this room, is that when you make such commitments you better be able to deliver them and I want to be honest with you, I understand where things are, the conditions and the work environment down there, and how serious those things are. We do know that we live within budgets and we make those decisions but it is a priority for us and it is something that is on our agenda to be working with the federal Government on. I appreciate your question, thank you.

J. Earle stated I just want to say one thing. Thank you to Mr. Ball for doing that, but as we committed to all three of the Party leaders is that we would not be posing questions from the floor to put them on the spot. We didn't advise the Leader that would be happening so I'm not going to feel any further questions or comments. After any of the party leaves, then you are welcomed to make any comments to the Convention, but not to put any leader on the spot. It's just those four specific questions that we told them.

F. Pittman (7001) stated it wasn't meant in anyway and I thank him for his response and honesty. It wasn't meant, it was just for me to put a bug in his ear, don't forget. That's all it was.

## SECOND CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

K. Roche opened up the floor for second call for nominations.

### **General Vice President**

Nominated: Nil.

### **Eastern Vice President**

Nominated: Nil.

**Eastern Area Board Member**

Nominated: Nil.

**Central Vice President**

Nominated: Nil.

**Central Area Board Member**

Nominated: Kristal Rice (4206)

**Western Vice President**

Nominated: Marie Lodge (1853)

**Western Area Board Member**

Nominated: Nil.

**Region 5 Board Member**

Nominated: Nil.

**Region 6 Board Member**

Nominated: Robert Thomas (6237)  
Aiden Donahue (6208)

**Region 7 Board Member**

Nominated: Nil.

**Region 3 Board Member**

Nominated: Sheldon Rideout (4301)

**Region 4 Board Member**

Nominated: Nil.

**Region 9 Board Member**

Nominated: Nil.

**Region 1 Board Member**

Nominated: Nil.

**Region 2 Board Member**

Nominated: Nil.

**Region 8 Board Member**

Nominated: Nil.

E. Hann (7104) stated Local 7104 would like to make a donation to the Kids Eat Smart Program.

LUNCH BREAK

The Convention broke for lunch at 11:45 a.m. and reconvened at 1:30 p.m.

B. Blundon called the Convention back to order.

G. Beazley (5205) stated I would like to donate a cheque to the Kids Eat Smart Program on behalf of my Local.

C. Henley (7001) stated I'm not a delegate so I ask for permission to speak. I'm here really because one of the groups that I represent is the Public Service Credit Union and they, I would suggest, have done a lot for Union members for a long period of time. They are part of the Credit Union process. They have a document that they passed out on every table here today asking that people would consider them as the bank for their banking institution as your choice. We ask that you would give them consideration when you go back to your workplaces and have other people give them consideration. After all, they are our brothers and sisters, members of this Union, and we would like to see they get some support. Thank you.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES REPORT

Cynthia Thorne (7104) - Committee Chairperson - stated I want to introduce members of our Committee - Gloria Peddle (5853), Brian Abbott (6236), Walter Meadus (6901), Krista Newell (6207) and Jimmy Lacey (Advisor).

Report of the President

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Report of the General Vice President

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Report of the Eastern Vice President

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Report of the Western Vice President

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Report of the Eastern Area Board Member

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Report of the Central Area Board Member

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Report of the Western Area Board Member

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Report of the Region 1 Board Member

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Report of the Region 2 Board Member

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Report of the Region 3 Board Member

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Report of the Region 4 Board Member

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Report of the Region 5 Board Member

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Report of the Region 6 Board Member

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Report of the Region 7 Board Member

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Report of the Region 8 Board Member

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Report of the Region 9 Board Member

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Report of the Constitution Committee

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Report of the Education Committee

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Report of the Environment and OH&S Committee

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Report of the Health and Insurance Committee

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Report of the Legislation Committee

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

Report of the Pensions Committee

CONCURRENCE.

## DISCUSSION:

R. Morris (7002) stated I rise in support of the Committee's recommendation of acceptance of this Report. It's nice to see that the Pensions Committee, since our last Convention, has been fairly active with NAPE because for a couple of years we were doing very little and coming in here with little or no report on what the activities were for the year. I guess we have now changed and we're going to continue on with this. Pensions to everybody in here is a very important issue, and I think you should take the time to read down through this and look at some of the recommendations that are being made, or suggestions that are being made, by the Committee in relation to education of our members and the pension benefits that they receive. I, in my different fields of working with retirees and pensioners, almost daily get questions from people who are either ready to retire to have some interest in the Pension Plans themselves wanting to know where they go for information and how they go about it and all of those types of things. Of course, it is all readily available through different sources, through Government websites and your Union, but all too often people don't know the ramifications of looking for things or giving up things that they have. One thing I will caution you on, and it seems that more and more people who are ready to go on pension today are calling up and asking should I take the commuted value of my pension. My answer to them is don't do it unless you're absolutely sure that you're going to be able to live without that pension and you're going to get enough in the commuted value to carry you until the day that you die. One other thing to remember in relation to commuting your pension and that is you do not have the group life insurance or the medical insurance that you would have if you had your pension. All of those things are issues that need to be discussed. I notice that the Committee, and I am part of that Committee, and we're recommending that NAPE make this part of their educational programs, particularly their Level III Shop Steward, so that they can direct people on where to go for information. I think educating your Stewards and Officers of this Union and sending them in a direction as to where they can go to find that information is a very important part of your retirement and I urge you to support this Committee's Report. Thank you very much for your time.

T. Kelly (BofD) (Chairperson - Pensions Committee) stated I rise, first of all, to thank Brother Ralph Morris for his words and I'm standing behind him on those. I want to thank the Committee and anybody who had input and helped us in this Report. It's so important to look back and see where these benefits came from over the years, and they are not to be taken for granted. You know we've gone through a lot over the past year or so with our Union leading the way practically, and practically sewing up a much better Pension Plan for our members.

These are things that are not to be taken for granted. They were fought for by people before us, myself or Ralph and others. When you look in here and see some of the recommendations, especially the education component, that's so crucial today. By supporting these recommendations and making sure that the Union goes ahead with these sorts of things and we build that website together with the links that provide you with the information for such basic things as terms and definitions, some of them are so important in understanding your own pension plan and those of the workers around you who may need at times. We've also made recommendations to have, as soon as possible when these things get off the ground, to update the booklet which exists. These are the kinds of issues that get put by the sidelines if you don't put the pressure on to get things changed. It's a very complicated issue. It's nothing that can be taken lightly. It takes a lot of work and understanding to develop the proper way to go forward with this. I just hope that you see the need for us and recommend that you support it. Thank you very much.

J. Earle assumed the Chair.

B. Blundon (BofD) stated I echo Ralph's comments when he said that it might appear that we know a fair bit about pensions, but it's easy to look like an expert when very few people around us know a whole lot about pensions. I think we brought a lot of expertise to bear, particularly in the last couple of years, and I would like to remind delegates here, it's not directly on the report, but we made a major accomplishment over the last two years gaining control of our Pension Plan. For those of us who believe that somehow your Pension Plans weren't under severe threat, maybe you should look around the Country. Before Rachael Notley in Alberta was elected, there was legislation tabled to move mandatory retirement age to 65. We only need to look in Quebec where Uniformed Services Officers, Police Officers, were actually out demonstrating in the streets because the Legislature had threatened to change their Pension Plan. Now we can move much closer to home in PEI where, after some efforts by our sister Union, to influence the decisions of how their pension plan was affected, that Government moved to the Legislature to unilaterally change their Pension Plans. And of course in New Brunswick where our sister Union spent considerable time trying to negotiate the adverse effects of the Plan with some success. I tell you, you don't need to move too far from home for those of us who believe that pension plans were somehow in jeopardy. You look at the City of St. John's you may recall, only a year or so ago, where after a long round of bargaining with our sister Union CUPE implemented a Defined Contribution Plan and over time eliminated the Defined Benefit Pension Plan, which most of you in this room enjoy. You go to Mount Pearl, the fellow who is running for election now, Mayor Randy Simms said come on, let's call a spade a spade, that the City of St. John's give a significant increase because they give up their Pension Plan, but what he didn't say, in the City of Mount Pearl that they too unilaterally invoked a similar form but without consultation with the Union reduced pension benefits and increased premiums. And the latest, you may recall, is in Labrador City, where Wabush Mines closed down and there is some concern now whether pension plans are going to be maintained in the Union and is continuing to fight on behalf of their members in Wabush Mines. I need not remind you about Nortell, who when they went bankrupt the pensioners now, you're last of the creditors at the back of the bus, may only receive 50 to 60 cents on the dollar that they are owed. I can go on and on across this Country where pension plans have been attacked.

I say what we did in this Province is a remarkable feat. It's been held up now across the Country as the first major impact or fightback that was successful against the erosion pensions. I'm not going to go through all the details, but you may recall we negotiated \$2.685 billion to be placed in the Public Service Pension Plan. We went further, over 30 years, we demanded an interest rate, a guaranteed interest rate at 6%. I get amazed with people like Paddy Daley who appears to be somewhat fiscally mindful when he takes \$195 million and says oh, it's only

\$2.685 billion and forgets to multiply \$195 by 30 years, I think you'll come up with a much larger number, well over \$6 billion. You factor in the amount of money we have been successful in the last ten years, you may recall the Atlantic Accord where we got almost a billion dollars placed into the Public Service Pension Plan. You add up all of those numbers and since my term of office and out to the next 25 or 30 years, we will have negotiated close to \$10 billion to be placed in the Public Service Pension Plan on your behalf. Not only have we had substantial contributions but we've also developed a way that if we can perform in the sense of investment rates and what not, that we have some control over what happens to those investment returns if we move into surplus positions. Theoretically we own half of those surpluses. We only have some say in contribution rates going forward. Government can't, because we're now joint partners, Government can't increase contributions or reduce benefits without our consent, whereas before we were subject obviously to the whims of the Legislature and the whims of the politics of the day. I think it's really important as we move out into the future, when we are now facing major deficits in this Province, that Government now because of the efforts we made, can't attack your pension plan, they can't increase your premiums, and they can't reduce your benefits.

I say to you, there is another pending problem with our pension plans. We have our Uniformed Services Pension Plan who we haven't yet entered into discussions with. Hopefully, using the model that we used before we can come to some satisfactory conclusion in that too. I tell you it seems to have fallen off the agenda about the MHA Pension Plans. Somehow there is no need during this election to talk about pension plans anymore and how we're going to make MHA pension plans more fair to the taxpayer and by comparison, to the people who deliver public services. I have no problem with MHAs or politicians getting pensions, but I do have a problem when you're asked to make some sacrifices to preserve your plan when they're not stepping up to the plate and say we have to do the same thing. I think one of the things that we have to get back on the agenda during this election campaign is to make sure that politicians understand that we don't want them treated any better than we are and we don't want them treated any worse than we are either. Fairness is fairness. Equity is equity. I ask you all to stand up and protect pension plans as we move forward and force our Federal Government to deal with Old Age Security, to deal with the Canada Pension Plan and bring in some of the recommendations so that some of us who don't have Defined Benefits Pension Plans can enjoy some standard of living when they retire in their future years. Thank you.

CARRIED.

#### Report of the Women's Issues Committee

CONCURRENCE. CARRIED.

J. Earle stated thank you very much Committee for your work.

Sisters and brothers as we indicated earlier, it is my pleasure to welcome the Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador, Paul Davis, to address our Convention. Mr. Davis is the 12<sup>th</sup> Premier of our Province. He was elected to the House of Assembly in 2010 by an election in the District of Topsail and was re-elected in 2011 Provincial election. He has served as the Minister of Health and Community Services, Minister of Child Youth and Family Services, Minister of Transportation and Works, and Minister of Service NL. Before entering politics he was a Media Relations Officer with the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, as we know as the RNC, and the Deputy Mayor of Conception Bay South. Please join with me in welcoming the Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador to our Biennial Convention.

PREMIER PAUL DAVIS, LEADER - NL PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY

Good afternoon, thank you Jerry very much for having me join you today and it's great to be back in such a warm room. As you know in a couple of weeks from now we will be heading into a general election. My platform and our platform will be grounded on two simple words - leadership and hope. In terms of leadership, I believe I am taking a fresh approach. That's what I wanted to do. My background, like yours, is in the front line, the front line of public service, and I stepped forward, just like you have in your own organization, to change the system, to make improvements, to make things better. Your vehicle of change is NAPE. My vehicle of change is Government, and we will get the Province that we want because we all want a better Province, and only when we work together as partners. I've just started in the short time that I've been in this office. I'm ready to break the mold to try new things, to fix what's broken and to build on the kind of society that all of us want to see and have wanted to see for a very long time. I believe we are all looking for the same thing. To me, leadership means partnership because you're not really a leader if you're by yourself and stand alone. You have to be a partner, you have to have people around you. That partnership is a foundation on which we will raise the four pillars of a better society.

The first pillar of my campaign will be on health care and when and where we need it, mental health as a priority and access to food and fitness and healthy lifestyles for all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. The second pillar is on opportunity - investing and employment growth, investing in small business and rural enterprise, looking for better ways and opportunities for innovation and new things that create jobs within the public service and in private business. The third pillar is about people, it's about families, it's about child care and education, it's about apprenticeships, it's about affordability housing, it's about long term care, it's about community living for seniors and it's about poverty reduction. The fourth pillar in our platform will be on the economy - a progressive fiscal plan that doesn't involve deep cuts - deep cuts as we've seen in the past, deep cuts as the Liberals have called for - but for protection of public servants, protection of public service, shoring up your pension plans, putting aside a generation fund for our children, ratcheting down our debt so that we can shift money from interest payments to front line public service and the services that you deliver. Health, opportunity, people and the economy - and what that spells is HOPE - hope for our Province and hope for our future. Here's a plan that all of us can believe in and work together to achieve.

Let's talk about the short term, right now today, for a few minutes. You can trust me to have your back as public servants and public employees. We've had a tough year together fiscally, it's been probably one of the toughest years that we've had in decades. As a matter of fact, when I put my hand up to take over the leadership, I had as many people say to me, my God what are you doing, why would you put yourself in that position because you can't win? But I said, yes I will and others encouraged me to do it and how do we handle that, and how do we do it and what are we going to do? Well, that's all part of the work that we're doing. You've heard in the House of Assembly and you've heard publicly and every step we've taken you've heard the Liberals chastising us for how we've invested public funds and the demands that we have to cut, to be more efficient and more effective. You've heard those comments. You had to listen really carefully to some of the things they've said. I've said, no we're not doing that, that's not our way and that's not my way of doing business. I knew exactly what such a course would do to our economy, to our people and what it would do to you. I've drawn a lot of flack from Dwight Ball, and I've drawn a lot of flack from Cathy Bennett, for the stand that we've taken and the decisions we've made. They talk about waste, they talk about public employees needing to work harder, they've insulted you and the work that you do when they talk about inefficiencies in Government and how this or that doesn't happen, they're talking about you when they talk about that. I've stood my ground and I continue to speak highly and respectful

of our public service and I will continue to stand and fight for the service that is delivered, not delivered by Government, but delivered by you.

My approach is a long term one. It's a long term plan for fiscal health and sustainability, a plan that will bring us step by step to surplus in a reasonable period of time while still protecting public services and securing jobs for public employees like the people who are in this room, and the people you represent. My background, my history, my record is really no mystery. We live our policies and our decisions every single day. However, the Liberals, they won't tell you what they're planning. They like to talk in concepts and ideas. They will tell you we overspent on infrastructure. They will tell you we overspent in many ways, but they won't say what school they wouldn't have built. They won't say what hospitals they would not have upgraded, what equipment they wouldn't have purchased. They won't say which roads they would have ignored and they won't say what employees they would have cut. They've admitted that they would cut programs; they just won't say which ones they will cut until they see the books. Well, the books are open. The only thing hidden is the full truth about what the Liberal agenda really looks like. If it was good news that they had, they would just simply tell you, and they would let you know, but they're not telling us. You can mark my words that if the Liberals are elected on November 30<sup>th</sup> it won't be sunny skies for Newfoundland and Labrador; we've seen that movie before. The first thing the Liberals in this Province will do once elected is to start a process to pinch every penny that goes to every valuable service that we've grown and developed together in the last decade or so. Come March in their first budget when tough choices have to be made, and they always have to be tough choices during budget time, I will tell you now the axe will fall and you could take that one to the bank. The axe will fall. You will find out at that point in time which of your members, which of your public services, are on that list and on that chopping block. Now think about the old faces that you're seeing in the Liberal party; think about the old faces in the back rooms. The ones that had influence back in the 90s and many of you remember that. They're the ones who are driving the Liberal party, they are the ones who are driving the Liberal plan, they are the ones who took on the Nurses. Do you remember those days and they said Nurses will never forget. They are the ones who orchestrated Bill 16 and used the iron fist of Government in the Legislature, and what they do, they shred collective agreements that you negotiated. Now they're back and they've found allies in the front benches of the Liberal party and you're hearing all of the buzz words that got tossed around when the axe was being raised before, the same old buzz words are back - We need to be more frugal. We need to spend wiser. We need to reign in our debt. We need to weed out programs. We need to halt growth and funding. We need to make Nurses work harder. Now, Cathy Bennett has even gone so far as to say that they haven't decided what part of Government they are going to eliminate until they get into Government.

I realize that many people in this room are closer aligned with the NDP. I get that and I understand that and I respect that. I know that the NDP is near and dear to your hearts, and I respect that. But there is a real threat on the horizon, a real threat for public services on the horizon. You're facing a real enemy. I can tell you that enemy is not me. I'm your ally in this fight and if you're absolutely determined to prevent the fights from Dwight Ball and Cathy Bennett, the Liberals, that they're forecasting and suggesting in their own, if you're absolutely determined to protect our public services and members of NAPE who deliver them, then this is the election when you have to think and vote strategically. I may not be orange or a member of the New Democratic Party, but you know my background, you know my record, and it's no secret, it's not kept under wraps, it's not waiting to be unveiled or unleashed somewhere. I've proven what I will do when tough fiscal circumstances happen. You can vote for me with confidence and I'm ready to support you. I will reward you fairly and quickly when we regain fiscal capacity. We will regain fiscal capacity, we will ride out these low times and the better days will come back to us once again. That's not the future that lies behind the red door. Don't

allow Cathy Bennett and the back room policy advisors of Wells and Tobin, who wielded the axe before, because you know back in that room they're sharpening that axe. It will not be a bright and shiny Justin Trudeau morning on December 1<sup>st</sup> when we wake up to these Liberals controlling the purse strings at Confederation Building, it certainly won't be that. It will be cold comfort to say that I told you so or we should have known. It will be too late from preventing the axe from falling. Don't inflict that future on Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, don't inflict that future on your membership. Don't do that.

Let's talk about, and I know it's on the minds of many of you, long term care. Let's talk about that for a few minutes. I'm quite happy to share those thoughts with you. There is an absolute urgent and immediate need for long term care beds in our Province. That's a fact. We have the fastest aging population in the Country. In a few short years we will have the oldest population in the Country. Today, we have significant pressure, we have an immediate need for long term care. We need these long term care for patients who are currently occupying acute care hospital beds. We need to be able to provide long term care so we can move them into more appropriate facilities, and that will free up those hospital beds for those people who need them, those who are lying on stretchers in emergency rooms; those emergency rooms that are putting tremendous pressure on the people who have to work there under those circumstances. It will alleviate the pressure for people who work in health care when you have to tell a patient when they arrive for their procedure, that you have to go home as we don't have a bed for you. The Province is in no fiscal position today to build the facilities to create those beds. That's the clear fact, but we do have a plan to create that beds. In fact, we're the only Party who has talked about a way and means to create those long term care beds, to build capacity for the growing needs for long term care. Our bold plan is going to create 360 new badly needed beds in three regions of the Province. In our plan there is significant opportunities for Unions, opportunities for this Union, for your Union. The other two parties have criticized us for our plan but have not offered any alternative to manage these urgent needs. In the absence of funds available to us that we would need, our plan is to work with private and not-for-profit sector to create those beds and meet the need. Doing nothing, simply doing nothing, which is the decision position of the Liberals, is not a sensible or defensible position. It's easy to criticize us but again, they're not telling us what their plan is. Those new beds will be regulated, just as every other long term care in our Province is regulated today. The care and services offered for those long term care patients will be delivered by health care professionals and it would be at the same standard as is delivered in other long term care facilities. These four new facilities will employ hundreds of additional staff - health professionals, service and administration personnel, hundreds of new jobs, and most of them front line jobs, just like I spent my lifetime working.

Here's my challenge to NAPE and other Unions interested. Get in and organize the workers, I welcome that. Give them the option of joining a labour movement not unlike what happened in Chancellor Park here in St. John's. In fact, Chancellor Park is seen by some as a model as to how this could work and how people could benefit. It's a private operation that partners with Government to provide long term care beds that this Province's seniors need and need very badly. The standards of care there are comparable to the public system and that care is delivered by dues paying professionals who are members of Unions. To sum up, we need beds. Our seniors deserve better care. We can't afford beds the traditional way; we can't afford to build those facilities today, and we are the only party that has come up with a plan to create them. Our plan would create hundreds of jobs, most of which are front line, perfect for Union organizations. There is a win-win here in my view. I believe in supporting public employees who deliver public services in a Unionized environment; I believe in that. You do a remarkable job. I'm proud of our public services and I speak of that on a regular basis. We

need to make sure that the folks at the management level are doing the jobs that they need to do to support you. I'm sure you would probably be among the first to agree to that.

I've worked on the front lines in the public service, 25 years I did, I've served in the public service Union, the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, I was an executive member, I was a member for my whole career, and an executive member when I retired from there. I believe in the collective bargaining process, and I believe in collective bargaining in good faith. I believe in honouring contracts once they are negotiated and agreed to. I know the tough lives that so many front line workers live. I think about snow clearing operators. I think about EMS professionals. I think about every one of them - security guards, health care workers, correctional officers, and so many more. I've worked night shifts. I've done that. I've crawled out of bed early in the morning. I've worked on holidays when it would have been much nicer, and much more pleasant to have been home with my family. Frankly, to be honest with you, I get a little ticked off sometimes when I hear people who joke about public service. I know the general public too often is unkind with public servants, when they talk about public servants have an easy job, you're overpaid, you've got great benefits, and you're underworked. I know that you do not deserve it, that you deserve better. Criticisms sometimes one receives are simply not fair and we have to challenge those and we have to get on with what is the reality and talk the truth in what happens in public service. When the Liberals condemn us about the way our public services are operating and when they say public employees need to work harder, that criticism comes down very hard on each and every one of you. It also gnaws at me. They are so steep in criticism, they can't see the good work that you're doing. That's painful. When they are denying you any credit for the things in the Province that are going right and happening right. When they fail to see how hard you are already working in delivering services. You ought to be more annoyed than I am, but I am sure you are, and you ought to be worried and ought to be concerned.

This morning I had a great pleasure on the waterfront to unveil a new ship and as we toured the new ferry vessel, we talked about, the Minister and I, talked a lot about the accommodations for the employees who are going to have to work on those vessels and they are so much better than what we have had on vessels in the past. We looked at the galley; we looked at the services that are going to be provided, not so much for the public, but for the staff on those vessels. We know that yes, the public will benefit from having new boats and new ferries, but the employees will benefit as well in having better, kinder workplace for them as well.

We are doing everything that we need to be doing. Have we arrived to where we should be? No, we haven't. Absolutely not. We're not there yet. I will be the first to admit that there's a whole lot more that needs to be done. That's why I've stepped forward to take a lead role in making the changes that need to happen. Everyone in this Province is talking about the need for change. Well, I'm talking about that too. I'm doing things differently. I'm building a fresh team. I'm doing away with old models, old models that people are sick and tired of, and I want to find a better approach. I am willing to bring people together like we did at the Health Care Summit when many of your representatives came to this very room to talk about how do we improve health care and how do we make health care better. I'm talking about partnerships. I'm talking about the big tent approach, not where you just come to the table, but where you come in the tent and we come in together. That's how I work. Everyone will tell you that. Others will say, we need you at the table, but we need you more than just at the table, because together we're actually starting to overhaul the way in which we think and the way we do things. There is a better way to find better solutions. We're already breaking the mold in terms of open Government, as just an example. Enough hiding at what Government is, let's tell people. We should be able to tell people about the successes and studies, and also the failures when an idea or a project wasn't successful. We should do that, enough of the hiding, and let's expose

the underbelly of all and let's start fixing things. Just as they did when they were in the last Government, the Liberals seem to be hiding again. If you listen to what they're saying, they're not giving you the details and information. They're pedaling change, but they won't tell you what that change is going to look like. That makes me nervous. That keeps me awake at night. When I talk about change, I'm talking about reshaping Government and the way that we want it to be, the way that you want it to be. It's about serving people. It's about respectful to public servants inside Government and the public outside of Government. We all know here that we can do that. My focus is on building sustainable communities grounded on hope. It's about putting front line workers in the driver's seat and the best interests of our people first. If that is real change that you want, and you think that is a change, then we need to think harder and we need to do it together. Think about when you wake up on December 1<sup>st</sup> and what I ask you to do is vote strategically to make sure that we get to the future that we all want. Save this Province from the kind of change that some are peddling. Stand with me together as public servants. Let's make the change that Newfoundland and Labrador wants and needs. Let's bring about a future that we can all be proud of and let's do it together. Thank you everybody.

### **Question #1 - Economy**

As you are aware, the recent decline in the price of oil coupled with other strains on the provincial economy has had a negative impact on the Province's current fiscal situation. If your Party is elected, what role do you see the public service and the public sector playing in a New Democratic lead Province facing conditions like these? In your answer we would expect you to specifically address cuts to public services, additional revenue streams, upcoming public sector negotiations and diversification of the economy.

### **Response -**

The economy is, in so many ways, connected to every part of Government. When I came here, I don't know what other leaders did or will do, I chose to have a discussion about these questions. When I became Premier last year, when I put up my hand and we needed someone to steer the ship and to direct the ship, and I was asked to consider it and I did, and I put my hand up and I was chosen. When we started last year, one of the first discussions that started was around budget and what are we going to do. The price of oil was crashing and falling, the commodities were suffering and having an impact significantly in Labrador, as well as having a significant impact on revenue of our Province. What a lot of jurisdictions will do, and we've seen this in the past, when you are faced with a tough fiscal challenge, is well where is the easiest way for us to save money. In some of those discussions in the past, as history has shown, is the people have taken the course, let's target salaries. Salaries is about 70% of Government costs. I've chosen not to do that. I said we're not doing that. I worked through those times just like many of you have and I've seen the impacts from inside the public service. As a politician and as a citizen I've seen the impacts outside the public service.

If we go back to the 90s for a couple of minutes, and we all remember the 90s, remember when contracts were axed and cut, remember those days when we went in, I remember going in as a Police Officer saying we will give up this and this and this for this new raise. It was like a dream come true, they're offering us money that we would never think was available to us before. We gave up items in our contract, lots of Unions did that, lots of negotiations have resulted in that. They went into the House of Assembly and they took away those raises. We still lost what we had to give up, we never got that back, but they gave away those raises. Then in 1992 we had the failure of the cod fishery. If you look at all of the economic drivers and economic indicators in 1991 things were going back and the Province was struggling and was moving down like this. In 1992 the cod fishery came along and it kept going like this. In 1993 all of a sudden there was this massive reduction in public service just to right size the budget and the cost of operating Government. What happened next was the economy went like this. The economy

dropped. Not only did the economy drop but morale in the workplace dropped, production dropped. The care that many of you have and the pride that you have in the work that you do on a daily basis dropped and left. Government came to almost a standstill. People were not happy inside Government. People were not happy outside of Government. The economy dropped, values dropped, private businesses started to lay off staff, people stopped spending and Newfoundland and Labrador changed. What I said a year ago was that I'm not doing that. I'm not going to be doing massive layoffs just for the sake of trying to right size the budget; I'm not going to do that. We have to find a way forward. This year we're running a massive deficit and that was a choice that we made because we either reduce our spending or we run a deficit, or we increase our revenues or do some combination of that. At the time we're talking to bond rating agencies, we're talking to our banks, we're talking to our partners, we're talking to people in the Province. We have to try to find a balance. I've said we're not doing massive layoffs.

From a public service perspective, that's a view that I've taken, and we've taken an attrition plan. I know many of you here are not fans of the attrition plan. I've also been criticized by many by saying you should cut public service, and you should do it swiftly and harshly, and get it done and over with, but I don't agree with that obviously. But I've also been criticized for doing the attrition plan that we're doing. As public servants leave, and we know that every year, every month, every week, public servants leave public service either because of retirement, they decide to leave the workplace, or they leave to go to other career opportunities. Our plan is to replace with them a smaller number - eight for ten is what our goal has been, to try and do it in a way that's smooth, it doesn't impact people who are working for the public service, it doesn't have a big crash on our economy, it doesn't create challenges in big crash of communities, it's not that big slam of an axe that I've talked about.

Public sector negotiations - negotiations are always tough. I've sat on your side of the table with public sector negotiations. As I've said, one of the things that has to happen in negotiations, it has to be done in good faith. It has to be done with the belief that we're going to find an end. Sometimes they are hard to do, hard to come by, and hard to accomplish. But we know that when we do reach agreements, that we all benefit.

Diversity of the economy is mentioned here - I'm a huge supporter of diversifying the economy, but as we diversify the economy, we build business, we build capacity and we build need. This week I was in Labrador West and I met representatives from a company called Labrador Rewind, they've spoke publicly so I'm not saying anything they haven't already talked about. When the mining industry turned in Labrador West, they were faced with really tough circumstances, but they didn't want to see their business dry up and blow away like dust. They didn't want to lose their business, so we partnered with them. They saw an opportunity in South America, to bring their business to South America, and today they have an office in Peru, they have an operation in Peru. They are growing a workforce in Labrador West and they are selling their way of doing business, the technology they are using, has been far ahead of where their customers have ever seen in South America before. We did it through our Business, Tourism, and Rural Development Department in supporting that business and growing its markets and growing exports. That's the kind of diversification that we need to do. There are many, many examples of this around the Province. We are leaders in technology; we're leaders in innovation technology in Newfoundland Labrador. We have companies here, you look at Verafin is an example I like to talk about. When you go to a corner store, you go to a bank, or a restaurant, or service or hotel, and you put your card in and use your point of sale machine, there's a good chance that the security feature built into that were designed and built right here in Newfoundland and Labrador. Verafin does business, I think they've now broken 1,000 banks in North America and security software done right here and we've partnered with them as well. That's the kind of diversification that we need to continue. Of course, when businesses do well

and hire more employees, of course Government has to have its level of oversight and integration. Even if we're building these businesses and we're partnering with them, then we need the public service to do that for us as well, and that means you.

### **Question #2 - Child Care**

Lack of high quality, affordable child care is a concern for many families in this Province. It also acts as a barrier to young people, predominantly women, from re-entering the work force. Some are delaying starting a family due to high cost of child care. What would the Progressive Conservative Government do to address this quality, affordable child care?

### **Response -**

When we came into power in 2003, child care was in so many ways, sub-standard in our Province. Child care was, frankly, a mess in Newfoundland and Labrador. We recognize that, and we made two or three attempts very early to improve child care. One was we developed a new department - Child Youth and Family Services, and to get even to that point, there was an enormous amount of study, work and review done on where the system was, how was the system operating when it comes to children and families, and we had to revamp all of that. Then we created a ten year plan on child care. We need to improve child care in Newfoundland and Labrador, it's as simple as all that. We did an extensive consultation process around the Province to find out what was causing that challenges in child care. Not just here in the urban areas, but also in the rural areas, in remote areas as well, and what's the impact of child care, or the lack of child care. Our ten year plan was to develop based on three pillars, and this came from our consultations - one was sufficiency, being enough spaces, or lack of enough spaces; one was on quality, because the quality of child care was not where families and parents want it to be; and thirdly was on affordability, on the direct cost of child care. Under that ten year plan we also made a commitment to double the spending on child care during that ten year period. We are on line with those increases in spending.

On sufficiency, in 2004 there was about 4,500 child care spaces in the Province, and there is just short of 8,000 today. Some of the programs we used funding to do is to create things such as family child care homes. Just recently we made it known that we're expanding our support to family child care homes because they've turned out, there are many success stories throughout the Province when it comes to family child care homes. We've grown a number of spaces, but there is still not enough. We've taken steps to improve the quality. We've done a new Child Care Act, and only did it after extensive consultation throughout the Province, we consulted with parents and families, and child care operators and people working in child care, we consulted with Social Workers and partnered groups and stakeholder groups, to come up with a new Act to improve the quality of child care.

The third thing of course is affordability. There is no doubt that affordability is a challenge for so many families in Newfoundland and Labrador. That's having a big impact, it is really pulling back those reigns of so many families that want to grow the population, they want to have their own families, their own children, but yet they want to pursue their own careers. We've made great strides in the last decade, but we've got more work to do. My platform will show the importance that child care and the work that we need to do in child care in the future.

We've heard through some of the federal platforms what they're going to do, what some of those platforms were around child care. We've heard the \$15 a day child care. We've heard those types of comments. Every time I've heard them, I was very keen to listen to Mr. Mulcair because he always said we're going to partner with the Provinces. That means, we're going to pay. That's simply what that means. Somehow he is going to set up a program and design that we're going to have to pay for. I know in Quebec, and I've met with the Premier of Quebec

and we've talked about child care, and I've talked to the Canadian Premiers about child care, and we know it's a challenge across the country, but we know we have more work to do. Some of those policies like they have in Quebec have been a tremendous challenge for the Province because they've had to take resources from other aspects of Government to utilize for child care. I am fully, fully focused on child care. We have to do more for child care. We have to provide opportunities for people to go to work. We have to continue to assist with non-for-profit groups in certain areas, and if you look into many rural parts, we've had non-for-profit groups come to us and say we want to set up a child care centre. So, they set up an entity, we fund them in doing their business case study, and if their business case study comes back and supports the need for child care as they believe it was, then we even provide financial supports to them to establish a not-for-profit child care in communities. It can happen in neighbourhoods, communities, urban or rural, anywhere in Newfoundland and Labrador, and it's being met with great success. The bottom line is we have more work to do with regards to child care, as well.

### **Question #3 - Health Care -**

The health care system in Newfoundland and Labrador is under incredible strain due to a number of factors including an aging population and poor health determinants. Oftentimes front-line workers in the health care system bear the brunt of this strain mainly as a result of staffing shortages. What concrete actions would a Progressive Conservative Government take to improve the health care system for both the patients and those delivering the health care services to the people of this Province? Will you commit to including NAPE in planning and discussions on this work?

### **Response -**

The simple answer is yes. When I talk about my history as a front line worker, and I can tell you from my own background, I remember the days of Friday afternoon, finishing up a work week and out comes the directives and memos that say on Monday morning you're now going to do your task this way, we're going to change how we do business, or tomorrow when you do a certain process you're going to change how you do that. It was always a problem for me because I felt like, why didn't they come and ask the people who actually have to do the job how you can make improvements. Why don't you come and ask me how there's a better way to do a certain task in my day to day life as a public servant, because I've got some ideas myself of how my job could be improved or how I could get better performance or do better work and be a better workplace for me and create better outcomes. I believe in that. I believe in partnerships as I've talked about at the Health Care Summit that we held in January. The room was full and we had 300 people from around the Province. It was a well organized day. Every table had a note taker and a facilitator. What we did was, every note taker had their laptop, and they were feeding what discussions were coming from each topic and they were fed to a central location at the back of the room and they were grasping what were the big level ideas and concepts that were coming from all of the tables around the room. We then brought them back in and put them on screens and everyone had their voting device and then had a discussion about the options and people could vote and indicate how they felt about those options. It was a beneficial and worthwhile process. It was a lot of work. It's a lot of work to be consultative. It's a lot of work to ask people for their views and opinions and try to develop concepts and solutions from those views. But it is worthwhile work. I fully believe it is worthwhile to do that.

We talked to health care providers, we even improved emergency rooms and wait times in emergency rooms. We've taken steps to do that and we have. Are we where we would like to be? No, we are not. We've got some of the shortest wait times now with hip and knee replacement. We talk about our aging population, because aging population and hip and knee

replacements go hand in hand. When you have an aging population, you're going to have those kinds of surgeries and services that are needed. We have among the shortest wait time today for hip and knee replacement. We've got one of the best cardiac programs anywhere in North America. I would put our cardiac program here in St. John's against any cardiac program anywhere in North America, and we've vested in partnership with Vale and their Unions, who contributed as well, to a new cath lab. When we toured it last year for the first time, and Sean Connors, who is the doctor in charge, was telling me how it's about a \$10 million investment combined between Government, the Union, and Vale itself, with brand new best technologies available anytime. It reminded me of a child when I use to go in a garage where all the fan belts were hanging on the wall, that's what it looked like in the cath lab. Sean was telling me that we have three new Cardiologists that have come to Newfoundland and Labrador because of the investments in that equipment. Over in the corner was a young guy, and I said my God, he's a kid, he looked like he was sixteen, and he told me he was one of the finest recent graduates in the Country. He came to Newfoundland and Labrador because he liked the idea to live here and he also came for the technology. That's the kind of strategic developments that benefit patients, but it also helps us grow to capacity and bring those new young technically trained doctors and specialists and experts to Newfoundland and Labrador.

I talked about long term care at some length before so I won't go to that one again. Today, our geography is so large and we have people in rural communities and remote communities that need health care. We can't have every service in every area. We all know that, but we've got about three dozen hospital services throughout our Province for half a million people. If you go to Hamilton, I think they have two for roughly the same population. We are strained on health care budgets. We are strained on providing all of those services. But we have more doctors in Newfoundland and Labrador than we've ever had before. We just invested heavily to add to Memorial's Med School, one of the most technically advanced medical schools, training facilities, anywhere in North America. We've increased the number of doctors that are being trained there by one-third and we are focusing on those extra doctors, those extra spaces, for rural Newfoundland and Labrador. That's going to go a long way to benefit rural Newfoundland and Labrador and to keep people there which we have to support to do and we have to keep people living the rural parts of our Province. As well, we are increasing nurses training. We have to do that as well because we know that we have a significant pressure when it comes to nursing as well. We all know that the variety of expertise and skills that are needed to run hospitals and deliver health care are critical, and we have to have the best people. We are working towards that. We are working with our University, we are working with training facilities, and we want that. We also recognize that the forty cents on every dollar spent in Government is spent on health care, and it is tremendous pressure.

#### **Question #4 - Privatization -**

If elected, will you commit to protecting public services from privatization? In your answer, we would expect that you be specific to a full range of public services, not just health care, including such as those as the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation or education.

#### **Response -**

The Newfoundland Liquor Corporation comes up from time and time and I don't really know where it came from because I've never suggested privatizing NLC for Newfoundland and Labrador, and I don't agree with privatizing NLC. You mentioned other than health care, but our hospitals have to be delivered by public services, there are no two ways about it. Our hospital care and surgeries and acute care absolutely has to be delivered by public servants. We have great public servants. I mentioned earlier about snow clearing, I think about them all of the time, especially when the snow falls. People criticize snow clearing so often. We have about 600 pieces of heavy equipment around our Province and we have about 10,000 kms of

road and our public servants do a very good job of keeping our roads open in very difficult circumstances. To be frank, we don't do enough of telling them that, because they work in very difficult circumstances, the worse and harshest conditions, ice rubbing off the side, you can't see for fog. I've been on those, and they are tough conditions, and I know what it's like to work night shifts. When the public are coming to you and saying I want more and I want it now, and you know you're under a tough time, I get all of that. Public service is critical to Newfoundland and Labrador. There's no two ways about it. What I see my job doing is providing the best opportunities for public servants to be the best they can be. Can we be everything to everybody? The public knows we can't provide every service and every need and solve every problem for every one of the public; we simply can't do it. But as a Government and as a Premier we have to look at ways to make you the best that you can be. I know you're all proud of the work you do and I'm proud of the public service as well. We need to maintain the public services. There's a critical role for public services in our Province. A lot of the good things that happen that I sometimes get to announce only happens because of the public service, and it only happens because someone comes into my boardroom, or sits with the Minister or sits with a Director around a table, and says I got an idea, why don't you do it this way. How often does that come from public servants? Lots of times. Public servants for me is a critical part of our Government, our critical part of our Province. You live in all areas of Newfoundland and Labrador. You earn your income there. You raise your families there. You drive your community there. You contribute to your communities. You're softball coaches and beaver leaders and soccer coaches; you do all those things in the communities that we need for communities and you're all contributors. I fully believe in a strong public service and one that you could be the best you can be.

Thank you very much. I appreciate being here with you and I wish you well in your deliberations and again, thanks for having me this afternoon.

J. Earle stated thank you very much.

It is a great pleasure to introduce your closing speaker for this afternoon. I would like to take this opportunity to welcome our keynote speaker to our Convention. Diana Gibson is a Political Economist who has authored and co-authored many publications on economic and industry policy in resource richest jurisdictions. She has been on Faculty with Campbell College in Alberta. She is the President of the Canadians for Tax Fairness and a Research Advisor for both the Canadian Centre for Alternative Policies and the University of Alberta's Parkland Institute. Diana is no stranger to our Province having been here on numerous times talking about a range of issues that matter most to the working people in the Province. Diana is here today to talk about the perils of privatization and public private partnerships with specific reference to the Canadian experience with privatization agenda. Please join me in welcoming Sister Diana Gibson to our convention.

#### GUEST SPEAKER - DIANA GIBSON, CANADIAN CENTRE FOR POLICY ALTERNATIVES

Hello sisters and brothers. I'm super happy to be here. I love being in Newfoundland and Labrador and I love being in groups of labour activists. It's my place. I am really honoured to be part of your convention; it's an exciting convention.

On privatization, when pushing for the Champlain Bridge P-3, a Minister said "and the taxpayers won't pay a cent". P-3, a bridge, so of course it's going to be paid for by tollbooths. That person when they drive up to the tollbooth is suddenly not a taxpayer. What are they? This too encapsulates the debate about privatization. It's about the Government offloading costs onto the backs of us. It's about the Government taking an easy out, short term hiding of costs

instead of facing the hard realities of the challenges of delivering this service and infrastructure the citizens need.

I thought I would talk in the beginning about demonizing privatization, but I sort of feel like that has happened a lot. I do need to go through some of the data because I think it will be helpful for you in fighting that battle, but I want to turn a little bit about what the alternatives are. One of the things that is really important is that we all know that we're stronger together than as individuals out in the market. That's partly why we form Unions. I mean, one of many great reasons why we form Unions. It's the same for what taxes are. Taxes are the way we pull our resources to buy services cheaper. One of the reasons why the Government can get away with offloading costs onto individuals is because Government and taxes have been so demonized by the conservative movement. They shouldn't be demonized. How many people here go to bulk purchasing stores? The reason why we go and buy in bulk is because it's cheaper. That's what our taxes are. They're the way we put our money together to bulk purchase health care, roads, mail service delivery, prisons, whatever it is that we need to pay for as a group of citizens, it's cheaper for us to get together and pay for it. That's the same for negotiated. You know, if you walk into the employer's office, as an individual without a Union, and said I want to negotiate benefits, they'd laugh you out of the room. But you go in as a group and say we want to negotiate benefits, they have to talk to you. But if one individual says if you don't talk to me, I'm not going to work tomorrow. Then they will say, have a nice time. We know we're more powerful as a group when negotiating. That's what Government and taxes are about. They're the way we, as citizens, work together to purchase our resources and services and to manage quality and cost.

I want to talk a little about public spending here in Newfoundland and Labrador and in Canada. You'll hear a lot about how we can't afford the public sector. You guys hear that lately? You hear a lot and have heard in this Province for a long time now that they can't afford the public services. You had cuts in budget after budget, you talk attrition, but the reality shows you Canada, in terms of spending to the size of the economy, we are slowly behind Portugal, Greece, Ireland, Hungary. This tells you we are well below the (OECD) Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development average, but that's international developed economies. We're almost at the bottom. Basically, in terms of developed economies, we are basically at the bottom. We should be ashamed of ourselves. Newfoundland and Labrador sits at the bottom of Canada. One of the lowest spenders in one of the lowest spenders in terms of the size of your economy. What this tells you, before I demonize privatization, I just wanted to give you a sense that when you're being told over and over, we have no choice, we support the public sector, we really value our public sector employees, but we're going to have to lay you off, we have no choice, it is a choice. It is an ideological choice, not an economic choice.

Profits vs wages - this is another important piece of the alternatives puzzle. What you see on this graph is wages as a portion of Canada's economy. Right beside it is wages as a portion of Newfoundland's economy so you can see that wages are a much lower portion of the economy in Newfoundland in terms of how it's distributed. The next columns to the right are profits as a portion of the economy. You can see the column to the right of wages is Canadian profits as a portion of the economy, around 15%, and you can see that more than twice that rate for Newfoundland and Labrador. Over 30% of the economy is going for corporate profits. What you see here is compared to the rest of Canada, the economy here in Newfoundland and Labrador is disproportionately going to corporations and not to workers.

Again, I just wanted to point this out so that we can talk about these ideological and not economic decisions. This tells you that there is room for redistribution of income in this Province in terms of economy and the share of that economy and what's going to whom. There

is room to do that through taxes, and not even come close to bringing Newfoundland and Labrador into line with Canada, let alone the OECD. I think it's important for us not to be caught up in this spiral downward that happened in North America between the US and Canada and right-winged Provinces and competing to be the closest common denominator for taxes. Canada is now the lowest in the GA for taxes, corporate taxes. That's why we have a problem with distribution of wages and a problem in social spending. There's no coincidence that we're among the lowest in terms of spending on our people in Canada and we have some of the lowest corporate taxes in the developed countries. That's not a coincidence and it's time for that to change.

I now want to go back to demonizing the privatization. Cost - does it save money? No. Profit - first off a private enterprise is responsible for making a profit. They have a fiduciary duty to their shareholders, they can be sued if they do not make a profit for their investors. The public sector, not such a problem. First off you have a higher cost on a private deliver because they have to make a profit. They're going to have to squeeze money out of somewhere. They have to advertise. They're advertising and marketing and competing and bidding on projects, the public sector doesn't have to do that. Lobbying - I'm not sure I need to go into this, but there is some really good data on the increase in corporate lobbying across Canada over the last decade, massive increase in investments by private sector companies in lobbying for access in Government. Higher to use salaries - they pay higher salaries. You guys know this. Admin and overhead - the public sector can spread administration across a very large base. Corporations in private sector delivery don't have such as large a base, so their administrative cost per unit of delivery is higher. Borrowing costs are dramatically higher for private sector borrowing. The Government has access to cheaper credit. So, it doesn't cost more.

I have a couple of examples from around Canada on costs. One of them is hip and knee surgery in Alberta - the Government actually paid a 10% premium per surgery for hip and knee surgeries in the private clinic. They agreed to it. They wrote it in the contract - 10% premium to this private clinic. According to the University of Toronto Study of 28 P3s in Ontario, the P3s cost an average of 16% more than a traditional contract. You've heard this, the Auditor General's Report has been talked about a lot, the Auditor General of Ontario, \$8 billion more than if those had been delivered under traditional model.

I have some more examples - Confederation Bridge \$45 million; Charleswood Bridge in Winnipeg - \$1.2 million; Trans Canada Highway in Moncton to Fredericton - \$5 million more than if it had been done publicly, New Brunswick Auditor General on a P3 school - \$75 thousand more; Ontario Auditor General Report - \$8 billion. There's pretty good data out there that it isn't actually saving money. Then why is it being done? In Alberta when Ralph Klein was doing the P3 and the cost went up, I believe 60% in eighteen months, he finally had to admit that in fact costs were going to be higher than if he did it publicly, and he said well, we're transferring risks.

So, let's look at risks. What does that actually mean really, but it sounds so reassuring because we like to have risks managed for us. When I talk about risks, I just say one word - Walkerton. How many here are familiar with Walkerton? Pretty good number of you - public sector employees you should be. Privatized water testing linked in May 2000 to bacteria contamination of municipal water, the death of seven people, serious illness for 2300 more from ecoli. The review of that did find that it was the absence of criteria and regulation that led to the risk which is what you get with privatization and private delivery. So then if it's not cost and it's not risk management, what is it? Also, just on risk, of course the cost overruns risk for us, that's not managed, and bankruptcy is another risk, and that's not managed. There is a lot of risks that don't get managed, the risk argument is really bunked.

Transparency and accountability - my one word for this is redacted, because that's what they do. I actually tried to fight a P3 contract, and they told me if I fight this, you will have to pay a lot of money because we charge per word we black out. It's shrouded in secrecy. There is no transparency and there is no accountability. It's really really hard for us to get a handle on the risks and the costs and benefits of it when we can't get access to that information.

Choice - This is a lovely word that the privatization and public sector cuts love to use. We're going to increase choice. Again, just like risk, what does that really mean? Just in turns of cost, Manitoba Telecon services privatized in 1997 - 20 years later, the cost of a basic phone was \$8 cheaper with SaskTel than with the Manitoba Telecon Services. What you see is that access isn't increased under a private model because individual costs are higher and that's the same as with the Alberta case, for example, when out of pocket costs sky rocketed, is access is actually reduced and choice is reduced unless of course, you're wealthy. Liquor store study - you've heard that talked about. Liquor consumption up - wholesale costs up - retail prices up - Government revenues down. In terms of choice and access, what we see is a two-tier system under private delivery where there is more choice for people with more money. There is more access for people with more money. In fact, in a lot of the private health care delivery what you see with privatization is a boutique style private clinic that operates more like a private club with high entry fees, membership fee, and priority access. What they do is they cream off doctors that are much needed in the public system. They cream off the low acuity patients and they make the public system actually have higher wage because we have fewer doctors and higher acuity rates. So, it doesn't actually improve choice and it doesn't improve access.

Innovation - efficiency - equality - My answer to you is bankruptcy, litigation and fraud. In terms of bankruptcy, I mentioned to you the Alberta Clinic where the Government is paying a 10% premium for every surgery. It was supposed to be this magic silver bullet, you guys are now hearing this here in Newfoundland and Labrador that privatization will be a magic silver bullet that is going to take the heat out of the public system, reduce wait times and access problems. They've got this private clinic paying 10% per surgery, but it didn't work because that clinic went into business mode and overexpanded and went into bankruptcy and then litigated the Government for not giving them more contracts. Meanwhile, quietly in the public sector a number of individuals were being innovative and developed a centralized hip and knee clinic and moved all the hip and knee surgeries through a centralized wait list, a centralized clinic, day surgeries, massively reduced wait times. In fact, they really liked to portray the private sector as having a monopoly on innovation, but in fact the private sector is driven by a very narrow mandate that actually often inhibits their ability to be really creative and innovative because they've got to maximize profit. The public sector in this case was more innovative and delivered better on the outcomes health care needed.

When I talk about litigation and fraud, I'm talking about the Chalouie case where in Quebec private sector litigated to try and get access to the public sector. Brian Day litigated to try and get access to the public sector. Not only is the corporate community lobbying like crazy, but they are also litigating like crazy and then the health care clinic in Alberta that litigated the Government, so we've got lots of examples, where if they can't get access to lobbying, they will try a lawsuit. And then on fraud, there was a study in the United States that found that private investor health care deliverers were actually being found guilty more frequently of actual fraud. That goes back to managing risks.

In terms of public innovation, it doesn't deliver. Also on quality. I'm sure you guys have heard a bunch of this data but there is good research out there by folks like Margaret McGregor, Academics, Paul Devereaux, looking at health care outcomes in poor profit facilities. Paul Devereaux, Cardiologist at McMasters, did a big med analysis on a whole bunch of different

studies across the US and found that in a for-profit hospital, there's a two percent higher chance of dying than in a non-for-profit facility. So, you go into a private investor owned hospital, get a surgery, you have a two percent higher risk of dying. I'm not saying that every single private investor-owned facility is bad. I'm not saying that every single private investor-owned facility will cost more than the public sector. These studies just show that on average, they cost more, and they deliver poorer quality. In Alberta, the Health Quality Council did a survey and found on average the private facilities delivered poorer quality in terms of staffing levels, care of resident belongings, assistance with daily activities such as toileting and eating and drinking, than the public sector ones. Across a survey of patients and family members, they delivered poorer quality outcomes in terms of service. We know that because we know that in order to squeeze out the profit and cover all their higher administrative costs, they have to do it somehow so they're going to do it by reducing staff, by reducing wages, and increasing workloads, which is going to come out in terms of quality of delivery and the data shows that it does come out in the quality of delivery.

So again, why is privatization still being thrown around as a silver bullet to solve all of our problems? Profit. It does deliver. It delivers on the key thing that matters for the private business community which is why business associations are working so darn hard to get it done. It's because it delivers on profit. I have a great example for this. A friend of mine is an Optometrist in BC and BC delisted vision care and he was crushed. He was devastated. He knew half of his patients weren't going to be able to afford vision care, but then a lightbulb went on for him. He realized that the cap was going to come off what he could charge, so he could charge twice as much, see half the patients and be wind surfing in the Hood River more. That's what happens. The cap comes off and the costs sky rocket. In Alberta after they delisted vision care, in one year, costs went up 17 percent. This is what's driving health care costs. We all know that because we're inside the public sector. It's the stuff that didn't get included in the public sector that's driving costs - pharmaceuticals, any sort of services that have been delisted deinsured, services that never got included like home care, living assistance for elderly in their homes. There are a broad range of services that didn't get into the initial health care package, it was a compromise, and those are driving costs in health care.

Privatization is a cash cow for the corporate sector, and they are lobbying and litigating like crazy to get in. What are the alternatives? One of the things that is important to remember in terms with the fight against privatization is that they want it really really bad because it is a great market. It is incredibly lucrative if you're an investor to be in a sector like health care. It's recession proof. People don't spend less on health care because there is a recession. If you have a family member who is sick, you will pay whatever it takes, everything you have, to get them the care that they need if you have to. It's a market where people will pay whatever they have to, whatever they can, it's almost recession proof, and often it's Government paid. If they can get access to tapping Government dollars, they are thrilled. The model that is referred most by corporations in terms of public sector service and delivery is one that is public paid - private delivered because the tap turns on for them, they don't have to go out there and try to compete in the market, they just step under the Government tap and deliver the service and hide off the profit. It is a frontier, you know there was a scramble for Africa in terms of resources, there was a scramble for oil and gas recently in terms of everybody jockeying for position to hold on to their resources, that's what the public sector is. It's a frontier for the private sector where they can get access to a market that's incredibly lucrative. It isn't about Government delivering services that is more efficient, more innovative, lower risk, lower cost. It's about a higher cost, lower quality model, that delivers profit to the private sector.

I want to turn now to what the alternative is, and I think you've heard new visions coming out from the politicians at this Convention, and I think you are a very smart, articulate audience and

can sense where that vision is actually reflective of what they've done in the past and where it isn't. What I think we really need to debunk is this public sector is something we can't afford. I've already told you from an economic side, in terms of comparators, that we can afford to be bigger and better. Now I want to talk about why a public sector is so important. First, job creation. For every ten public sector workers, you get four private sector jobs. Just think about that. You cut ten public sector workers, you lose four private sector workers. That's not the conversation that the Government has when they say they're going to cut positions by attrition, they don't talk about how many jobs we're going to lose across the rest of the economy. Here in Newfoundland and Labrador, that matters because as oil and gas has grown, employment hasn't grown in tandem. That's because oil and gas has one of the lowest job creation multipliers in anything in the economy. Less than half of a job per million dollars invested, or something along those lines. They have their models for how many jobs get created depending on where you put your dollar. Oil and gas - right at the bottom. As you grow an economy based on a resource like that, you need to have an employment strategy and it isn't going to be about growing that sector.

Public sector spending can create up to twenty times the jobs in oil and gas. It's really important to recognize that redistributing the wealth through corporate taxes and public spending is actually a job creation strategy for the private sector. You get twenty more jobs in the public sector per dollar and you get another four jobs for every ten of those in the private sector. Just to help you understand that concept, I just want to talk about why you get those jobs in the private sector. You guys know, you get your income, you're going to spend most of it locally on goods and services, groceries, haircuts for kids, winter jackets for kids, rent, mortgage. You're going to spend it on things local. I've seen studies that show that money will circulate within the local economy up to seven times. That's where you get those jobs locally because a dollar that goes to public sector workers is going to go into that local economy and circulate. That's creating jobs.

Let's talk about what happens if you give that as a corporate tax cut to a large corporation. It's going to offshore share holders for the most part, maybe debt repayment, asset holding. We've seen the companies have been sitting on larger and larger buckets of cash of late, they haven't been reinvesting that in productive investment. They've been accumulating assets and there is good stats on the hundreds of billions of accumulative assets in the corporate economy today. We're not seeing it reinvested in local jobs in the economy. But you give that, you tax it from a large mostly foreign owned corporation and you give it to a teacher, a nurse, a postal worker, you give it to any of you in this room, and it's going to be mostly recirculated. You give it to a wealthy person, where is it going to go? A condo in Hawaii, a bit of market speculation, it's not going to be going to investing in the local economy. It's not like they're out there building local factories anymore, that money is not being reinvested locally. That's why tax cuts to corporations and wealthy do not create the kind of jobs that the conservative movement is telling you it does. There was always sirens on promises that we heard that we're going to cut taxes to stimulate the economy. I say, let's have public spending and public employees to stimulate the economy. Let's raise those taxes and show that we can redistribute from corporate over the wages how our economy is being shared. You won't see a flood of corporations outside of Canada. We have some of the lowest taxes in the G8, so there is room to move there. But the conservative movement doesn't want to talk about that because they represent business interests, but don't want to pay higher taxes. Because that's their fiduciary duty to maximum profit. There's room to move. It's a job creation strategy to redistribute income.

I want to talk about the second piece of this slide - stability. Norway has, if we went back to the chart, Norway is closer to the top - more public spending of its economy than most of the other

economies. So what happened when the recession hit Norway? Norway had entered the recession later than most of the other countries, had the shallowest dip of all of them and exited the recession the first of all developed economies. Why did Norway have the shallowest dip and the smaller recession? It was because it had a large public sector to stabilize the economy. A large public sector doesn't react as quickly to change as on markets. Oil and gas, other price changes, and it's a stabilizer, it helps to redistribute income, it keeps jobs around when the private sector starts cutting. So it can act as a stabilizer. For Newfoundland and Labrador that's essential because Newfoundland and Labrador is tied to commodity prices with resource exports and those fluctuations are really hard. You guys have been through the booms and busts I know, I'm Alberta, we all know what that roller coaster looks like. A large public sector helps to manage those and keep the dips and valleys. It's really important for stability.

The last reason the public sector is so important is inequality. I'm sure you guys have heard about the book from Wilkinson and Pickett when they talked about inequality being bad for economy versus society. It's a book written by these two researchers and they looked across a whole bunch of countries at what inequality was correlated with in terms of health outcomes, education outcomes, mental health incidents, obesity rates, crime, and they found on every single one of those things higher inequality was correlated with poor outcomes. More inequality means poorer health; it means poorer education outcomes. It's not just absolute poverty that is tied to well-being, it's also relative income that is tied to well-being. That was their study. We all know that too much inequality is bad for society, from a moral perspective, and a social perspective. But more recently, there has been a consensus growing around the fact that too much inequality is bad for the economy in terms of growth.

The International Monetary Fund - not a vast of left wing thought really, not a group I tend to quote a lot. They said inequality is bad for economic growth; it's a drag on economic growth. They did a study like the spirit level that looked at economic growth and found that slower negative economic growth was most correlated with inequality. Now more recently, we've seen organizations like the Conference Board of Canada, TD Bank, jumping on board to say that inequality needs to be brought under control. It's actually causing a drag on economic growth. There was an RBC study that came out in Newfoundland and Labrador saying public sector cuts are a drag on economic growth here. The data is out there that inequality is bad for economic growth and it's bad for us as a society and needs to be brought into check.

How does that connect with our conversation of privatization and public sector? The public sector is also a really important part of redistributing income. Here's one way, we've talked about jobs. The public sector helps to redistribute income through taxes into jobs, public and private. That helps the economy and it helps reduce inequality by getting people employed. The other thing it does of course is deliver services. For people accessing services, lower income people intend to benefit proportionately more from access to public services than the wealthy, proportionately to their income. In effect, it reduces inequality and mitigates it to have public services. A strong public sector is part of an industrial strategy for Newfoundland and Labrador because it creates job, it stabilizes the economy, it reduces inequality and it actually fosters economic growth.

I think we will have a little bit of discussion after this, but I just want to say Newfoundland has a high road. There's data out there that talks about what that high road is. There's been good studies done here of the revenue options available to this Province. What the Government did in 2007 was dump the bucket out for revenues by cutting taxes. Some of that was raising the lowest marginal rate and it was good for lower income people, but the bulk of it went disproportionately to high incomes. There's good data on that. They disproportionately benefitted from that tax cut. As I told you, money was needed to create jobs here in the

Newfoundland in the economy. The conservatives dumped out the bucket, and cut revenues and then said, oh my goodness, we can't afford public sectors, so they started cutting the public service in a direct giveaway which shifts more money from wages over the corporate profits. Then in the last budget, they put a tiny drop back into the bucket. They reinstated a portion of the tax fairness. It's really important to recognize that that was a baby step. This Province has lots of room to move. There was a massive transfer of wealth during the high oil years because royalties were structured poorly and there isn't surtax on extraordinary profits. There are other places that have an extra tax instrument that captures some of those when profits get really high but brings that back in to the owners of the resource so that it doesn't all leave the country or the Province. That didn't happen here. That piece wasn't in place. There's no reason why pieces like that can't be put in place today to protect Newfoundland and Labrador from seeing a transfer of wealth outside of this region. There's room to see revenues captured on the top end of taxes. There's room on corporate taxes, the Government federally has cut back, there's lots of room to move. It's really important to make sure in the next election conversation there is a balanced conversation that includes both sides of the balance sheet - the revenue side and the expenditure side and the corporations would really like to focus on spending because the other conversation means they have to pay their fair share. It's really important to make sure this conversation focuses on the revenue side as well. It's a tough economy right now and the knee jerk reaction is for the Government to cut spending and not to be courageous and look at the revenue side and tackle the business community and say you got to pay your fair share and make sure that those instruments are in place when the economy tips back up so that that share comes back into the public sector. The way to do all of this is to recognize that as we work together, whether it's through Unions, as citizens, through our Government, we do get a better deal and we're stronger than one in a private market.

### **Questions and Answers:**

D. Hillier (3102) stated there are a lot of questions these days about types of taxes and one thing that comes up a lot in this Province, and there have been a lot of promises made around it, is the HST and the affected value added taxes on the economy, and since we have to have taxes, what kind of taxes should we have and is it better to have a higher HST and a lower income tax, or revenue from other sources.

D. Gibson stated I think that's a great question because we're talking about inequality and we need to make sure that the revenue instruments are structured to make sure that it's progressive and we all know that on a flat tax like an HST or something where it is consumer, though the wealthier folks will be spending a bit more, a lot of that spending is not here so we're not capturing a lot of it and the people who are spending that most for their income are the lower earning income folks. That's proportionately going to pay a higher share of those kinds of taxes. Certainly, they're not that progressive, so I would suggest the first place to look is reinstating the tax cuts that were taken away at the higher income levels and making sure that the progress is built in to redistribute income from the wealthy and large corporations. Small businesses need to be incentive in this Province for sure, local businesses, so that large chains. I saw a great study recently that showed that an independent local restaurant, if you eat at any of the independent local restaurants, you create twice as much economic activity and jobs with your dollar than when you eat at a chain because they're buying their products locally. Starbucks, for example, brings all of their product shipped in. They wanted consistently across their products; they don't buy local bakery products. If you go into a local place that is not a chain, they're buying and sourcing their product locally, twice as much impact of your dollar on that local economy as with a chain that goes for retail stores. I think it's important to recognize that in your tax structure you do want to make sure that you're incentive independent local businesses, not big chains, to create jobs locally. And you want to make sure you are

reinstating fairness before you start talking. Now, it may be, you know after the GST was cut and then the Government started cutting public services, the majority of Canadians said they would rather not have the GST cut than see their public services cut. So, if the Government needs the revenues and that's an instrument that helps capture revenues, it may be that there is room in the mix for that, but I would suggest that conversation not happen until after tax cuts to the corporations and the wealthy are reinstated and then turn to other instruments if they are needed to ensure public services are delivered.

T. Kelly (7104) stated thanks for that excellent presentation. It certainly makes it quite clear the strength of an invaluable public sector economy which we're all aware of in this room, but I wonder sometimes, do you ever get a chance to present this kind of information to right-wing organizations or the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, and those types of organizations? It would have been really interested if the three leaders that we had coming into the room and giving presentations to us about their stands, could sit and listen to you first before they got up.

D. Gibson stated I hear you brother, I am speaking to the converted here. My job today is to help you guys be able to articulate this out there. I know this isn't new information for any of you. I'm just hoping to arm you with some more statistics so that you can better go out and push any party on this agenda. I do get the opportunity sometimes to speak to the right-wing. I've debated Scott Hennig from the Canadian Taxpayers Federation, and I love debating right-wingers. I've even talked to international finance investors and I've found that interesting. When you're talking shop to the finance community, the bulk of them are from the countries on that spectrum that are spending more and taxing higher, and they're often shocked at the lack of industrial strategy here in Canada. I've found a remarkably fertile ground in that community talking about this because they recognize you need an industrial strategy and you need a healthy work force and you need infrastructure and social services because they need it as corporations too. We don't know that because we have this image of ourselves that is from the 1970s when social programs were expanding and we had our role in the international stage was to be peacekeepers. We have this soft nice picture of ourselves, but what's happened to our economy since the 1990s has turned us into a lagger on a whole bunch of fronts and in terms of inequality and social program deliver and taxation, we really need to make some big changes.

D. Hillier (3102) stated we've had the politicians in the last couple of days and a very important topic that never came up was royalty regimes on our national resources, and for some reason, nobody mentioned that. It also seems that everyone wants, the companies want, lower values, but everyone holds up stat oil in Norway as the way to go, but it seems that they have higher rates. What's your thoughts on royalty regimes going forward for the Province?

D. Gibson stated well I definitely think it's time for Newfoundland and Labrador to have a review, and again, you need some transparency on this front. Let's look at where the revenues have really been going. Industry will be crying for it because prices are low, but if you have a price sensitive instrument, those prices have been high and the Newfoundland and Labrador did not get their share at all. You can see that if you look at the economy and looking at the savings fund that the revenues just weren't there. So, you see Norway has a corporate tax that is comparable to ours, or sort of internationally comparable for all corporations, and then they have an additional tax for oil and gas. Oil and gas actually pay more than other sectors, plus they have public ownership that gets them a share. At one point they actually had it up in the 90 percent range and oil and gas was still knocking on their door. Now, you guys have already called industry out on that and seeing that they come back on their knees. They will fight hard but it's really important to recognize that you want to have an investment climate that attracts

investors, but you also need to make sure that it's a fair deal for both parties. If you get industry to the table saying we want a fair deal, and you guys want a fair deal, let's simplify the royalty system and make sure both parties are getting their fair share. You guys have had this conversation about royalties before I'm sure, in this debate if it does come up, it's really important to make sure that royalties and taxes aren't mixed up. Royalties are the price they pay for the product. If you have a steel manufacturer plant, they don't get their steel for free. If they're going to make a manufacturer product, they need to buy the steel. Oil and gas are putting a product on the market and they're getting it for free. They need to pay up to us, the owners. We own that resource; they need to pay us for that resource before they put it on the market. That's what royalties are. Royalties are us getting paid for them taking our resource and selling it on the market. It's not a tax. I know a lot of economists out there like to call it "Government take" - it's not. It's simply the price they pay for the resources they want to sell. I really think it's important to make sure when that conversation does happen, and it needs to happen, but when it does happen that you guys call them out on that and say, no, let's talk taxes separately. Let's talk rent and royalty capture over here. It's a really different conversation; they're totally two different conversations and don't let them get away with calling it "Government take".

J. Earle stated I just want to thank Diana on behalf of the delegates here at our 21<sup>st</sup> Biennial Convention. Thank you for taking the time.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The Convention adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

#### **SATURDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2015**

#### CALL TO ORDER

The Convention was called to order at 9:10 a.m. by Chairperson, J. Earle.

J. Miles (BofD) stated the total raised for the Kids Eat Smart by the delegates here at the Convention is \$4,215. Thank you to everyone.

J. Wakeham (6206) stated we're going to tack a little bit more to your total. Our Local hosted a hospitality suite and the generous donations from our sisters and brothers, we have another \$200+ to add.

R. Kelland (7801) stated we would like to donate \$500 from our Local to the Kids Eat Smart fund.

D. Reid (6604) stated from my Local, we have a \$500 donation for the Kids Eat Smart, and from the St. John's District Labour, we have \$500.

J. Lacey (6206) stated brothers and sisters, I stand here today before us all, the last couple of days there has obviously been quite a bit on the go and again, I would like to pay homage and respect to somebody, and we've all seen the person going, coming, he's been the networking for it all, he put the glue together, I would like to pay respects and my gratitude to Keith Dunne, who is our Campaigns, PR Co-ordinator. Again, he does quite a bit behind the scenes, but I think there is a time and a place, and this is the time and place. Congratulations Keith and thank you.

MOTION: B. Blundon (BofD)/T. Kelly (7104) - that NAPE would match the donations that have been received here on Convention Floor for the School Lunch Program.  
CARRIED.

B. Blundon (BofD) stated it's obvious the consensus of Convention here is that we continue to donate to this great cause. For many of you who are new at this Convention, and I notice there are a lot, and I'm extremely pleased with the number of young people, which is almost all of you, that you may not remember that NAPE provided the original seed funding for the School Lunch Program and it's been a project of ours ever since. We've helped feed thousands and thousands of people over the years. I say thank you very much to delegates and your Locals, and of course, we extend far beyond the School Lunch Program and you've seen us yesterday with donations to Daffodil Place, we're trying to help people in other Countries, and I think they're all worthwhile causes and NAPE needs to become a greater part of the community and do more of that type of work.

J. Miles (BofD) stated as Chair of the Kids Eat Smart, I would like to thank NAPE for matching. I also work as a co-ordinator in my own school. Once you see the gift that we do here to the kids, it's well worth it. Thank you everyone.

J. Earle stated again, you show the efforts of NAPE members when they come together as to what they can do. You will see more of that in the coming times as Brother Blundon stated I think we have to show a greater presence in our communities and we will be doing that I assure you on a go forward, assisting those where we can.

G. Horan (BofD) stated for the benefits of members here, for those of you who would like to know the answers to the NAPE privatization questionnaire:

Question #1 - P3s mean **Private Public Partnership**.

Question #2 - How many different brands does the NLC (Rock Spirits) production plant package locally? **23**

Question #3 - How much money did the NLC (as a whole) remit to Government last year? **\$170.5 million**.

Question #4 - All health care in the Province, whether public or private, is funded by provincial Government. **False - Dental care isn't.**

Question #5 - All persons working within health care in the Province are regulated.  
**False**

Question #6 - Privatization is more cost effective. **False**

Question #7 - All home care workers in this Province receive the same benefits as public service employees. **False**

Question #8 - All forms of privatization use public money to increase corporate profit margins. **True**

Question #9 - Does public health care provide a better service to the public than a private serviced industry? **Yes**

Question #10 - Who is the most likely to be adversely affected as a result of a privatized system in health care? **Patients**

Question #11 - Privatization restricts increased revenue thus leading to increased tax bases. **True**

Question #12 - School Board buses cost \$7,000 less than contracting busing. **True**

Question #13 - Special Needs students who are transported to and from school by private transportation costs more than if a Student Assistant were to travel on the regular school bus with student. **True**

Question #14 - The MOS Component of NAPE represents ninety-seven (97) classifications and three (3) Collective Agreements. **True**

Question #15 - How many kilometers of road does Transportation and Works employees across the Province look after? **10,000 kms**

Question #16 - Five (5) reasons why privatization is bad for you: - Your service gets worse; - Your cost goes up; - You can't hold private companies accountable; - Staff re undermined; - It is risky and difficult to reverse. **True**

J. Lacey (BofD) stated I personally would like to thank our Anti-Privatization Committee. It's actually our newest Committee. We've met twice and have worked quite diligently. I would like to pay accolades and my gratitude to say thanks.

#### CREDENTIALS REPORT

J. Wakeham (BofD) presented the Credentials Report:

Delegates	341
Observers	23
Board of Directors	31
Staff	30
Fraternal/Guests	<u>9</u>
TOTAL	434

MOTION: J. Wakeham (BofD)/A. Squires (6240) - move adoption of the Credentials Report.  
CARRIED.

#### THIRD CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

K. Roche stated this is your last call for nominations.

K. Roche opened up the floor for second call for nominations.

#### **General Vice President**

Nominated: Nil.

**Eastern Vice President**

Nominated: Nil.

**Eastern Area Board Member**

Nominated: Nil.

**Central Vice President**

Nominated: Nil.

**Central Area Board Member**

Nominated: Nil.

**Western Vice President**

Nominated: Nil.

**Western Area Board Member**

Nominated: Nil.

**Region 5 Board Member**

Nominated: Nil.

**Region 6 Board Member**

Nominated: Nil.

**Region 7 Board Member**

Nominated: Nil.

**Region 3 Board Member**

Nominated: Nil.

**Region 4 Board Member**

Nominated: Darren Durdle (4205)

**Region 9 Board Member**

Nominated: Nil.

**Region 1 Board Member**

Nominated: Nil.

**Region 2 Board Member**

Nominated: Nil.

**Region 8 Board Member**

Nominated: Nil.

K. Roche stated I will now ask if people will accept their nominations. I will do that in reverse order from when they were nominated.

**General Vice President**

Nominated:	Jacquelyn Wakeman	Accepted
	Arlene Sedlickas	Accepted

**Eastern Vice President**

Nominated:	Robert Thomas	Accepted
	Jimmy Lacey	Accepted

**Eastern Area Board Member**

Nominated:	Kathy Gliddon	Accepted
	Eleanor Byrde	Accepted

**Central Vice President**

Nominated:	Kristal Rice	Accepted
	Betty Goodyear	Accepted

**Central Area Board Member**

Nominated:	Kristal Rice	Accepted
	Sonya Hickey	Accepted

**Western Vice President**

Nominated:	Marie Lodge	Accepted in writing
	Brenda Eldridge	Accepted
	Joanne Miles	Accepted

**Western Area Board Member**

Nominated:	Rhonda White	Accepted
	Karen Gillard	Accepted

**Region 5 Board Member**

Nominated:	Vicki Laing	Accepted
	Steve Roach	Accepted

**Region 6 Board Member**

Nominated:	Aiden Donahue	Accepted
	Robert Thomas	Accepted
	Scott Mercer	Accepted via email

**Region 7 Board Member**

Nominated:	Goldie Porter	Accepted
------------	---------------	----------

**Region 3 Board Member**

Nominated:	Kathy Oake	Accepted
------------	------------	----------

**Region 4 Board Member**

Nominated:	Darren Durdle	Accepted
	Sheldon Rideout	Accepted

**Region 9 Board Member**

Nominated:	Wade Kelly	Accepted
------------	------------	----------

**Region 1 Board Member**

Nominated:	Daniel Quilty	Accepted
------------	---------------	----------

**Region 2 Board Member**

Nominated:	Gary Bolger	Accepted
	Viva Pittman	Accepted

**Region 8 Board Member**

Nominated:	Trent Decker	Accepted
------------	--------------	----------

**ELECTIONS**

K. Roche stated I'm going to ask the Balloting Committee to give out the ballot books. Hold on to your ballot books because you will not be given another one if you lose it; there are no exceptions. You have to hold on to the balloting book. When an election is called, I will tell you which ballot number we will be using so don't mark on any of them yet. I will not be going in order. While you're getting your ballot books, just a couple of things. For those wondering, your Election Committee will be elected at your next Biennial Convention in 2017 because your next election is 2018, so there is still time to do your election at the next Convention. Let me explain. There's an Election Committee that is elected at this Biennial Convention that does your elections for your President and Secretary/Treasurer of NAPE, and usually it's done at every Biennial Convention. Those two positions that I've mentioned are done every three years now, so your next one is 2018 and you will have another Convention in 2017. So that's when that Election Committee will be elected.

So, only people with blue and green tags will be getting a ballot book and those are the only people who will be voting. So, if you don't have a blue or green tag, you can't be voting. Now is probably a good time to ask the delegates to move to the front of the room and the observers or fraternal/guests to move to the back of the room.

Because you potentially might have to have an election for your Secretary/Treasurer, we all hope Brother Blundon will be elected in the upcoming election, you might have to have an election prior to 2018. You're going to need to do an Election Committee. We are going to do your election for General Vice President, and then we will call for nominations and elect the Election Committee. During the election process the doors will be tiled which means no one will be allowed in or out. I will announce when the doors will be untiled but I caution you to stay fairly close to the Convention, because if they are tiled while you are gone, you will not be allowed back in to vote. Speeches will be of five minute duration. Each person can have a scrutineer to oversee the counting of the ballots. Voting is simple majority, so it's fifty plus one.

All voting took place by secret ballots.

### **General Vice President**

Nominated: Jacqueline Wakeham  
Arlene Sedlickas

RESULTS: Arlene Sedlickas elected as General Vice President

### **Election Committee**

Nominated:	Mary Myles (9201)	Accepted
	Glenda Smith (5104)	Accepted
	Lisa King (1104)	Accepted
	Patrick Dunne (7104)	Accepted
	Paula Brewer (6208)	Accepted
	Clyde Byrne (3211)	Accepted
	Joyce Reardon (7002)	Accepted
	Henrietta Hillier (9204)	Accepted
	Kim Noseworthy (3802)	Accepted
	Ray Clarke (6901)	Accepted
	Walter Meadus (6901)	Accepted
	Mona Matthews (7813)	Accepted
	Agnes Squires (6240)	Accepted
	Roger Gillard (3212)	Accepted

RESULTS: Walter Meadus  
Roger Gillard  
Lisa King

### **Alternate - General Vice President**

Nominated: Jacquelyn Wakeham (6206) Accepted

RESULTS: Jacquelyn Wakeham elected by acclamation

**Alternates - Election Committee**

MOTION: M. Myles (9201)/J. Miles (1852) - that the next three top to be alternates for the Election Committee.  
CARRIED.

RESULTS: 1<sup>st</sup> Alternate Patrick Dunne  
2<sup>nd</sup> Alternate Ray Clarke  
3<sup>rd</sup> Alternate Mary Myles

The Convention broke out into Regional voting rooms.

**EASTERN REGION**

**Eastern Vice President**

Nominated: Robert Thomas  
Jimmy Lacey

RESULTS: Jimmy Lacey elected as Eastern Vice President

**Eastern Area Board Member**

Nominated: Kathy Gliddon  
Jacquelyn Wakeham  
Eleanor Byrde (Withdrew her nomination)

RESULTS: Jacquelyn Wakeham elected as Eastern Area Board Member

**Region 5 Board Member**

Nominated: Steve Roach  
Vicki Laing

RESULTS: Steve Roach elected as Region 5 Board Member

**Region 6 Board Member**

Nominated: Scott Mercer  
Robert Thomas  
Aiden Donahue

RESULTS: Scott Mercer elected as Region 6 Board Member

**Region 7 Board Member**

Nominated: Goldie Porter

RESULTS: Goldie Porter elected by acclamation as Region 7 Board Member

**Alternate - Eastern Vice President**

Nominated: Jacquelyn Wakeham      Accepted  
                   Tony Kelly                      Accepted

RESULTS: Jacquelyn Wakeham

**Alternate - Eastern Area Board Member**

Nominated: Kathy Gliddon              Accepted  
                   Eleanor Byrde                      Accepted

RESULTS: Eleanor Byrde

**Alternate - Region 5 Board Member**

Nominated: Vicki Laing                      Accepted

RESULTS: Vicki Laing elected by acclamation

**Alternate - Region 6 Board Member**

Nominated: Aiden Donahue              Accepted  
                   Jamie Meadus                      Accepted

RESULTS: Aiden Donahue

**Alternate - Region 7 Board Member**

Nominated: Earl Hann                      Accepted

RESULTS: Earl Hann elected by acclamation

The delegates from Central and Western Regions returned from their break-out rooms and the results were announced.

**CENTRAL REGION****Central Vice President**

Nominated: Betty Goodyear  
                   Kristal Rice

RESULTS: Betty Goodyear elected as Central Vice President

**Central Area Board Member**

Nominated: Sonya Hickey  
                   Kristal Rice

RESULTS: Sonya Hickey elected as Central Area Board Member

**Region 3 Board Member**

Nominated: Kathy Oake

RESULTS: Kathy Oake elected by acclamation as Region 3 Board Member

**Region 4 Board Member**

Nominated: Sheldon Rideout  
Darren Durdle  
Kristal Rice

RESULTS: Sheldon Rideout elected as Region 4 Board Member

**Region 9 Board Member**

Nominated: Wade Kelly

RESULTS: Wade Kelly elected by acclamation as Region 9 Board Member

**Alternate - Central Vice President**

Nominated:	Kristal Rice	Accepted
	Kathy Oake	Declined

RESULTS: Kristal Rice elected by acclamation

**Alternate - Central Area Board Member**

Nominated:	Ellen Barnes	Accepted
------------	--------------	----------

RESULTS: Ellen Barnes elected by acclamation

**Alternate - Region 3 Board Member**

Nominated:	Diane Murdoch	Accepted
------------	---------------	----------

RESULTS: Diane Murdoch elected by acclamation

**Alternate - Region 4 Board Member**

Nominated:	Kristal Rice	Declined
	Darren Durdle	Accepted

RESULTS: Darren Durdle elected by acclamation

**Alternate - Region 9 Board Member**

Nominated:	Mary Myles	Accepted
------------	------------	----------

RESULTS: Mary Myles elected by acclamation

**WESTERN REGION****Western Vice President**

Nominated: Joanne Miles  
Brenda Eldridge

RESULTS: Joanne Miles elected as Western Vice President

**Western Area Board Member**

Nominated: Karen Gillard  
Rhonda White  
Marie Lodge

RESULTS: Rhonda White elected as Western Area Board Member

**Region 1 Board Member**

Nominated: Daniel Quilty  
Brenda Eldridge

RESULTS: Daniel Quilty elected as Region 1 Board Member

**Region 2 Board Member**

Nominated: Viva Pittman  
Gary Bolger

RESULTS: Viva Pittman elected as Region 2 Board Member

**Region 8 Board Member**

Nominated: Trent Decker

RESULTS: Trent Decker elected by acclamation as Region 8 Board Member

**Alternate - Western Vice President**

Nominated: Daniel Quilty            Accepted  
Brenda Eldridge            Accepted

RESULTS: Daniel Quilty

**Alternate - Western Area Board Member**

Nominated: Karen Gillard            Accepted

RESULTS: Karen Gillard elected by acclamation

**Alternate - Region 1 Board Member**

Nominated: Brenda Eldridge Accepted

RESULTS: Brenda Eldridge elected by acclamation

**Alternate - Region 2 Board Member**

Nominated: Gary Bolger Accepted

RESULTS: Gary Bolger elected by acclamation

**Alternate - Region 8 Board Member**

Nominated: Jarvis Canning Accepted

RESULTS: Jarvis Canning elected by acclamation

MOTION: J. Lacey (6206)/D. Reid (6604) - that all the ballots be destroyed.  
CARRIED.

K. Roche swore in the new and re-elected Board of Directors.

J. Earle resumed the Chair.

R. Norris (4206) stated did we hear back from the Finance Committee on that resolution that was going back to be reviewed, or was that for after the Convention, or what was happening there?

J. Earle stated it's going back to the Finance Committee of NAPE.

J. Earle stated sisters and brothers, first of all congratulations to the Board of Directors who have been elected here. I look forward to the term working with them. We still have a few Component Conventions coming up where there may be potential changes, but I believe it's a confidence vote to the Board of Directors that we had in place, with the exception of a couple. I just want to say thank you to the delegates, thank you to the Board Members elected. Myself and Bert look forward to working with them for the ensuing term. What a great event this has been. It reflects what a great Union we are - proud, united and strong! What I want you to do, the delegates, observers and staff, go from this Convention with the knowledge that you've gained over the past few days, from the speakers that you've heard, from what we've put forward, go back to your workplaces, help us help our membership. Also five weeks before an election, it is critical to discuss with members the issue that is going to be put to them leading up to this election. They have some very important decisions to make because many of us are in a unique situation where we get to elect our employer. I ask you to take back to your members what you've heard from the speakers, from James Clancy, from Diana Gibson, from the leaders in this Union, from myself, from Bert and others that have spoken, from the politicians themselves. Listen to what they've had to say. Some of them didn't say a whole lot, even though they spoke for thirty minutes. Again, as I said in the closing of my opening speech, the road ahead is going to be difficult, no doubt, but I am convinced from what I've seen in the past couple of days, we are up to the task and we are up for the challenge and we are going to stand together.

My sisters and brothers, in solidarity, I know you've come from all parts of this Province, safe travels home on behalf of myself and Bert and the entire Executive Board. Be careful on the roads, and we will see you over the coming weeks and days. Thank you. Thank you.

B. Eldridge (BofD) stated I just want to wish Brother Bert Blundon well in his campaign and I believe I speak on behalf of all of the delegates. Good luck Brother Blundon.

MOTION:                   E. Byrde (6207)/K. Rice (4206) - that the Convention adjourn.  
                                  CARRIED.

The Convention adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

---

Jerry Earle  
PRESIDENT

---

Gail Quinlan  
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY