

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, April 17, 1979

Time: 8:00 p.m.

SUPPLY — AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee come to order. Resolution 10 Item 5. (a)(1)— pass; the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, when we were discussing this item this afternoon, the minister made some comments about the logic of relocating the regional headquarters of his department from Beausejour to Steinbach and, of course, so far he hasn't delivered the logic in the comments that he has made to this committee. I would suggest to him that what he should do tomorrow is read Hansard to find out how illogical he was, and not only illogical, but contradictory, Mr. Chairman, because one of his main excuses was that there was some short-fall in delivery of services in the extreme southeast corner of the province, and if the head office was in a different position, that wouldn't occur. Well, Mr. Chairman, the parallel to that would be, that it would likely occur at the other end, because if the head office means the difference, then it means that the closer the head office, the less possibility of that occurring. So he has destroyed his own argument with that kind of nonsense, Mr. Chairman. If the minister feels strongly that he has a commitment to make to the people of Steinbach, Mr. Chairman, that may emanate from the last election campaign or whatever, you know, I think he should be bold enough to say so. I asked him this afternoon, whether he had presented to him a staff submission who have been functioning out of Beausejour for the last several years; a submission suggesting that there be a relocation. I would ask him again whether he has a submission from staff asking him that he relocate the regional headquarters of the Department of Agriculture from Beausejour to Steinbach.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I referred in the discussions this afternoon that there had been discussions carried out within the department, within the administrative staff. I again go back to the initial study, the initial report on regionalization of the department and follow up to that, discussions with the senior staff and I think I've clarified for the member all I have to. I don't think there is any more that I can add at this particular point. As I've said, consideration is being given to it and in fact, finalization of any decision has not been made, but is certainly being considered.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I repeat the question. Did he receive a specific recommendation from his staff, who are responsible and working in the eastern region, that the headquarters of that region be relocated?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, again I go back to say that it was discussed at senior management level within the department, no submission, but as far as the decision to relocate a regional office, that comes from discussing with agricultural people, with staff at senior level and that's the consideration that has to be given, and I don't think I can clarify it any more.

MR. USKIW: I specifically asked the Minister whether the staff who is responsible for the administration of the eastern region — whether they have submitted a presentation to the Minister asking that they be relocated? I don't mean people that are not there. I mean people who have the responsibility of delivering the department's program in the eastern region — did they ask the Minister for a relocation of the head office?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, it was discussed with the Regional Director.

MR. USKIW: I presume it was discussed. My question is, was it recommended by the Regional Director that there be a relocation from Beausejour to Steinbach?

MR. DOWNEY: Again, Mr. Chairman, it was discussed with the Regional Director.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, obviously the Minister cannot now substantiate that there is logic to what he is doing. Obviously, he can't, and he rests on the fact that he believes, or wants to believe, that initially, when the decision was made to establish the regions and to decide on the central offices in each region, that there was a recommendation based on what he is now proposing to do. Well, I want him to know, Mr. Chairman, that the staff of the Department of Agriculture were not commissioned by the government to determine, or to recommend, the regional centres to the government. I want him to know that.

Secondly, I want him to know, if he doesn't have a copy of the report, I presume he has, I have one here, wherein there was not a unanimous position on the part of staff on the recommendation that they were not asked to present. Two very relevant points, Mr. Chairman. Because the decentralization policy was a Cabinet policy, a government decision. Staff were told that that would be a government decision as to where the centres are going to be located.

A MEMBER: I believe that.

MR. USKIW: Yes, that is correct, absolutely. We decided to put one in Portage la Prairie, too. —(Interjections)— Absolutely.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Member for . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could we have one speaker at a time.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Portage would like to have us believe —(Interjection)— would like us to believe, Mr. Chairman, that the staff shouldn't be told what they must do. That's what he would like us to believe. How much nonsense is that, Mr. Chairman? The Member for Portage would hire staff that would tell him what to do? Mr. Chairman, I don't believe it.

A MEMBER: No, but you told them exactly what they had to say. You know that.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the establishment of the regions, the staff's job was to look at the geography, and to recommend on geography, as to the regions, the boundaries, and so on. They were not commissioned to recommend the location of the regional centres, or the headquarters for each region. When this report was presented to the government, the first question, one of my first questions, was, "Who asked you?" Yes, we didn't ask you to name regional centres. That is a policy decision that should be left to the policy makers, who are the elected people of this province. That's where that decision belongs properly, Mr. Chairman, because we have a criteria different, different than the criteria of staff, and I'm going to tell the Minister, I'm going to read into the record the criteria that staff were using, to demonstrate to him what folly that would be if we were to follow that criteria. Yes, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the northwest region, and I'm quoting from Page 25 of this staff "The report: choice of Dauphin as a regional centre was unanimous", and so on. It goes on to say it has a population of 9,000 and so on, trading area, the number of motels, assembly halls, and so on. "The committee recognizes that Swan River area is on the outside of the 60-mile radius and would recommend that some specialist staff be located there," and that's their recommendation for Dauphin; unanimous that it be located in Dauphin. We didn't ask them that, Mr. Chairman, but they presented it anyway.

With respect to the southwest region and I quote, Mr. Chairman, from the text: "The choice of Brandon as a regional centre was unanimous", again, and they give their reasons. The central region, Mr. Chairman, the committee would recommend Portage la Prairie as a regional centre for the central region, but the choice was not unanimous, Mr. Chairman. Notwithstanding that, that is where it rests; it is the regional headquarters; I just point the distinction between the first two and this one. Then we get down to the eastern region and there you don't have unanimity either, Mr. Chairman. The committee was not unanimous on the Steinbach recommendation. You know, they were not unanimous on three out of the five.

A MEMBER: Where else did they recommend it? .

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there was a dispute between Steinbach, Beausejour, and somewhere inbetween; somewhere around Trans-Canada Highway. Well, Mr. Chairman, just let me follow through. The Interlake region, Mr. Chairman, the committee was not unanimous on either.

And so here you have a Minister that is telling me that while there is some lack of unanimity on the part of staff who are recommending on something that they were not commissioned to recommend on and then that the politicians shouldn't play a role; that's what he is saying, or attempting to say, while he was attempting to play the role today, Mr. Chairman. That's the absurdity of his position.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say to him, that the criteria for establishing regional centers was not based on the criteria as I would read into the record as was established by staff on page 27. Just look at what they say: "Steinbach is an economic growth centre with a population of 4,890 people, July 1970, in a trading area of population of 30,000." Now here is the importance of the recommendation, Mr. Chairman. What does it hinge on? There are two assembly halls, one hotel, three motels, and retail sales are \$14.9 million. In comparison, Beausejour has a population of 2,586, trading area of 8,000, and one assembly hall, two hotels, one motel, and \$4.3 million in retail sales. Mr. Chairman, who gives a damn how many hotels and motels there are with respect to where the government wants to set up its regional headquarters? What relevance is that, excepting for the comfort of the staff? But that isn't the purpose of the exercise, Mr. Chairman.

The purpose of the exercise, Mr. Chairman, was to use the instrumentality of government in the regionalization process in such a way that it would try to plug into those regions where it was reasonable to do so; government regional decentralized staff in those areas that needed some economic uplift. That was the criteria, Mr. Chairman, some economic uplift. And therefore if you want to compare Steinbach with Beausejour on that criteria, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe anyone will believe you, Sir, that Steinbach needed urgently some injection into their local economy; or that they needed to balance their economic performance, because the statistics that they read into the record here alone tell you that. And so what does it mean when you decide to locate a regional office: it means that there are support services; it means that people in those areas are more likely to apply for job opportunities in the provision of those services, that's what it's all about, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjections)—

A MEMBER: \$10 million worth of more action, that's all.

MR. USKIW: And so, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has not been able to demonstrate to this Committee any evidence, hasn't been able to present any evidence, from his staff that there is indeed a desire on the part of the staff for reasons that should be obvious, if they are there, that there be a relocation. He has not been able to tell us that, he has dodged every question that I have put to him on whether or not the eastern management, whether the eastern regional director has asked for a transfer of the office location. He has not been able to say, yes he has, and these are the reasons for it.

So, Mr. Chairman, obviously, the reasons are other than the efficiency of government, other than the delivery of services from government, it has to do with something that is obvious to all of us here, Mr. Chairman, and that is the political desires of this Minister. Well, Mr. Chairman, I would respect very much his decision with respect to launching a new program that required new facility with respect to wherever he wanted to locate them. I would not, Mr. Chairman, take the position that we would dismantle because there was a change of government, just for political purposes, Mr. Chairman.

A MEMBER: Sam, you were never politically oriented, we know that of course.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, you don't dismantle something that has been built. That is irresponsible, that is not in the public interest, and, Mr. Chairman, if that is the way this province has to function — heavens, the road to Steinbach goes both ways, Mr. Chairman. Does it mean that after the next election we have to take trainloads of office facilities back into Beausejour, is that what this Minister is really trying to suggest? —(Interjection)—

But, Mr. Chairman, that's the name of the game. That is what he is suggesting, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I challenge the Member for Springfield to state to this Committee that he supports the relocation of the eastern regional headquarters to the community of Steinbach. I challenge him to say so. —(Interjection)— Yes, we will deal with it in the right place, at the right time, but I challenge him to take a position vis-a-vis his Minister, who is moving people and facilities out of Beausejour, and relocating them into Steinbach, Mr. Chairman.

But, he hasn't told us whether he is going to build a new building to house them, or whether he has a few friends in Steinbach who have a few square feet of office space that they weren't able to rent, and there's a bit of pressure on, Mr. Chairman. Is that the logic of it, Mr. Chairman?

A MEMBER: A good idea.

MR. USKIW: Yes, those are the logistics of this Minister, Mr. Chairman, and if that's what they come down to, Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister to hang his head in shame. Yes, because that is not the way to administer the affairs of the people of this province, I ask him to hang his head in shame if that is his criteria for this kind of move, Mr. Chairman. It's a disgusting approach to government, Mr. Chairman. I challenge the Member for Springfield to enter this debate, because we will remember, Mr. Chairman, his contribution on this issue. —(Interjection)— I will remember, yes, well, we'll see who will be around.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is most amusing to sit here and listen to the Member for Lac du Bonnet run down a report that he, in fact, had his staff put together and now he's saying that, you know we should be paying full attention to the staff when it comes to making a decision. —(Interjection)— Well, he made that exact statement, but let us go back and look at the report. And he said that it was a political decision. Well, we all know that it was a political decision for him to, in fact, put the office in Beausejour, paying very little attention and of course looking very lightly at a report that, in fact, was put together by his staff.

So, let us look at some of the criteria that was given the regional centre committee that were set up to pick them; as well as recommending regional boundaries the committee was instructed to select appropriate regional centres for each region. Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's right in the report on Page 24, he refers to the report. And all at once there's no point in referring to the report because he is hearing something that he does not want to hear. Mr. Chairman, in fact the committee was instructed by him to select regional committee, regional centres, and in fact he didn't use what was recommended to him and then he goes on to say that the hotels or the numbers of service motels or Assembly Halls that's available to the committee.

Well, let's go back to the report again. And it said, Mr. Chairman, in the report that it should be located in viable, economic growth centres which could, in fact, facilitate the regional office, that in fact it had to be accessible to the majority or the region that it serviced; in fact, that fit the criteria for the Steinbach region and in fact, Mr. Chairman, the key thing that the member has not brought to the attention of the Committee was service to the farm people. No, Mr. Chairman, he had a great political desire to put financial funds, or funds of the province, into a large centre which was part of his constituency, Mr. Chairman. That, Mr. Chairman, was the only criteria that that Minister used of the day. —(Interjection)— I'm not saying that at all, Mr. Chairman. I am looking at the support of agriculture in the eastern region.

Mr. Chairman, our objective is to supply through the regional district system the best service, the best delivery of extension, to a centre which can best do that, and all the balderdash that he comes forward with trying to paint the picture that we are, in fact, trying to help our friends to rent space — you know, it amuses me to sit here and listen to the picture that he paints.

His staff prepared a report, given the criteria to recommend regional centres, Mr. Chairman, and he comes back and says, "Well, you know, it's now my staff that I should be listening to whether we change it or not". It was his staff that recommended, Mr. Chairman, an economic growth centre which can facilitate and give the people of the region the real service that they need to develop the agricultural industry. He hasn't said that once, but I've said that earlier this afternoon. I'm saying it again now, and Mr. Chairman, I don't think we should be subjected to listening to any more balderdash from the Member for Lac du Bonnet because that's totally what it is.

I've indicated that we'll be carrying on with the Agricultural Extension Offices in Beausejour, that in fact they will not be deprived of anything, and he says, "Well, what you take south you take away from the north". He brings a good point in, the Member for Springfield. I'm sure when the Member for Springfield can indicate to his people that possibly there'll be an Ag Rep office moved to Dugald instead of having two Ag Reps sitting in Beausejour. How could the member justify two Ag Reps sitting in Beausejour when, in fact, he could have disseminated them throughout the region to further diversify or to further spread out the services of the Department of Agriculture.

No, Mr. Chairman, again the Member for Lac du Bonnet proved his desire to build a great empire in the Beausejour office. In fact, it was totally there. We are doing exactly the opposite, Mr. Chairman, we are putting the farm people of the eastern region first with the delivery of extension service. We are using a recommendation of his department, his staff that put a recommendation — maybe it wasn't unanimous — but Mr. Chairman, the other point that was picked was a point on the Perimeter Highway in St. Vital which wasn't acceptable to the Minister of the day. We aren't going back to St. Vital. We're saying we're considering. We're considering moving the regional office to

Steinbach. Mr. Chairman, again the move has not taken place. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, the member is saying an election.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could we have one speaker at a time. Order please. Could we have one speaker at a time, please. The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: In concluding, Mr. Chairman, I just think that the Member for Lac du Bonnet, in trying to generate a great amount of smoke about the fact that we are doing something that shouldn't be done, he, in fact, had the recommendations to do what should have been done because of his desire. And he admitted it to the Committee, that it was provincial money that he wanted to put into a town in his constituency to give it a financial uplift. Mr. Chairman, that is not our desire. Our desire is to give the farm people proper agricultural extension so that the development of the industry can go ahead. So I think it's truly indicated by the member of the type, really the type of administration which we've had in the past, so I think that should clearly answer the question and I would hope that we could move on to the next item.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the last time the Minister was caught with his pants down we had a motion of Closure. Yes. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet. I recognize the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Yes. The last time this Minister had his pants down we had him bailed out by a motion on the part of the Minister of Highways who moved closure on the item and denied the Committee debating time. Yes, that's how he got out of his tight spot the last time around, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOWNEY: Tight spot? . . .

MR. USKIW: Yes. It was a tight spot. Because, Mr. Chairman, if your arguments were valid, if the Minister's arguments were valid he didn't need a motion of closure to shut up the opposition. Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could we refer to the item that is before the Committee here, please. The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Very much so, Mr. Chairman. The Minister has already made a decision with respect to this issue. He is merely waiting for the outcome of the election on the 22nd of May, after which he will feel freer to make it public, to make an announcement to satisfy those who have pressured him into this decision. Yes, that's where we are with this decision, Mr. Chairman. We know it and he knows it and the people in Beausejour know it, Mr. Chairman. His staff over there are aware of it, Mr. Chairman. Yes, they're aware of it.

But Mr. Chairman, this Minister today, this afternoon, and this evening, has been unable to tell me that there is some valid technical reason why this office will perform better in Steinbach than it has been performing in Beausejour. That is what we are waiting for, the meat of the issue. How will it do a better job for the eastern region? How has the staff arrived at that position? Who has made the recommendation? On what grounds have they made the recommendation, Mr. Chairman? That's all we want to know. And if the Minister has such fortifying information I'd be pleased to read it, Mr. Chairman, or to hear from him. Yes, what is the information that he has that would make us believe that the operations headquartered in Steinbach would somehow add to the value of the service to the farm community in this region? Where has he that evidence? I ask him to show it. I plead with him to show it, Mr. Chairman. We are desirous of knowing just what he is basing this on. If he has it, let him tell us. But he hasn't told us, yet, Mr. Chairman. No, he hasn't. No, Mr. Chairman. In answer to my question, Mr. Chairman, whether or not he has had a recommendation to relocate from his staff who have been operating in that area for several years, he says no.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, I have, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister now prepared to tell us that he has a recommendation from the Eastern Regional Director and his staff, that they could perform better out of Steinbach than they are now performing in the Town of Beausejour. Has he that kind of information? If he

has, I will be satisfied with that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, it's very amusing that all at once, I am to pay total attention, total attention, to the Eastern Regional Director, whom I am sure is doing his job, and again commuting out of Winnipeg to the Beausejour office, in performing his duties as a Regional Director, would feel that he was able to deliver, and I'm just saying this as my approach, that he would feel that he would be able to deliver out of one centre as well as another.

Mr. Chairman, the decision that is being made is being made by senior management, of which he is a part of, and in discussion with that individual, that in fact, management of the department, the Minister, the Cabinet, in which the member refers, or the —(Interjection)—

MR. USKIW: Well, say so.

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman, I'm not saying . . . no, Mr. Chairman, I'll go back to the decision of the Minister that is being discussed, that kind of a decision. I would say that he did not listen to his senior staff, and he's saying all at once we should listen to the regional people.

MR. USKIW: I didn't say that, you said it.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am saying we are, in fact, discussing it, and have discussed it, with our senior management staff. We are still discussing it. And, Mr. Chairman, again if we had some great, glaring reason not to, because we weren't going to be able to deliver the system better out of Steinbach, then that should have been brought forward by the Regional Director. But it hasn't been brought forward, and to make that decision we're looking at all the economic factors as it relates to the growth of the agricultural community. And again I go back, our number one objective is to deliver agricultural extension in the best possible method to meet the needs of the people. Mr. Chairman, he has never indicated that, as a member, that that was one of their objectives. In fact his prime objective was to inject provincial money into a town in his constituency. And yet here we are with the objective to provide agricultural extension the best possible way with the relocation of the regional office in a town that was recommended by his department, Mr. Chairman, his department, and yet he is trying to tell us that we should listen and we should not in fact move it because, well, the Regional Director says it shouldn't be moved. Well, I totally think that it demonstrates more than ever the decision that was made in the beginning wasn't the proper one to make. It was a complete political decision that was made by the last government. We are making our decisions on the needs of the people.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, let the Minister know and understand that those are political decisions, and they should be political decisions, yes, absolutely; that is not the kind of decision that you delegate to your staff. —(Interjection)— Absolutely, heavenly days, what are we elected to government for, Mr. Chairman? Does he think that he is elected to government so that the staff can tell him what is good for his constituents? Is that what this Minister is saying?

Mr. Chairman, the political process isn't cut out that way, Mr. Chairman. But, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is trying to tell this Committee that he doesn't have to listen to his Eastern Regional Director, that that isn't where the important information is going to come from on this issue. And, Mr. Chairman, that is fine. There is nothing wrong with that. If he is saying that, yes, they want to make a political decision that may cost the people some money and some inconvenience but for political reasons he thinks it's all right, it's a fair tradeoff, I respect him for that if that's what he is saying, but let him not hide behind the bushes. We know it's a political maneuver, Mr. Chairman. No one has to tell us anything other than that. It's obvious. I simply tell him that it's irresponsible. Yes, irresponsible because the facilities are there. They are there. It's not as if we're building new facilities. It's not as if we're building new facilities. The facilities are there, Mr. Chairman. And therefore if this Minister wants to relocate staff to satisfy his political desires, that's fine. But if he is doing it at a price of having to either rent new space or build new office space in another community and have vacant space left here, yes, that is a problem, Mr. Chairman.

There is another human problem, Mr. Chairman. He knows that the support services to the Regional Director and his staff are provided by people who live in that particular community. He knows that if these people are moved that they will have to retire these people, release these people or ask them to relocate to Steinbach, Mr. Chairman. That's right. He knows that. And therefore what will happen is a layoff situation or a termination for a number of employees in the area of Beausejour, yes, and there will be new staff positions opened up in the area of Steinbach; he knows that.

Mr. Chairman, if he is doing all of that to satisfy some political desire he was irresponsible.

If the facility was not built, if the structure was not there and you were developing a new one, Mr. Chairman, I would not argue the point, Mr. Chairman, but it is there and it is not in the public interest, Mr. Chairman, to destroy, disassemble, to relocate just because this Minister wants to play a few political games, just because he has a few political debts that he still wants to meet, Mr. Chairman. Yes, that is not a responsible administration, Mr. Chairman, and we are not prepared to let that go by very lightly, Mr. Chairman.

I still invite the Member for Springfield to tell me that his Minister is correct in having that office relocated to Steinbach. I invite him, because I would be interested to know what his views are, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I just go back again. There was probably one other thing that I should bring forward and that is I would yield the floor to the Member for Springfield if in fact . . . Well, I just go back, Mr. Chairman, to clarify for the Committee's sake, the Member for Lac du Bonnet was reading into the record; we will read into the record what was recommended for the Eastern Region, that the Committee recommends Steinbach as the regional centre for the Eastern Region. Mr. Chairman, as noted earlier, there are two distinct communities in this region with both funneling towards Winnipeg. The Committee did discuss at some length the feasibility of establishing the regional office somewhere along the Perimeter Highway in Transcona. Strong representation from staff also recommended this approach. The Committee finally rejected this alternative on two grounds. First, a Perimeter location is not decentralization and does not permit optimum identification with the regional community; second, the arguments used in supporting such a location could be applied equally both in the Central and Interlake Region.

So, Mr. Chairman, there was no mention of Beausejour in the recommendation of the department, no recommendation at all, and he is trying to leave with the Committee that there was a great recommendation to go to Beausejour. It was a totally political decision. —(Interjection)—

Well, Mr. Chairman, he tried to leave that impression with the Committee. For the clarification of the Committee, I wanted to read that. I think we have discussed it far enough. I think we have made the record very clear where we stand. And again I will go back and repeat it one more time: The objective of the Department of Agriculture is to provide extension to the people of rural Manitoba through the regional delivery system. That, Mr. Chairman, is the main reason that we are considering the relocation of the central office, the regional office in southeast Manitoba.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, this minister tells us that somehow by relocating the head office, that that will somehow improve the service to the region. I ask him to tell me how, I invite him to tell me how it will improve the services to the — (Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, this . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. Order please. Could we have one speaker at a time?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I asked the minister, since he made this statement, that his sole interest is in the improvement of services to the agricultural community —(Interjection)— But that is his interest. I ask him how that interest will be better served from Steinbach than it is now being served from Beausejour. Perhaps he has some very logical ideas, Mr. Chairman, along those lines. I invite him to tell this committee what those are.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, number one, I do — as much as the member is discrediting the staff that he had — I would say that I would have to take the professional judgment of people within the Department of Agriculture at the time the review was put forward, number one. Number two, I would say that the discussions that I've had with the administration, with the department to this point, plus some discussions with certain individuals throughout the farm community that is affected, will again —(Interjection)— well, Mr. Chairman, he has asked me why, and I'm using this . . . and of course, that is the decision that I have to make as a Minister. Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm very, very happy to be able to live with the proper decisions, ones which he is unable to live with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I view the problem that we do have tonight, it is the transfer of some of the responsibility from Beausejour to Steinbach. I think it would have to be pointed out that the former Minister of Agriculture is no longer the Minister of Agriculture, and the ministerial decisions are now in the hands of the Minister of Agriculture, and it seems to be that the former Minister of Agriculture is a very slow learner.

But there are a few things, I think that should be pointed out to him. The first, of course would have to be that there is an area of Manitoba, called southeastern Manitoba, whereby there are no railroads. —(Interjection)— There are very rapid — I didn't heckle you when you were talking but I will if you want to keep yapping. But in any event, there is a rapidly developing community there that isn't serviced by rail, it's serviced by trucks. And those people deserve the same representation as everyone else. The proximity of Beausejour, of course when we had our good socialist government in power, they had to keep on building little edifices to themselves and as the former Minister said this afternoon, that is a political plum. That we accept. As the pendulum swings, the thing goes the other way, then he's got to accept the fact that he no longer is in power and he has got to accept the fact that things are not going to keep coming his way.

Now, to get back to the area of servicing people. This basically is what our present Minister of Agriculture is out to do. He is out to establish an area whereby the people of that area will be serviced, they will be having the ag reps, etc., come in there, they will be gone, and by the same token, Mr. Chairman, they will not be building an edifice to themselves, they won't be building a great big stone monument that says, okay, this is what we have got for the town of Beausejour, we've built a thing and, as my friend here says, talk about paying election debts, my God, is it required to have a building —(Interjection)— the same as we have in — I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that as the transfer of power or the transfer of authority goes to the village of Steinbach or the town of Steinbach, there will not be the same kind of building programs, there will not be the same kind of capital outlay as we have seen in some of our honourable socialist friends.

There's a few other things that I would like to bring up, too, Mr. Chairman. It's the fact that, you know, where are we going? where have we been going with the young ag reps? The first question I would like to ask of the former Minister of Agriculture is this: How many of the real up and coming ag reps resigned, starting in 1974 to 1977-78, 1977, whereby the instructions came out, and I will not use the term that you so dearly love, I won't call our friend, the former Deputy Minister of Agriculture, "the colourful Deputy", yes. Where the instructions came by, they were instructed to go out and not service the agriculture community at all, they were told to go out and service the programs that were projected by the Minister of Agriculture and his honourable friend. Very well.

That is one thing, and that is the first thing, Mr. Chairman, —(Interjection)— that's the first

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could we have one speaker.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I've been in this House since 1969, and I can truthfully say right now that is the first word of truth that I've heard out of the former Minister of Agriculture. That is the first.

MR. CHAIAN: Order please. Could I ask the members that are interrupting that we could have one speaker at a time. The Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, over the past few days, I have made an effort of retaining myself. I haven't heckled across the way at all and I'm certainly not getting that turned back. So consequently, if our friends across the way want to play games, we'll just carry on and we'll get back to heckling a bit. But I thought the name of the game was to start to be nice. Of course, I have a little respect for the former Minister of Agriculture. I have no respect, of course for his policies, which he knows, and I can assure him that it will be an awful long time again before he will ever be the Minister of Agriculture. As a matter of fact, I wouldn't mind even making the statement, I give him three to one odds he never will be again. On any amount, also.

But in any event, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the former Minister of Agriculture how many of the up and coming young people that were coming up through the agriculture reps deals resigned. I can't ask, because I won't, but I know in my own particular area, I have five young ag reps, the smartest young fellows, they had degrees in Agriculture, they're back farming because of the former Minister of Agriculture and his Deputy Minister. They were not projecting policies to the farm community in Manitoba, they were told to go out and sell the B programs of the Minister, they were told to go out and to work on the marketing of —(Interjection)— no, well, anything outside the Wheat Board, rapeseed, etc., this sort of thing.

Mr. Chairman, our former Minister of Agriculture proved himself to the degree that when the crunch came and he made his move, he found that he had 23 percent of the people of Manitoba supporting him, 77 percent were against him. And they were against him for what reasons. Because he was not projecting the aims and the aspirations in the farm community of Manitoba at all, he was projecting his own personal gain of state control of land, and complete control, marketing

boards, everything down the spout. And I'll tell you, the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet will never ever be the Minister of Agriculture again in the Province of Manitoba, because he may sit in this committee, and his little friend from St. George may sit beside him and smirk; he couldn't run a wheelbarrow, he never has, no, never could, never will. All right, he is the aspiring, he's the agriculture critic — and I'll tell you —(Interjection)no, if he did it would probably upset him before he got halfway down the . . .

But, Mr. Chairman, I think I made my message abundantly clear. There is absolutely no way —(Interjection)— you bet it's clear, he never will be again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. At least I know from the member from wherever he's from, that he can't recognize a wheelbarrow when he sees one. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister whether it's government policy to build regional offices on the basis of community halls and hotels within a particular community — if that will be his criteria for moving and building regional offices for his department?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman. I've answered that prior to the Member for St. George asking the question.

MR. URUSKI: That will not be his criteria?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I again go back and say that the Number One objective is to supply the farm people with extension service, through the regional system, and the community, the trade centre, the accessibility of it to the farm people and the location within the region are some of the main criteria, and I go back to the report that the Member for Lac du Bonnet read from, and I think it clearly states that the initial recommendation was for — to service the community, the trade centre, or to locate them in trade centres, that in fact that recommendation had come forward. I again go back and say that the criteria is to service the farm people in the region that the regional offices are located, and that is the main objective.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, then can I ask the minister whether it is his policy, by the way he's enunciated, to build up in a building or an office, to move an office, in a regional centre or the growth centre as he calls it, at the expense of other communities within that region?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that that is the case. I've clearly indicated in the particular one we're discussing, that there will be a continuation of agricultural extension service in that particular area. In fact, let's go back and look at the office that we were talking about. The Regional Director, I don't know how many others, the people that are working out of that regional office, but I can find out for him that there are a certain number of those people that do not even live in that community, which I think is something that, as far as I am concerned, an individual should have the right to live where they want to live in the province. But, on the other hand, when they are . . . if he's making reference to the fact that there's going to be some great loss because those individuals are being located in another regional centre, then it doesn't hold water, and I know, for exale, the Regional Director does not live in the regional centre, in the eastern region at this particular point.

MR. URUSKI: Is the minister prepared to instruct his staff to live within the community that they are working?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman, but I would think that it would be a desirous situation, but I do not think that it would be up to the minister to direct anyone to live where he should think they should live. We've had eight years of that, Mr. Chairman. We aren't going to dictate to our people where they should live, but I think it should be a desirable kind of a situation, and I do know that, particularly in some circumstances — there are health reasons, there are other reasons why people have to live in other areas, and I don't hold that against them, but I do want to make it very clear that it would be desirable to have individuals who are working within the department to live in the community in which they are servicing.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, in view of the minister's comments this evening with respect to the eastern region, is it his intent to also move the regional office in the Interlake Region, from Arborg to Gimli or some other area, some other community?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman, that is not being considered.

MR. URUSKI: There is no intention at all to make any changes in terms of regional staff?

MR. DOWNEY: Not at this time, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, we have this minister telling us that the Conservative government is going back to the policy of looking at growth centres and strictly — while staff in many of the government departments, especially Industry and Commerce and others, historically, wanted to move governments of the day, in terms of providing development in rural communities — strictly on the basis of retail sales and what they perceive as growth centres. We have this minister, of this government, following that direction that was given that . . . You know, there were many reports prior to us being in office, since we've been in office, of a particular direction that staff wanted to take in terms of building office space wherever there . . . in whatever community they perceived as being a growth centre. The growth centre concept, Mr. Chairman, is one that really ends up as having one major community in an entire region at the expense of all the other communities. And really, Mr. Chairman, that is what the minister is talking about with respect to the eastern region. Steinbach, of course, is the largest community within that whole eastern region. Economically, Steinbach is doing very well. There is no doubt about that, but yet the minister indicates that he wants to service the farm population. Has he got statistics in terms of indicating the farm population that are not being serviced at the present time, or have not been serviced by the office where it is located? He indicates that that will be the policy. The Interlake Region is not being considered at this time. Mr. Chairman, I foresee the Interlake Region next having a battle between community versus community for the same situation. We see it, Mr. Chairman, in the Estimates of the Department of Health. We see the Minister of Health, who has come up and I want to —(interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, to relate what this government is doing — I want to give you an example what the Minister of Health is doing in terms of providing health delivery systems. At least he is being open and indicating that he is prepared to have community fight community for the services that will come to his region.

Mr. Chairman, the communities of Ashern and Eriksdale both have hospitals in their respective areas. They were scheduled to have 20 personal care beds in their region. Mr. Chairman, I want to relate to you what kind of a policy the Minister of Agriculture is following in light of what the Minister of Health is doing because this is a general direction of the present Conservative Government, Mr. Chairman.

Those two communities that I mentioned have and were to have constructed 20 personal care beds juxtaposed to their hospitals. Mr. Chairman, those units were tendered prior to 1977 when the Conservative Administration came into office they stopped those tenders. We had an announcement this session, Mr. Chairman, to the effect that there will be one 20 personal care bed unit built...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could I request the member from St. George to confine himself to the area that we are covering. If I allow that kind of latitude we will be covering the whole waterfront. The Member for St. George. The Member for Lac du Bonnet on a point of order.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, as I understood the member for St. George, he was merely relating to the committee comparisons of other departments to this department and it's very relevant to the consideration of these estimates. He is talking about the approach of government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Member for Lac du Bonnet does not have a point of order. I would direct the Member for St. George to try and confine himself more to the issue that we have under discussion here. The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: We are talking about regional offices and services to rural areas. Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate to you the pattern that this government is taking in terms of providing services to the rural communities. Does the Minister of Agriculture not believe that hospitals and personal care homes in rural communities are a service that is necessary to those areas, or does he want to divorce himself and stick to ag reps versus all the services that are required to build up a quality of life that is much needed by the people of rural areas.

Mr. Chairman, the decision and the announcement made by the Minister of Health was to the effect that there will only be one community that will receive a 20 personal care bed, but, Mr. Chairman, there comes an area where he indicates that it may be put into other communities within that region thus forcing those communities to pit one against the other — one against the other; rather than making a decision as to which community shall have the service he has injected a third option. When he was asked whether a third community and the community of Lundar would be eligible for the personal care...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would request the Member for St. George to try and confine himself within the item that we are discussing. By allowing this kind of latitude — if we could at least contain it within the realm of agriculture please. The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, in terms of the agricultural community... Mr. Chairman, if you would allow me one more minute I will be through with my remarks with respect to the direction that this government is taking in terms of regional offices in agriculture as well as health care services, both require to have a healthy rural community. Mr. Chairman, now we have the provincial government, the Minister of Health and the Minister of Agriculture, hand in hand pitting community against community. Indicating well if you can give me a better argument why these services should not come to your area we will not move it to your area but if you can't give me, if you can't give me an argument that we should move the office space from one area to another, then they will be moved because the minister tonight, Mr. Chairman, has not shown to us, not shown to anyone on this committee that by his rationale that the office space should be moved — Mr. Chairman, the members opposite kept interjecting that they didn't like to be heckled...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could we have one speaker at a time. The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Agriculture tonight hasn't indicated to us that the office space, the regional office in the eastern region should be moved or should be moved to the community of Steinbach and that it makes economic sense. If he has then he should be able to provide us with figures, figures to indicate how many farmers are not being served or have not been served by having the office elsewhere. He should also tell us, since there was a divergence of opinion with respect to the Interlake, why the Interlake office is not being moved along the same lines because the opinion was very similar with respect to the Interlake region. All he will tell us at this time is that it's not being considered at this time. I want to know, Mr. Chairman, when the minister is going to consider that since he is obviously considering moves in other areas. Are we next on the line? Is the concept back to the regional centre concept with respect to regional offices or is he prepared to say that yes this is a political decision and I, as minister and government, am making that move? He'd better...

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the minister will indicate whether he is intending to move those offices or he's not. He says he's considering them. What is delaying his announcement of those offices? Can he tell this committee? What is the delay for making the announcement?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make sure that I follow up what the member has recommended to count the farmers and see if they are not getting the total service. The information I have at this particular time is the fact that we could deliver the service and meet the needs of the people better by moving of that office and I just will make sure of that, Mr. Chairman, on his recommendation.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the minister indicate to us from whom he received those recommendations?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I have answered that earlier today. I have answered it all evening. I think we've fully discussed it and there is no need to...It's all repetition what we are doing here now and I can see no objective in carrying on with kind of debate that we are in. I've said we've discussed it at senior level within the department. We've discussed it with some of the individuals in the farm community. As far as names are concerned I guess we could provide some names but I don't think it's necessary. Again if the member is not satisfied that I have enough substantiated

evidence that it should be moved then that's his problem but, Mr. Chairman, I have —(Interjection)— It appears to be your problem, Mr. Chairman, because... So, Mr. Chairman, I think we've again continued on in repetitious debate.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, is the minister prepared to repeat his statement that the building of an office complex in Beausejour and in Arborg was an irresponsible decision?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I did not say that.

MR. URUSKI: The minister implied that the decision to build an office building in the community of Beausejour was irresponsible and if he did not say that then, Mr. Chairman, can he indicate what he meant? What did he mean?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't think I implied it and I know I didn't say it. Agriculture is only a portion of that building in Beausejour and that of course in time will tell if it was an irresponsible move to have built that building.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that there is an implication that there may have been an irresponsible decision based on what the minister is thinking and the way he is speaking, Mr. Chairman. He is indicating that if he empties half of that office or the staff in that office that the building will be vacant and then he can get up and say that it was an irresponsible decision to have a building built which is now half empty. Is that what the minister is indicating?

MR. DOWNEY: Well if that's in fact what happens, Mr. Chairman, you'll bet I'll get up and say it.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, has the minister named a regional director for the Interlake region?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, how long will it be before a regional director will be named to give direction and delivery of services within the Interlake?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, we have an acting regional director in the Interlake area and I would think, as my colleagues have indicated for the member, it will be done soon.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, how long does the minister feel a region in terms of having direction and carrying out government policies will be able to carry on without a fully appointed director.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I am quite satisfied that the acting regional director is doing a very competent job and that the delivery of any programs throughout that region are not suffering at this time.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, if the acting director is doing an adequate job, what is stopping the minister from appointing him as the director?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I can assure you that there will be consideration given to a multiple of individuals for that particular job.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister indicate whether that job has been bulletined?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Can he also indicate when the selection is expected to be made?

MR. DOWNEY: Soon, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Interlake region has not had a regional director for I believe six to eight months, approximately that length of time. What does soon mean in the minister's words? What time is soon, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DOWNEY: I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that we could make that decision within the next two months.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Springfield.

MR. ROBERT ANDERSON: Inexperienced and perhaps little able as I am to participate in the political game that's gone on here this evening and representing a riding that is located between the two points that have been in contention this evening —(Interjection)— the name escapes me for the moment — I would just like to point out that perhaps farmers are the type of individuals that vote with their feet. Over the last number of years a regional office or a part time office was established in the village of Dugald located on Highway 15 in a rather deplorable little building where I remember dropping in there several times during cold winter days where the ag rep on duty would be sitting in his parka writing with his gloves on and the coffee, coffee that had dripped down the edge of his coffee cup would be frozen on the desk but the interesting thing is that in the two half days he spent a week in those deplorable conditions, he had substantially more farm calls than he did in that magnificent edifice in Beausejour.

So I am pleased to note that while the conditions of the part time ag rep office in Dugald are somewhat better, they are still located in a rather spartan construction trailer but I don't think farmers are that much concerned about magnificent monuments, they are more concerned about receiving a service. Perhaps our discussions this evening would have been better directed in that regard rather than the so-called political game, because I don't perceive this matter having any effect on the national campaign in Provencher but if the member from Lac du Bonnet feels that it would be, I don't believe the date for nominations in the federal scene is for closed. Perhaps he would care to venture in and take advantage of the situation. It may be a lesson in humility. So let's just remember that the object of the Department of Agriculture is to provide service to the farmers of the nation and the farmers of the province, and bear that in mind as we continue through our discussions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(1)—pass — the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: The Member for Springfield, a question. Is the member suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that he is in support of relocating the Regional Office from Beausejour . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would like to direct the Member for Lac du Bonnet to address his remarks to the Chair. The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I did ask through you, whether or not the Member for Springfield would care to elaborate on whether or not he agrees with the Minister that the office that is now in Beausejour, the Regional Office for the Department of Agriculture, should be moved to Steinbach. It's very simple; it's a yes or no, and I wonder if he is prepared to elaborate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Member for Springfield's Estimates are not before the Committee. The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet on a point of order.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, you would know that in the debates in the Assembly that it's open to anyone to ask for clarification on the part of any speaker in the Assembly, and I ask him for clarification, without having to have an intrusion on your part, Mr. Chairman.

A MEMBER: He doesn't have a point of order.

MR. USKIW: I sure do. I am entitled to pursue any line of questioning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Springfield.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, again . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Member for Springfield.

MR. ANDERSON: . . . being quite inexperienced at the so-called "political game" and procedure, I can only answer this question as I see it and as I perceive it, and as I feel the farmers of my constituency would perceive it. And again, I think they would probably vote with their feet. If I understand the way the farmers of my constituency move around, probably in the course of a year's travelling about they would end up in Steinbach much more often than they would end up in Beausejour, which tells me that perhaps the services might be more useful to them in Steinbach than in Beausejour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(1)—pass — the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I wonder, before we pass this item, could the Minister advise me what is the reduction of the staff at the Regional Office in Dauphin, if any, and also the sub-office at Ste. Rose. I guess Ste. Rose is a sub-office to the district.

MR. DOWNEY: On this particular item, we are showing an increase of 5 SMYs for agricultural representatives, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ADAM: A five increase in Dauphin and Ste. Rose; is that correct?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman, in the total department.

MR. ADAM: Could the Minister advise how many staff was laid off or done away with in Ste. Rose? How many were terminated?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, there was no change in the Ste. Rose office as far as the agricultural representation is concerned. It is a district office and we are continuing to man it with an ag. rep.

MR. ADAM: How many staff are under the Dauphin district?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, we are, at this particular time, in the agricultural representatives' section of these Estimates and we could get that information for the member as we proceed. The total numbers of people out of the Dauphin office, that is information that the staff will look up and give you the total figure. But as far as the Ste. Rose office is concerned, the staff of the ag. rep. or individual, it is the same as it has been, and that is one ag. rep. and a district office.

MR. ADAM: Are there any other Extension people, apart from the ag. reps. that were deleted or their employment was terminated out of Dauphin and Ste. Rose?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and the place in which we can discuss that will be under the Canada-Manitoba ARDA Agreement, that there was, I believe, a farm advisor that was in the Ste. Rose office that is not there any longer. The position has been deleted.

MR. ADAM: Is that the only position that was terminated, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DOWNEY: That, Mr. Chairman, as of this last year. Of any change in staff, that is the only change, that there has been one deletion because of the Canada-Manitoba ARDA Agreement.

MR. ADAM: No, it's okay; go ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could the Minister give us the total number of staff in this 5.(a)(1)(2), the complement in that area, or does he want to go through the whole . . . ?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, we might as well take them one at a time, the agricultural representatives. We have a staff complement of 45 positions. I want to indicate, and I indicated it earlier I realize the Member for St. George was not here prior to this evening but I did make a statement that the five new additional positions are to make available positions for Extension

assistance throughout the summer for agricultural students to become a part of the agricultural system. It is a training program, or in fact job opportunities for summer students, that they can go out and work as assistant ag. reps. throughout rural Manitoba, so that when we do look for new people to fill ag. rep. positions we have some experienced people that can, in fact, qualify for the jobs, because of experience gained over summer employment through the Extension Service of the department, something that I feel has been long overdue. I think we have to develop ag. reps. It is not something that comes natural to those individuals, who automatically come out of Agricultural College, that in fact they have to learn to work with people and the addition of these five staff man years will facilitate this kind of a program that will support the regional agricultural representatives. So that is the reason the additional staff man years are in there, to facilitate . . . And it does two things. Of course, it . . . Well, it does more than two. It facilitates the training of ag. reps. It further supports the agricultural community with Extension work in the production season, crops in particular, and it provides job opportunities for students in the summertime.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the five additional SMYs, is that in addition to the 45 in that part of it?

MR. DOWNEY: That is part of it, Mr. Chairman. That is the total staff man years.

MR. URUSKI: From last year then, that's an increase of five from last year's complement.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister indicate, the students that will be hired in those five positions, they will be undergraduates or graduates from the University?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the question I believe was: Where do we draw on the individuals to fill those positions? They would be agricultural students, University students, who would in fact qualify to fill those positions in that role. They could, in fact, be graduate students who have completed a course. I might say that this five staff man years facilitates something like 15 assistant ag. reps. for a four-month period, which I think is very supportive to the rural community and supports the ag. rep. Extension work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)(1)—pass; (a)(2)—pass; (a)—pass; (b)(1)pass — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister elaborate on the Regional Production Specialists' staff and role?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The Regional Production Specialists that we are requesting positions for, we are requesting positions for 56.16 staff man years, in opposition to 56.42-½ contract staff man years last year. The change is due to . . . There are two new Farm Management Specialists added, one in the Central Region and one in the Southwest Region. There has been a deletion of three positions, that being a Swine Specialist, a Livestock Technician and a Livestock Specialist, Mr. Chairman. So there has been an addition of two Farm Management positions and a deletion of three, and the deletions were vacant positions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)(1)—pass — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, it appears that there is a shift in emphasis in this area. Could the Minister, even though the staff positions were not filled, what is the intent of the shift in emphasis in terms of hiring the two Farm Management positions?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, there isn't really a shift in emphasis. Really what is taking place is, the hiring of two Farm Management Specialists will be filling in where in fact there could be a void take place through the deletion of the Small Farm Development Program that was provided through the federal government and the provinces. There was somewhat of a cutback there in that particular area. As I say, any direct appearance that it might be a shift in emphasis, I don't think we can read that into it, but in fact we have lost the CanFarm Program, as it was known, to the farm people. We are not participating in that, and we are picking that up . . . Not picking it up but in fact supporting the farm community through the addition of two new Farm Management Specialists.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, will these positions be located rurally? Are they to be located outside of Winnipeg?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: This total appropriation will be outside of the Winnipeg area, out of the administrative area of the Winnipeg Area, in some of the regions?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)(1)—pass; (b)(2)—pass; (b)—pass; (c)(1)—pass; (c)(2) — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister indicate the staff?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. There is no change in the staff, 5.4 staff man years in the 4-H and Youth Delivery Program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(1)—pass; (c)(2)—pass; (c)—pass; (d)(1)—pass — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate the staff complement in (d)?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. In the area of the Home Ecs. in 5.(d) appropriation we're looking at a reduction in staff, Mr. Chairman, a reduction from 25.35 staff man years to 17.35, of which 10 of those . . . Okay, there has been an addition of two Home Economists positions and that gives us a total of four Home Economists in each of the Southwest and Central Regions and three Home Economists in each of the remaining regions, the Northwest, Eastern and Interlake.

There is a reduction of 10 staff man years through the Home Visitor positions, due to the termination of the Home Visitor Program.

There are, at this particular time, four vacant positions: one in the Southwest, Central, Eastern and Interlake Regions.

MR. URUSKI: Those vacant positions that the Minister is indicating, are they the Home Ec. positions?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: To understand the minister then, then there will be seven home ec's in the rural areas and the remaining staff of 10.35 would be what? Clerical and support staff?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman, the total 17.35 staff man years will be located throughout the regions in the province. They are all Home Ec's throughout the regions of the province. I've indicated in my earlier comments that we would have 4 home economists in the two larger regions, that being the southwest and the central, and 3 home economists in each of the other three regions.

MR. URUSKI: Could the minister then indicate where the additional 10.35 home economists are located?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, if we add four in the southwest and four in the central, we have eight; and if we add . . .

MR. URUSKI: Oh, I'm sorry. Four each in the . . .

MR. DOWNEY: That is correct, that is correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: And then three in each of the other . . .

MR. DOWNEY: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, I noticed the Members of the Opposition conveniently skipped over (c), the 4H and Youth Section because I know there is some re-emphasis there on the thrust in that particular division, but on the Home Economics Division the minister has indicated that there is additional staff support in this area, and I wonder if he might elaborate a little more on the type of support that's going to be provided in this particular area, and what has happened with the lack of support that was evident in the previous four or five years when the home economists were removed from the particular regions and caused such a furor with the Womens' Groups throughout rural Manitoba?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, the emphasis on the . . . —(Interjection)— no, Mr. Chairman, I believe he has referred to the home economists which we are discussing and I would just like to, well, I could elaborate a little bit. The home economists' roles that they will be playing will be to work in the area of home management, nutrition, of total picture of some assistance to the people in the farm management field that in fact, the use of home economists throughout the rural parts of the province will be able to further organize and work with farm people to better their ways of lives and their businesses.

I think that it is the ability of professionally trained people such as the home economist to further the objectives of the farm people to increase their incomes; to provide better home making techniques; and work in the area of 4-H, I think which is one that is of key importance to rural Manitoba. So I think we are in a position now where we are able to use the professional services of the home economists over a lot larger number of people through their ability to organize and set programs up and to work through the educational systems that they have available to them.

I think that it is totally an indication of our government's support to further and enhance the rural life and to improve the home making and farm management tools or making available to the farm people infrastructure for the betterment of the total farm home.

MR. BLAKE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I fully support the minister in this particular section of his Estimates, because it appears to me there was a very noticeable neglect in these particular two items in the past four or five years and I want to tell the minister that I support the addition of the home economists to this program wholeheartedly, because it appeared that with the furor that was created a few years ago with the Womens' Institute and the removal of the home economists from rural Manitoba that here was an area when we hear so much, and we heard so much from the past years about improving the quality of life for rural Manitoba, that here was an area, the 4-H movement and the home economists that did so much to improve the quality of life for the rural people of Manitoba, that was virtually destroyed by the previous government and I want to tell the minister that I am happy to see him bringing back further emphasis on this particularly important facet of rural life in Manitoba.

And it's pretty handy for the opposition to just zip over these two items unnoticed when they've spent so much time badgering and beleaguering some of the other items that have maybe less impact on the quality of life in rural Manitoba as these two particular items that we've just passed over.

So I want to compliment the minister for realizing this and taking some steps to restore the home economists to rural Manitoba points where the rural people can have the benefit of their expertise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like the minister to tell the Committee how many home economists he has all told working in the regions?

MR. DOWNEY: I've already answered that, Mr. Chairman. That figure was 17 for the information of the member.

MR. USKIW: Yes. Mr. Chairman, can the minister tell me how many people these home economists are going to be servicing?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, the total farm community is something like 30,000 people and I would think that this . . .

MR. USKIW: 30,000 farms.

MR. DOWNEY: well, Mr. Chairman, there are 20,000 to 30,000 farms; I would say 30,000 is a fair figure to use that they will be working with that farm community.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, could the minister tell me what criteria he has given to the home economists with respect to their role in response to those 30,000 farms that are out there that will be interested in services from the home economists? What is the policy of his government with respect to how that service is going to be provided?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I clearly indicated to the Committee that the type of delivery system that these individuals will be able to provide will be in conjunction with working with the Ag reps, with the 4-H programs. Their responsibilities cover a wide field through home management programs; through the use of extension material; and through meetings; that type of thing.

For the Member for Lac du Bonnet who really doesn't understand what farm communities are like and how they operate, I think the role of the home economists are to make available to the farm communities or to the homemakers throughout Manitoba they make available courses whether they be in homemaking or money management or that type of thing for those individuals to participate, whether it be through group activity, whether it be through the news media, whether it be through local media, however. But in fact, they have the capacity to go out and spread their extension knowledge and extension abilities over the total farm community.

I know he doesn't understand that because it isn't in fact a hand-holding program but I would like to say that it is quite possible, it has been done and I can assure you that it will continue to be done very effectively.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, since the minister hasn't given the home economists some terms of reference on how they should deliver the service that they are so capable of delivering, Mr. Chairman, I then ask him how he expects 17 home economists to be able to respond to 30,000 farm families plus all the other rural families that from time to time they must respond to? You know, the figure of 17 is so meaningless relative to the clientele volume that is out there, Mr. Chairman. So, Mr. Chairman, if there is no policy on the part of this minister or no terms of reference as to how these people should function, then I can see that very many people are not going to get access to these services.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, the member brings a good point forward, you know. He says, "How can 17 people handle 30,000 farm homes or that type of thing?" Mr. Chairman, the total of 30,000 farm people, a lot of them are very qualified homemaking people and the type of programs that are being introduced are available to those who feel the need for it.

Mr. Chairman, we are not going around spoon feeding people, telling them that there is need for us to get involved in their lives. In fact, we do have programs that home economists are offering if they want to participate in a homemaking course or if they want to participate in a 4-H program which those people are administering, they're using the capabilities of many rural people that are available. They aren't, Mr. Chairman, going out and telling people that there's a great need for their services — they are offering them. And the same as the Ag. rep system, it's a delivery system that they use in the total farm community.

I would also say that there is a large percentage of individuals, of women throughout rural Manitoba who I'm sure he found out when he cut the home economists out, such as the W.I. group, Mr. Chairman, that all climbed on his back and he knew that they were quite alive, that in fact through the use of home economists and the use of many of these rural people, Womens' Institute for example, they are able to work with home economists and deliver a lot of the programs.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, it isn't totally identified by government that we have to go out and, again, hand-hold or force feed individuals. There are programs that are made available through extension. they are available to all the farmers and I clearly want to indicate, there would not be 30,000 people who would want to feel the need for to make use of them. But they are available to them, Mr. Chairman, something that the Member for Lac du Bonnet did not make available when he was in Administration. He directed the people to handle a few of his particular favourite ones, and I think that now the farm people are very much relaxed, that there is that extension service available to them if they want to use it. If they don't, then fine, but they aren't being directed to use them or not to use them, and he doesn't understand that.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, how many additional home economists do we have since he was in charge of this department? How many?

MR. DOWNEY: In the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Chairman, there are two.

MR. USKIW: Two, Mr. Chairman out of 17?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman, there is a correction to be made here. Last year there was an additional some home economists also, so let us get the record straight.

A MEMBER: He tried to destroy the program which we put back.

MR. USKIW: . . . what you put back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Does the Member for Lac du Bonnet have any further questions? The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We're waiting for the minister to give us some answers.

MR. DOWNEY: We don't have that, Mr. Chairman, but I do know I can recall that . . .no, in last year's Estimates we did increase the numbers of home economists.

MR. USKIW: One?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, he says one, but at least we have redirected them the same as the Ag. reps so that they are available to the total farm community.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is our problem. The minister has just told us they have been redirected and that is the nub of the problem because what is the role of a home economist, Mr. Chairman? The members know that the role of a home economist is to offer her assistance to homemakers in the field of home decorating, in the field of making clothes, in the field of the kitchen, the surrounding yard around the house, and so on. Yes, this is the role of a home economist. Now, Mr. Chairman, since we have only 17 home economists and we have some 30,000 farms, and we have tens of thousands of other rural people who are interested in the subject of home economics, it's very difficult for me to believe that these 17 home economists are going to be able to do much of a job. Now I agree with the minister — they will be able to have a presence throughout the province, but the question I put is whether or not we are going to get the kind of value for their services that we should be getting Mr. Chairman. That is the question that I raise because, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that this government should be using taxpayers' dollars to provide programs for people who don't need programs. Yes, I don't believe that that is a very proper thing to do, to use tax dollars to provide services to people who don't need the services that are being provided.

And so we have to examine our clientele in this regard, Mr. Chairman. There are thousands of farm families who truly don't need that kind of assistance and, if they do need it, they are able to pay for it, Mr. Chairman. They can get a home decorator in or they can do all sorts of innovative things on their own without being a charge to the taxpayers of this province. And the home economists should be concentrating on drawing into the program those people that don't even know that the program is good for them, but is desirable and should be there for them. Yes, that is the proper role of a home economist. It's a role to stimulate an activity on the part of those people to help themselves that need some help, Mr. Chairman. It isn't the role of the home economist or shouldn't be to sort of become part of the elite club in the community.

That is right. That is the thing that happens, Mr. Chairman, and I don't fault anyone excepting I fault the Minister who doesn't give direction when that happens. It seems to me if there are only 17 home economists, the policy of the government should be that those Home Economic Services should be designed for a category of people that truly need that kind of assistance.

Mr. Chairman, if the Minister has a constituent that has a net worth of \$100,000 or \$200,000, or a half a million — and there are many of them, Mr. Chairman, many of them — surely he isn't telling me that those people could not manage without the services of a free home economist provided by the Department of Agriculture. Surely he is not telling me that, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjection)—

Well, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Minnedosa says that it might be helpful to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could we have one speaker at a time, please. The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Minnedosa tells us that it might be helpful for those people. I agree it would be helpful. I question whether the taxpayers should bear the burden, Mr. Chairman. I don't believe that in my household, Mr. Chairman, that I would want to impose my household needs or the needs of my family on the taxpayers of this province for those services. I don't believe that that is proper, because we can get along very well without them. Yes, there are people that can't get along without them, Mr. Chairman. They number in the thousands, Mr. Chairman.

You know, when you talk about the Manpower Training Programs that this department administered up until this year, Mr. Chairman, we had people introduced to the community of Selkirk that didn't know how to flush a toilet. That's right; they didn't know how to flush a toilet. They didn't know what it was for, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjection)— Well, the Member for Minnedosa would like to make some disparaging remarks about the community of East Selkirk. That's his privilege, Mr. Chairman, he will have to live with that. But, Mr. Chairman, we have introduced to that community many trainees who didn't know anything about draperies, who didn't know anything about furniture —(Interjection)— That's right, Mr. Chairman; it's very apropos.

Mr. Chairman, those are the examples. Yes, those are the people that desperately need someone to — the Minister says "Hold their hand" — yes, until they get oriented into the new environment, and that is important, Mr. Chairman. It is important, since we have a limited resource or a limited capacity to deliver this service, it is important that we zero in on those areas, problem areas, in society that need that kind of attention.

Mr. Chairman, if these ladies in the Home Economics Branch are going to be holding hands and having tea parties with ladies that just want to have a little meeting rather than having serious problems in managing their households, then, Mr. Chairman, we are wasting \$456,000 if that is what they are going to do. Yes, it's a waste of \$500,000, Mr. Chairman, unless there is direction on the part of this Minister to make sure that we zero in on the human problems that are there and that need attention, Mr. Chairman, that this is a waste of money.

So the fact that he adds two home economists, Mr. Chairman, does nothing but exaggerate the waste that much more unless there is a definite policy of the government to apply these services to the area of need, not the area of greed, Mr. Chairman, the area of need; there is a difference.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can't help but reply to the Member for Lac du Bonnet, who is so totally uninformed. There is an indication in our Estimates that we have increased the numbers of home economists this year by two, but last year, Mr. Chairman, there was a significant increase of five. And so, when you look at the total increase, there is a 60 percent increase in the making available of home economists to rural Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, to rural Manitoba to work with the homemakers in rural Manitoba, to provide them with money management programs, nutrition, for those people who want to use that, Mr. Chairman. And I can assure you that it is not being wasted. In fact, it is being used very efficiently.

In fact, I would like to say that I think that the total farm community, that was one of the main things that they suggested and recommended was to reintroduce to the rural communities support staff in the area of home economists for the 4-H programs, for all the programs which in fact I'm sure the Member for Lac du Bonnet really doesn't understand what the needs are as far as rural communities are concerned. But as far as what he refers to in the East Selkirk area, Mr. Chairman, we did not reduce . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Member for Lac du Bonnet on a point of privilege.

MR. USKIW: The Member for Minnedosa drew into the picture the question of East Selkirk; I made no reference. So let the member address his arguments to the Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DOWNEY: I will retract that, Mr. Chairman. He referred to a program in the Selkirk area, and I'm sure that he referred to the Selkirk Training Plant, Mr. Chairman, which we have carried on with home advisors to help those individuals. But it wasn't him, Mr. Chairman, that introduced that program, it was under the FRED Agreement under the last Conservative government, not the NDP government who want to bow to be the great people who helped all these needy people. It was a Conservative government and it is being carried on by a Conservative government, and in fact has been put under the Department of Manpower, who in fact are responsible for that program. It is a good program; it is being carried on with, Mr. Chairman, and I am very happy to support that. I think it's one of those things which he has clearly identified. There is need to upgrade the individuals' living accommodations or their abilities to cope with modern-type house facilities, that

in fact we are continuing on with that. And if he is indicating that we're reducing that, I don't want that to put on the record and I don't want it on the record that he was the one that introduced it. No, Mr. Chairman, and I want to make sure that that's very plain and clear to the people of Manitoba.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has skated all over the place but hasn't answered the question. The question is are we going to put these 17 people into a service that will benefit those that have the greatest need in this area or is the Minister simply telling us that we are adding bodies and they will find something to do, because there is quite a difference between the two approaches. Yes, the Member for Minnedosa objects to the program of the previous government, who gave these people direction to deal with those critical areas in society that had to be dealt with, at the exclusion of the elite, yes. That is what he is objecting to, and I respect that, Mr. Chairman. He prefers to have general programs, Mr. Chairman, that is open to the whole community, so that those in the know in the community, the elite of the community, are the first ones in and then the resources are used up and the others have no way of getting in, Mr. Chairman. Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's a fat cat's approach to programming, Mr. Chairman, and that is what the Member for Minnedosa is now so proud of, that is being reinstated by this government.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not proud of that, because there are tens of thousands of people that need a lot of attention, Mr. Chairman. If we're going to have a Home Ec. Program, a people program to upgrade people's services —(Interjection)— That's right. Then make sure that there is direction given to staff so they can zero in to the right people, Mr. Chairman, not an overall general program that anyone can participate in. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Chairman, the members oppose the idea of categorizing people. Well, I will tell him that he is categorizing people, because he knows, Mr. Chairman, that when you have a wide open general program with a limited resource, a limited staff resource, limited financial resource, that only those in the know, those with the connections, get in right away, and it's to the exclusion of the others, Mr. Chairman. He knows that full well. And, Mr. Chairman, that is the role of government —(Interjection)— Well, the Member for Portage la Prairie is sick, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could we have one speaker at a time.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, we do not require the taxation of people to provide services to people who don't need the services.

Mr. Chairman, the First Minister is here and I would think that he would be prudent enough to recognize what I am talking about, Mr. Chairman. I would think that he would appreciate those comments. What we have here, Mr. Chairman —(Interjection)— Yes, anything that is for those that have a need is Marxist in the views of the Premier, Mr. Speaker, but anything, any dollars that are flowing out of the public purse, Mr. Chairman, that can be grabbed up by those who have too many already, that makes that policy just right for him, Mr. Chairman. Anything other than that is Marxist.

Well, I tell him, Mr. Chairman, that there are tens of thousands of people that need these kind of services but they can never receive them because 17 people cannot do the job, Mr. Chairman, and since the resources are not adequate to do a job for many people then we have to give them some terms of reference to make sure that our dollars are not squandered by those that are somewhat greedy in society, Mr. Chairman, who want it all. Yes, we have to put up guards against that. We have to make it a little difficult to have those kinds of people enter the program.

Like it would be a little hard to catch the home economist on the telephone, you know, because she is so busy with programming for people that need her services. That's the kind of approach that this government should be following if they are serious about home ec. services, Mr. Chairman.

But, Mr. Chairman, that has not been the history of this service. The history of this service has been that the ladies club of the community, who happen to represent the elite most of the time, are the ones that use up all of these services. —(Interjection)— Yes, well it happens in my backyard, too, Mr. Chairman. I have seen it; I have worked with it; I know them personally, and it's a nice get together but it is a waste of taxpayers money and it isn't doing the kind of job that it was designed to do when it was put together many years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the Member for Minnedosa and his wife and family don't need Home Ec. Services. They may be helpful to him, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. USKIW: These services may be helpful to the Member for Minnedosa or his wife, but I know that he doesn't depend on them. I know that he has the financial resources to find these services elsewhere, Mr. Chairman, and to pay for them, if necessary. He doesn't need the taxpayers of this province to subsidize his home operation in Minnedosa, Mr. Chairman, or in Winnipeg or wherever it might be. And that is why I ask the question of the Minister: Has he given the home economists some policy direction, some terms of reference as to how they should function, or is he just telling us we are increasing the numbers of bodies and they will do whatever they will do? Because if it's the latter then we're wasting \$500,000, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think we have hashed this one over many times and I would like to indicate to the member that they have had policy direction. In fact they are to service the total community that they are involved in. And I give credibility to the people who have professional training, who know, who in fact know how to distribute their time and their efforts to the people in the community who are in need. You know, there are qualified, trained people in this field of providing extension through Home Economist Programs. Mr. Chairman, they do not need, as the Member for Lac du Bonnet has totally convinced himself, that they need to single out, single out a certain segment of a community and that is their total time to be spent with them. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the Member for Lac du Bonnet, who really doesn't understand what a rural community is like, it is a total community of people who are desirous of using agricultural and home economist extension. People who are in real need of it are identified by those professional people and they, in fact, zero in on those particular problem cases. —(Interjection)— No. Mr. Chairman, he doesn't understand that because if the Minister hasn't identified it for him, he thinks, in fact, that they don't recognize it.

Mr. Chairman, what did they spend four years or six years or eight years in their total education system to do? Mr. Chairman, they spent it to identify the needs of the people of the province and that's, Mr. Chairman, what the members opposite cannot understand. They cannot understand that people are trained to service the needs of people. They don't have to be totally directed. They're directed, Mr. Chairman, to service the needs of all Manitobans, and they carry those objectives out very well, I must say. I've had real good reports on the Home Economists working with all groups, not the tea drinking people that he would like people — in fact, I would invite him to go out through rural Manitoba and campaign on that kind of a ground, and I would also say, Mr. Chairman, that I can go into any area that there is real need for Home Economists service to the people he's identifying. Well, Mr. Chairman, you do not need 500 because we live in a community that wants to help one another. You don't have to have a particular government paid individual to go in and hold the hand of every Manitoban who is in need.

Mr. Chairman, that isn't what we live in in Manitoba. We live in a community that want to help one another and that's what the job of a professional is, and it's carried out very effectively and will continue to do so as long as we are government in this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, the former Minister mentioned wasting money a while ago. Well, he should know, because God knows he wasted enough of it in the eight years that he held that particular portfolio. And I also want to have the record show that I have very, very many good friends in East Selkirk, as the member well knows, and I'm not making disparaging remarks about the people of East Selkirk, and I want the record to show that, but if the member thinks that he's going to stand before this Committee and tell us that we need a \$20,000 a year Home Economist to teach somebody how to flush a toilet, he is absolutely being ridiculous, or he's being facetious, one or the other. They learn that on television nowadays, and God knows there's not many people without a television set in East Selkirk or West Selkirk or anywhere else in Manitoba, and you don't need an economist to teach somebody how to flush a toilet, and if he wants to try and make this Committee believe that kind of nonsense, I'm surprised at him.

The Home Economists are brought back to the post that they were in, Mr. Chairman, to serve all of the people of Manitoba. They're not going to be segregated like he would have the former Ag Reps, that you only service those people that are having difficulty making a living on the farm. You don't worry about the fellows that have got it made, that are making a dollar. That's who he would have the Home Economists service. The Home Economists serve those that need the services of a Home Economist, and as the Minister pointed out they are well-trained, they've taken many, many years of University training to identify those that need their training, and they know full well. There may be someone in the upper echelon of society that has a very simple problem but she might want the Home Ec to solve it and she makes a phone call to her. That facility is available to her as it's available to the lady that happens to be unfortunately on welfare and needs a little

more help possibly. And if the member is going to sit here and make us believe that we're hiring 20 some thousand dollar a year people to teach people how to flush toilets, I'm very, very surprised at him, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, it was general comments made by the member. I will yield. I don't think there was a question. Well, if there was a question to me, if he's referring to me that I'm going to hire \$20,000 Home Economists to teach people to flush toilets, I can assure him that that isn't the intent. I think I've totally clarified what the objective role of the Home Economists are and I'll leave it stand at that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I really appreciated the remarks of the Member for Minnedosa in terms of this debate. He doesn't want to realize that prior to 1970 there were at least 6,000 farm families who did not have —(Interjection)— 60 percent of the farms in Manitoba did not have water services, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Member for St. George.

MR. USUSKI: Mr. Chairman, less than ten years ago 60 percent of the farm families did not have sewer and water facilities in the farm homes. This member is talking about holding someone's hand. Mr. Chairman, if the people learn to flush toilets by watching television we would be better spent by spending \$100 per TV set, we'd at least service 4,000 farm homes by providing them with a black and white television in the amount of these moneys.

Mr. Chairman, that is how ludicrous the comments were from the Member for Minnedosa. Mr. Chairman, the Minister should indicate whether or not there will be outreach programs carried on by the Home Economists in the area. I would like to know whether the Minister, if he is indicating that those services will be provided to the community, whether they will be provided to farm families in lower incomes who really need the support, whether he's prepared to provide this committee for next year an analysis, an evaluation of the services and data of the type of farm families that are served, what types of programs are being conducted, and give us an evaluation of the services and who is being serviced by the Home Economists. Is he prepared to provide that information for us?

MR. DOWNEY: I'd be quite happy to provide that information, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, we have then a commitment from the Minister that he will provide for the next Estimates process, regardless of who is Minister in that government, that there will be an evaluation done on the population that is being served, types of programs, and a full report brought to this Committee.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have said on many occasions, and if I didn't say it in my opening remarks as far as the Estimate process was concerned I think it's important that all programs carried out throughout the Department of Agriculture should be assessed on an ongoing basis, and I would be quite pleased to indicate to the members of the Committee of the numbers of families — I don't think it's the business of the Department of Agriculture to ask them how much money they're making or to get into their financial affairs — but as far as the people that are being serviced I would be more than pleased to prepare a report for the Committee next year whether I'm the Minister, whoever's the Minister, whatever be it. I think it's important to the taxpayers of Manitoba that there's an assessment taken and I think that's why we're in government right at this particular time as there was an assessment taken by the people of Manitoba and they decided what was happening with their money and, in fact, were fed up with the situation that was taking place, and that was one of the assessments and the processes that take place. Again, I will give the member the commitment that I will provide that information.

MR. URUSKI: The Minister indicates that it is not his intention to ascertain in what economic strata the clientele will be, but that's really the nub of the question, Mr. Chairman. Who are those economists going to serve, Mr. Chairman? That's really been the nub of this argument. Is he now saying that they will go on serving without direction whoever they desire? Mr. Chairman, is that what the Minister is saying? He may as well learn to flush a toilet and flush that report that he's talking about down now if he is not intending to give any direction to those Home Economists.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, the only answer I have, Mr. Chairman, is that that kind of a comment coming from the Member for St. George really doesn't deserve an answer because again he says the nub of it is the level of income of those individuals. I go back again and say that the people who are employed by the department are professional staff, professional Home Economists who can truly identify the needs of the people throughout Manitoba and I can assure you that the Number one requirement is to fulfill the needs of those people, not to totally be handholders of those individuals, but to work with them as a part of the total community, not to divide a community but to meld a community together.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(d)(1) — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: I just want the assurance of the Minister that the program that will be delivered will be delivered to people in the report that he provides, to people in need and not to people who can do, and do without the program, and can handle the activities on their own, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5. — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister indicate, and I just want to make sure that I got his comments correct, the reduction of ten staff man years was a transfer to the Department of Labour?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, then maybe I got the Minister wrong. He intimated that the Homemaker Service, that he indicated was a good program, started under the former Conservative Government, as he had indicated under the FRED Program, is being continued and is being continued under the Department of Labour, and the reduction he just told us of ten SMY was in the Homemaker Services. Well, could he explain himself, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can explain myself. I said that the individual home advisers that were a part of the Selkirk Training Plant are continuing on with the Selkirk Training Plant. The 10 SMYs, the home advisers that I said are being deleted from the department were throughout the total region of Manitoba. In fact, there were only three of those positions had people in them. Seven of them were vacant positions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(d)(1)—pass — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the program that the Minister so highly praised throughout the rural regions is, in fact, being phased out. It's cancelled.

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman. I've said the home advisers, the home advisers, of which there were seven vacant positions, are being deleted. We are replacing them, and have replaced them with something like — I gave the figures here a few minutes ago — there's been an increase from last year until this year of seven Home Economists. —(Interjection)— Well, yes, Mr. Chairman, we've dropped 10 SMY positions of which seven of them were vacant, and replaced them with seven professional people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(d)(1)—pass — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister indicate what the type of services that were provided by the homemakers versus the Home Economists, since he indicates that they were doing the same jobs, and could he also tell me how many positions were filled of those seven that he said that were vacant were filled last year?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the member wants to say that the positions that were deleted were in fact the same kind as I'm referring to? Is that what he's indicating? That isn't the case. The home advisers that were available worked under the direction of Home Economists, and those positions are deleted, of which seven were vacant. —(Interjection)— Well, no, Mr. Chairman, I referred to the program, the home advisers that were filling a need, a direct need of individuals who were coming into a community that couldn't cope with modern facilities, where in fact in the Selkirk Training Plant, that's what I referred to as being really the area of need as far as home

advisers are concerned. That was only truly the area that I could see was in need to continue on with home advisers. —(Interjection)— No, Mr. Chairman, that is correct. I feel that the replacement of home advisers with professional staff of Home Economists will more than fill the needs of the vacant Home Visitor Programs that —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I've gone over and over and over again the objectives of the Home Economists, that they truly identify the needs of the needy people and will work with them through their ability as professional people to set up programs, to organize themselves, and to truly fill the needs of rural Manitobans.

The home advisers, as far as I'm concerned, filled a need, particularly in the area of the Selkirk Training Plant, where people came into a totally new environment and in fact are being continued on with. But as far as the continuation of Home Advisors throughout rural Manitoba, the base of people which they covered, the numbers of people are now being picked up by the Home Economists, through their directive, plus the additional job description, as far as the Home Economists are concerned, in a larger field, the total people throughout Manitoba, not just a few selected people who the Member for Lac du Bonnet would indicate to them really needed that kind of help.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I indicate to the Committee that Home Economists have the ability to provide complete homemaking service for all Manitobans and can identify those that are in extra need and work out programs to assist them in those areas. So I think we are being totally responsible and more than responsible when we look at the programs that we have had over the past eight years. It's supportive of the total community.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could the Minister tell me whether he now does not consider the Home Advisor Service important to the rest of the province?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I am indicating that that Home Advisor Service is being provided by the Home Economists of the province.

MR. URUSKI: Could the Minister indicate to me what the salary ranges are for Home Advisors versus the Home Economists?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, if the member is trying to make a direct comparison, I would think that we could —(Interjection)— No, Mr. Chairman, he is saying . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. One speaker at a time?

MR. DOWNEY: He is saying that the Home Economist is unable to carry on the responsibility of a total programming of rural Manitoba, in homemaking and the needs of people. That is their responsibility. They are individuals who have the capacity to do that, Mr. Chairman. The Home Advisors, Mr. Chairman, are very capable and qualified people. There were three of them filling positions; there were seven vacant. Those individuals service a lot smaller group, Mr. Chairman. Their services were not spread over the numbers of people that the Home Economists are expected to service.

So I think it's very plain, Mr. Chairman, when we talk about total support service to the agricultural community as opposed to what they would consider the needs of the farm people, identifying a few people in need and the rest of them can go their own way. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is not our approach and I think I have clearly indicated that.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate and tell me whether the Home Economists will be doing Home Advisor services?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would have to say that the Home Advisor service that I can foresee taking place, as far as the ones that are involved in the Selkirk Training Plant, no, Mr. Chairman, I can't see the Home Economists becoming directly involved again in hand-holding programs. —(Interjection)— Well, it is a good program, Mr. Chairman, in the Selkirk Training Plant, where you have people coming in to a totally new atmosphere.

Mr. Chairman, there are very few of those particular situations in Manitoba and, if there are, I can assure you the professional ability of Home Economists will see that there are programs developed to educate and train those people far more efficiently than on the one-to-one basis that the members opposite are trying to say we should have retained.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, we had the Minister here come and tell us and gave members of this Committee —(Interjection)— more than a lecture; he berated us for knocking and for arguing against a program that his predecessors in the fed. program, the Conservative previous

set up, the Homemakers Services, which was a very much needed, very valuable service to many farm families. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, now he is talking about a specific area. He is now indicating that we shall discriminate against the Province of Manitoba for the sake of the Selkirk Training Plant. We shall not provide these services to the rest of the province —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, I am only repeating the words of the Minister of Agriculture, who indicates that the only support there should be for this program is . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could we have one speaker at a time. This is most difficult for the recording devices, this constant interruptions. The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now I don't know whether the community of Selkirk should be so privileged over all the other rural communities in this province, but for a Minister to indicate to this Committee with the praise that he has given to this group of staff, the Home Advisors, and then indicate, well, I have done away with it for the rest of the province, Mr. Chairman, really makes his program a laugh. It really makes him a joke. It makes him such a joke, Mr. Chairman, that if he is really serious about Home Advisors and helping people in need he should go out and ascertain as to how many people were handled by the staff, by those homemakers. Can he tell this Committee how many families were serviced by those homemakers who were in the field, those three that he is now deleting and the seven that were there before, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think, to further support what I am saying as far as the ability of our Home Economists and what we have made available to the Home Economists in the delivery of their programs to help in the areas where they would in fact say we should have a hand-holding individual, we have increased from 28,000 in 1977-78 budget to \$67,000 for the use of support staff to the Home Economists in the per diem capacity.

So in fact the Home Economists, Mr. Chairman, have the capacity to employ people or to help, to bring in individuals to support those individuals that they are referring to that are in so much need.

Mr. Chairman, I think it's a clear indication that we are allowing those professional people to operate in their capacity as professional people and do the job that has to be done. If he cannot understand it, I think now, after his questioning, I can understand why.

MR. URUSKI: I didn't hear the Minister indicate that he has an additional \$60,000 in the budget. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, there was a budget in the Home Economists 1978-79 of \$535,300, and this year the budget is down to \$456,500.00. There is roughly, Mr. Chairman, a cut of about \$80,000 in the budget. Now the Minister says that there is an increase of some \$60,000 and yet there has been a reduction of three staff. Could he then go through the budget and explain to us exactly what he is doing, step-by-step, in terms of the allocation of that \$456,000.00?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The deletion of those 10 SMYs, those positions as far as Home Visitors are concerned, show a reduction of some \$100-and-some thousand, but there in fact has been an increase to the use, as far as Home Economists are concerned, of some \$60,000.00. —(Interjection)— That's right; there is a reduction in the budget because of the fact that the money we're using to support the Home Economists in their efforts is less than the continuing on of 10 Home Visitor positions.

MR. URUSKI: Then the Minister now is admitting that there is a net reduction in terms of services to farm families in the total service provided by this Branch?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman. For the clarification of the Committee, the seven positions that we are deleting from the Estimates never were filled. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, they never were filled by the previous administration. —(Interjection)— That's right, and neither did we. So we, in fact, didn't cut the budget to the rural community, we are providing a better service to a larger number of people. And again I go back and say that we are doing it —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it clearly indicates that we are, in fact, providing more service to more people in a more responsible manner.

MR. URUSKI: Can the Minister then assure us that the moneys that will be utilized by the Home Economists will be used in the same manner to hire part-time, at least part-time, Home Advisor services that he indicated were so needed and so helpful to the rural community in the amount of dollars that he has indicated? I think he said \$60,000, or whatever was allocated to them.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can assure him that we will instruct our Home Economists as I have done, and I will do it again, instruct them to fulfill the needs to the best of their ability of the total rural community.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister has just finished saying that the program is for the total community. I would like to ask the Minister if this program, this service, is available to people living on Indian Reserves?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ADAM: One of the problems, Mr. Chairman — I have had a lot of experience. I have, I believe, three Reserves in my community. I was raised by an Indian Reserve. I am very familiar with the problems that our Native people face. I grew up with many of them, and one of the problems that they do face, over the years, the last 200 or 300 years, non-Native people have been coming in and advising them on how to better themselves and so on, and it has always been a failure. And that resentment has now grown to a position where they resent when non-Natives come in and tell them, you know, this is the way you should do this, you should do that, and I want to ask the Minister how many Home Economists are of Native descent, that can relate to those people, that relate much better than non-Natives coming in? They can relate better to their own people than they can to . . .

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't know the answer to that.

MR. ADAM: We have seen this in the education field, and we have attempted, with the BUNTEP Programs, to train Native people as teachers so that they can go back to Reserves and teach in their own schools and they can relate much better than we can to them. And I want to point out to the Minister that, you know, there are a large number of people in that area that are really in dire need of the services of a Home Economic Service, which probably are not being hardly tapped, you know, you only touch the tip of the iceberg. Because, let's be quite frank about it, white people don't relate well to Natives.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the member brings up a good point. I understand that our Home Economists are available to the people on Indian Reserves at the request of the Reserves. There has been quite a lot of work done, as far as nutritional programs are concerned, with the teachers and individuals on Reserves.

Again I say they are available at the request of those individuals, and he brings out a good point. It is a possibility that there is a good demand and a need for individuals of Native descent to enter into Home Economist training, and that, of course, is available to all Manitobans.

MR. ADAM: Just to give you an idea, in my own constituency there probably is around 3,000 people — I am speaking of status natives. There are maybe not quite as much that are non-status, but I'm sure that you're just skimming the top of that group because of the structure of our society and the way it's set up, social status in our society that I think the Member for Lac du Bonnet was trying to point out and that's a problem that we have to address ourselves to, whether we like it or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(d)(1) Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the minister indicate, since there is an increase of two positions this year in the home economists, are there vacant positions in the department or are they all filled?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes. Mr. Chairman, there are four vacant positions at this time.

MR. URUSKI: Would the minister consider, in light of the suggestions being made in terms of hiring practices, whether the Department of Agriculture would be prepared to undertake an affirmative action hiring program in terms of the hiring of the four home economists for the four positions? I believe the Department is well aware of the Affirmative Action Program in hiring groups in society who are in minority positions and this would be, and could be a logical step in that direction of hiring for these positions staff, and even doing an Outreach Program and encouraging the hiring

and possibly going to the university and seeing students that are there and saying that "Yes, this will be an Affirmative Action Program to deal with target groups in our society who would require this service."

I would ask the minister to consider the hiring of those four vacant positions, or at least the two of the four, into the target groups that have been named by the Equal Opportunities Group of Cabinet, of the previous administration; I don't think it's been rejected by this administration as far as the target groups in society, whether he would be prepared to undertake the hiring on that basis?

MR. DOWNEY: Not at this time, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(d)(1) — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Can I understand the minister when he says "not at this time", not in any of these four positions, is he not prepared to even consider an Affirmative Action Program as small as it might be through the Department of Agriculture, that this may be an area of development of a project in dealing with the target groups in society?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would indicate to the member that there is a move to fill the positions. They will not be changed; the job description and the individuals that we're trying to employ will not change from the employment of the last individuals.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I hope that the minister would agree that it may be to some advantage in terms of his agreement with the Member for St. Rose of the groups of people that he would like to help that it may mean redirecting staff in terms of looking at the job descriptions through the Department of Labour, through the group within the Civil Service Commission, and making these positions and directing as a matter of government policy whether these positions could be used in terms of hiring, in terms of the Affirmative Action program of this government. If he is saying, "No, we do not have an Affirmative Action Program, we reject the concept totally." then fine, I can live with that. But I would like to know why this could not be considered in that light, especially in light of his total agreement with the suggestion made by the Member for St. Rose, it would seem a very logical extension to move in that direction and directing the staff to write up the bulletins in that light and do some screening and maybe do some Outreach in terms of hiring and interviewing staff. It may take some extra effort on behalf of the departmental hiring staff, but certainly if the minister is sincere in dealing with the groups in society that he agreed with the Member for St. Rose, surely he would be willing to try that approach.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, I think I've answered the question for the member. I can't clarify it anymore.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(d)(1)—pass. The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: That means that the minister has no intent on pursuing an Affirmative Action Program in hiring within his department. I want to make sure that I understand that. Am I correct?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, no, Mr. Chairman. I've indicated that the responsibility of home economists are to supply the needs of those individuals in the province that are clearly identified and that the request of those individuals who throughout the community feel a need, have the opportunity to use the service available. We're continuing to fill these positions on that basis and I have no plans to change that.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could when he's monitoring the programs of the home economists, if he could advise us how many families or trips that they have done in the Indian reserves? I would like to know how they relate to that segment of our population who I believe probably needs it more than anybody else because there's a lot of problems there.

MR. DOWNEY: I can provide that at the same time as the other, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(d)(1)—pass; 5.(d)(2)—pass; 5.(e)(1)—pass. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just a small point. The minister read into the record the terms

of reference or recommendations to the Staff Committee that did the study on the boundaries and on the centres. I simply point out to him that he neglected to mention that it was a Staff Committee and the terms of reference were drawn up by Staff, not by Cabinet or the government. Just for the record, Mr. Chairman, I want to correct him on that point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(e)(1). The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the minister indicate the staff complement, whether there's a reduction or an increase in staff?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, last year we had 78 plus 1 contract. This year we're looking at 79, or 69 I'm sorry, 78.08 plus 1 contract last year. This year 69.08, Mr. Chairman; there's been a reduction. 9 SMYs and 1 contract position. They include 5 secretaries. Due to the termination of Small Farm Development Program, there are 8 vacant positions at the present time.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the reduction of 9 SMYs — were those positions vacant in the reduction or are they re-allocation of vacant to fill to keep the same number of bodies?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the only positions that had individuals in them were the Small Farm Development positions, Mr. Chairman, of which were 5. The other ones were vacant.

MR. URUSKI: So then the other 4, as I understand it, were vacant although there are an additional 4 vacant at this present time, to make it a total of 8 vacant at the present time. Am I understanding him correctly? —(Interjection)— No? He tells me there was 8 vacant.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the only positions as I indicated were the 5 Small Farm Development positions that were eliminated that had people in them. The other 4 positions were vacant.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I recall a figure of 8 being vacant. Is there 8 vacant positions at the present time?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there are 8 vacant positions at this time.

MR. URUSKI: That's in addition to the 9 that were reduced?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Okay. So therefore in effect there were 12 vacant positions with a reduction of 5 staff?

MR. DOWNEY: That's right, Mr. Chairman, if you add the 8 vacant positions. . .

MR. URUSKI: Could the minister tell me, in terms of hiring staff in the regional offices in the secretarial area, are all the staff hirings done through the normal hiring process of the Civil Service Commission?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: If there are staff being hired for a limited period of time, not a contract but a term position, are those also handled through the Civil Service Commission? Or are those decisions done through the Regional Director, the job is bulletined locally and the selection made through the Personnel Officer within the region?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, we do not have any term positions. If he's talking about per diems, that is done of course through the discretion of the local employ . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(e)(1)—pass; 5.(e)(2)—pass. Resolution No. 10.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,762,400 for Agriculture. Regional Agriculture Extension \$4,762,400—Pass.

The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, we have although there is no appropriation in terms of dollars in the Section, we have the Canada—Manitoba ARDA Agreement and certainly I believe there can be questions raised even though there is no funds allocated; there is an Item that is shown in the Estimates although it does not show any dollars to it, certainly there can be. . . I'm asking your guidance, Sir, whether questions can be asked in this area for an explanation to this from . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Past practice has been that where there are no funds devoted to a given Item in a Resolution, there is no debate forthcoming. The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister advise us where we will debate the Canada—Manitoba ARDA package, the most recent one?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, that money that's made available for the Canada Manpower Agreements are in the Department of Finance on an enabling vote. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess we go back to the minister's salary if that's the place that it has to be done. That is where the funds are made available to draw on if there's an enabling vote held within the Department of Finance to fund the Manitoba—Canada Agreements.

MR. USKIW: The minister is talking about the \$18.5 million is it — that will be debatable during the Estimates of the Minister of Finance, or Capital Supply or what?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the member wants to refer to Page 79 of the Estimate book. We're looking at the Enabling Vote under the Department of Finance. Under appropriation 109, l.(a) it's the Value-Added Crops Agreement, yes, that, Mr. Chairman, the \$18.5 million that was referred to by the member is over a total of a five-year period.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, is the minister saying that this year we are only going to spend \$1.1 million then?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, for a matter of clarification for the member. that is correct, that the \$1.1 million would be anticipated cash flow of the Manitoba-Canada Agreement this year.

MR. USKIW: I think the minister knows that that particular appropriation has already been debated. I think the Finance Department has already been . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Resolution 109 has not been debated.

MR. USKIW: Well, that's fine, Mr. Chairman, I have no problem if there's an opportunity to debate that issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 10. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,762,400 for Agriculture—pass.

Motion Committee rise. Agreed? No vote. Continue.

The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, earlier today the Member for Lac du Bonnet was bringing to the Committee's attention, the great urgency of getting into the debate as far as the Agriculture Marketing and Development Division, and now he is quite prepared to move Committee rise. I can't understand what the urgency was five hours ago, and at this particular time he wants to see the Committee rise.

However, in entering into the Agriculture Marketing and Development Division, we are looking at a division of the department that in fact emphasizes the Department of Agriculture's support to the development of markets for agriculture products; it encompasses the responsibility to marketing boards, not to become involved in the marketing process as a government agency, but in fact to support the agricultural farm community in the development of markets for goods produced in Manitoba, for markets that are domestic, national and international. I'm sure that the broad scope of products that are produced in Manitoba, with the emphasis and the movement of farm people to producing a more varied and a variety of crops further points out the need for government to be a part of the growing demands for those crops, and to support the individuals who are desirous of coming in and, if I can use the terminology, shopping for Manitoba goods that we as government can be good hosts to those individuals and provide them with an opportunity to look at the type

of products that we have.

and I think that it appears in looking at some of the recent developments, and I want to clarify for the Committee that if the Member for Lac du Bonnet, who was bringing an urgent point to my attention earlier today, that if it's in fact the discussions that have taken place in the past, in the turkey marketing and some of the discussions that have taken place at the National Egg Marketing Plan, that there are reasons to be concerned. I would want to clarify that we, as a government, have not been approached or been in any discussion. We are monitoring what has taken place with the national agencies. As I indicated earlier today, in a reply to a question in the House, that in fact our base quota as far as our share of the national turkey quota is concerned has not changed. The percentage that we get out of the new allocation of quota is of concern to me. I think that we have to be aware of the fact that we are not, as a province, sharing the same percentage of that increase as possibly we should be. Now, to my knowledge and at this particular point, I do not think that that is a fait accompli. I think that we have an opportunity, as a government, to meet with, meet with the producer boards, with the Manitoba Marketing Board, and to analyze really where we're at. And I am in that position right now.

The same as far as the egg marketing agency is concerned. I'm quite concerned that we are sitting in Manitoba with a comparative advantage. We have a lot of feed grain produced in the province. We have a lot of producers who have the capacity to produce the commodities that come under the national marketing plans, and any change to the intent of that plan, I would think, or the actual agreements, have to be looked at very closely by legal counsel and by the Manitoba producer boards, and the Manitoba Board. It's been indicated to me we do have some time to discuss with the producer boards, where we do stand as a government. I do not think we can sit and be in a position where we can see a reduction in the percentage of new quota that's available.

If the intent of the original agreement, as I would think the last administration were a part of entering into that agreement, if the intent of entering that agreement was in fact to share in any additional quota on the same kind of a percentage basis as we were in fact entering the original agreement, then we should be meeting with the producer boards to hold that position. And if that has changed, then we will have to look at the legal position that we're in as far as being able to uphold that position for our producers.

Again, I go back that it has been pretty much, as far as I am concerned, at the producer marketing board levels, that they have been in discussion with the federal agency. Again I want to emphasize that I will be meeting with the producer boards, the producer groups, to clearly identify really the position that we're in. Again, I do not think . . . well, Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. George indicates that I'm a little late. I do not think that is the case. If the agreement that was entered into by the province and the Federal Government, some one or two or three years ago, was such an airtight agreement that they couldn't change that percentage, then in fact we aren't too late. And if, Mr. Chairman, that agreement has not got that written in there, then we have to look at those individuals. I'm not here to point fingers at those people who signed an agreement. They, I'm sure entered it in good faith, and we will be looking at the position that we're in, and we will be in discussion with marketing boards, the producer boards, who are directly effected. I do not want to see, as a government of this province, want to see Manitoba's percentage of any increased market be any less than what we initially entered the national plans under. That is an unacceptable position, and I would think that if the agreement was entered into properly, that we are able to debate that and hold that position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For clarification of the Committee and the records, we are dealing with Resolution 11, Item 6 Agriculture Marketing and Development Division, 6.(a)(1)—pass — the member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I'm beginning to question your impartiality. Mr. Chairman, the minister of course having been forewarned today that this will be a matter of debate has now hedged his bet somewhat, and I'm pleased that he is doing so because maybe we are making a small degree of progress. But, Mr. Chairman, I would want to remind this minister that he is one of the minister's responsible for the dilemma that we now find ourselves in. Yes, this minister thought, Mr. Chairman, that he could go down to Ottawa or anywhere else in a Federal-Provincial Meeting, and demand that Manitoba have a greater proportionality of the national market than our entitlement was by formula. That was his position. Now, Mr. Chairman, we fought that position tooth and nail several years ago before the first plan was agreed to, Mr. Chairman. The Province of Manitoba virtually, solely, held up that agreement for months on end, on this very issue. Mr. Chairman, we were right —(Interjection)and we are still right, Mr. Chairman, and you who don't know anything about this subject wait for your turn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, we don't need the . . . of the Member for Portage, on matters that he knows nothing about. —(Interjection)— I am speaking to the subject, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could we have one speaker at a time.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the Committee, away back in 1970, somewhere thereabouts, the Federal Government, along with the Provincial Governments, but the Federal Government was promoting the idea that we have to tie up all these provincial marketing plans into a national marketing system. But, Mr. Chairman, what scared the hell out of us was the way in which they were approaching it. They had a chart, giving the provinces and their respective populations, and they were . . .

A MEMBER: Classifying them.

MR. USKIW: . . . that's right, Mr. Chairman, they said from Newfoundland right to Vancouver to British Columbia. And here you have ten provinces, and these are the populations, people populations of those provinces, and these are the production figures relative to each of these commodities. And they said there's a deficiency of production in Quebec and Ontario, relative to their human population, and there's an excess production on the Prairies, Mr. Chairman, relative to their human population. And that what we would really like to do is bring things into balance. Well, Mr. Chairman, bringing things into that kind of balance would mean that even though Manitoba-Saskatchewan, who had abundant feed supplies, could produce poultry products for the Canadian market at a competitive price, compared with Ontario and Quebec, we were going to be denied that right by virtue of a formula that was going to be devised based on people populations per province, that would tie those provinces to self-sufficiency.

That was the argument way back in 1970, Mr. Chairman, and almost every province, in fact I believe every province was going along, Mr. Chairman, at that time, not because they liked it, but because they said in convention and in conference that but who can win an argument against Ontario and Quebec. I mean, let's throw the towel in. That was the spirit of that conference, Mr. Chairman. The Maritimes said, "Well, who are we to fight with the people of Ontario and Quebec, they're just too big for us." Manitoba dug its heels in on that issue, Mr. Chairman and we forced the withdrawal of that clause in that agreement and there was never a clause put into any agreement to do that — up until now, Mr. Chairman. Yes, now we are told that the new quota arrangements with respect to the production and marketing of turkeys has been altered to go back to the first position put forward by the Government of Canada. Mr. Chairman, at that time I made the argument with the Federal Minister and with his Deputy Minister, and a whole host of other people, that if that is the way they want to Balkanize the production and marketing of agricultural commodities then we had better start looking at how many combines we are consuming in Western Canada, and we had better start moving some factories over to Winnipeg, Regina, and Calgary because that's where the market is, if that's the way we are going to divide this country in terms of its production of goods and services.

And on that basis we fought them tooth and nail, Mr. Chairman, and they withdrew. They withdrew. It wasn't long till we had other allies in the argument, Mr. Chairman. There were provinces, yes, that said, "But you know, we really think we have a right to more of the national pie because after all, why should we be importing from Manitoba when we can provide for ourselves?" And Mr. Chairman, the books are full of the news releases, the history's full of the information that flowed from the chicken and egg war, the imposition of import controls by the Province of Quebec and so on. We all went through that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have a new Minister in this province and I guess I can't fault him terribly because he is new, but I hope he is listening because he is new, because this has nothing to do with ideology; it has to do with common sense and what is good for the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, the proposal that is — not proposal, I gather that it is already a fact — that with respect to the allocation of the national market for turkeys that the additional market opportunity, the increased market, is now divided up into three categories; a third based on the original share, a third based on the share of the national population — and in that case Manitoba would get 1/24th of the total — and the other third would be a share of population increase as it relates to the nation per province. Well, Mr. Chairman, that puts us out of business. That kind of formula puts Manitoba and Saskatchewan out of business. Yes, we are being frozen out of the

national market notwithstanding our competitive advantages. That's right. And that is something that our government could not agree to, Mr. Chairman, and I venture to say that is something that your government would not agree to if you properly delved into it.

But, Mr. Chairman, this Minister has put himself in a bit of a box because I have here his Press statement of November the 25th, 1977: "Conditions are set on Chicken/Broiler Pact". That's his Press release, Mr. Chairman, that I'm reading from. "Agriculture Minister, Jim Downey, said Friday that Manitoba would enter a national chicken/ broiler marketing plan only if certain conditions are met. These conditions", he said, "were that Manitoba's share of the quota be allowed to increase ½ a percent per year for the first five years and that there be further consideration at the end of that period, that Manitoba can move live and processed products interprovincially without restriction". Who was placing conditions that have jeopardized our market share, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, it was this Minister, and he issued a Press release thinking this was a great day for Manitoba because he's going to bargain for a bigger share of the Canadian market than he is entitled to. Yes. Yes, he was going to flex his muscles, Mr. Chairman. He hasn't any muscles. He knows it, we know it, but at least, Mr. Chairman, we have the position, the credible position of having stayed, stuck with our first position of several years ago that we are not prepared to Balkanize this country based on human populations. And Mr. Chairman, that has been compromised very much by this Minister. It is being compromised now by another province. The big push now is coming from Alberta.

Mr. Chairman, what are the people from Alberta saying? I'll read something that this Minister, I know, is aware of, Mr. Chairman, or if he isn't he should be. They are saying that without some accommodation for Alberta's growing population and provincial demand — yes, without some accommodation in the quota system — development of further processing facilities would be slowed in Alberta and probably supplies of these processed products would be imported from British Columbia or Manitoba, and heaven forbid that Alberta should buy anything from Manitoba. Yes, this is where we're at, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I plead with this Minister that he walk out of all the national plans that are in existence unless we go back to the status quo ante, and that we not compromise the original principles of agreement, and that is that we would never agree to a national plan that would Balkanize the production and marketing of agricultural commodities on the basis of calculating human populations and allocating the shares to each province respectively. That is a position we can not live with, Mr. Chairman, because if we accept that position at all we are doomed. We are dooming the potential that we have in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, in particular and I plead with the Minister that he now give notice to the federal people and to all marketing boards in Canada that he is not going to be part of any national agreement on the basis of what is now taking place with respect to these quota changes. And if he is not going to take that firm a position, Mr. Chairman, if they sense a soft belly they are going to go under it, Mr. Chairman. It has to be a very firm position.

It has to be a position that cannot be compromised if this province has to put forward because if they fall short of that, Mr. Chairman, we have lost the battle that we have fought for so long and fought successfully to keep things in proper perspective while at the same time giving our producers a measure of bargaining power in the marketplace which has worked relatively well after the first couple of years — relatively well, Mr. Chairman. And all the documents I read from other provinces indicate that it has worked relatively well.

Mr. Chairman, the people in Alberta are saying, "We know that we will have a bit of chaos if we pull the plug now, but if we suffer through the chaos we will capture the market and we will take it away from Manitoba and Saskatchewan." That's what they are saying, Mr. Chairman. So before this Minister gets further in bed with the Minister from Alberta — I know they're kissing cousins, Mr. Chairman — he had better, yes, he had better examine what is in the public interest of the people of Manitoba and go back, Mr. Chairman, and plead the case that Manitoba pleaded several years ago, and stuck with, and was able to withdraw those clauses from those agreements, Mr. Chairman, and we had many hours, Mr. Chairman, many days of debate on that issue. A lot of midnight oil, Mr. Chairman, yes, but we stuck with it and we held firm and it was to our — not to our advantage, it was to our fair advantage — there was nothing unfair about what we were doing, Mr. Chairman.

So Mr. Chairman, I suggest to this Minister that nothing short of a withdrawal from all national plans is going to save the day for Manitoba. If he's not prepared to say that, he has lost his battle.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I really find the comments from the Member for Lac du Bonnet most interesting, I must say. Firstly, for the Committee's benefit, the Press release that the Member for Lac du Bonnet referred to as of November of 1977 was an initial position which we took as a province, and as far as the entry into the national broiler program was concerned was not, in

fact, the final one that was agreed to. —(Interjection)— The point, Mr. Chairman, the member referred to a Press release and I want to clarify it for the people of Manitoba and the Committee. Mr. Chairman, I go back to the actual signing of the agreement and that particular entry in which we participated in and that, in fact, was that any additional market development, as far as the Province of Manitoba was concerned, as an individual producer or as a marketing board, the Broiler Board, any market found or established outside of the country of Canada that we, in fact, wanted that particular market made available to the producers who obtained that market or, in fact, the Manitoba Producer Board, which was an acceptable position by the Producer Board in Manitoba and which was agreed to by the national plan.

Well, as far as us agreeing to any deviation from any sharing of the already established quota base for the national plans is totally not in any part of any negotiations that we entered into that plan. As far as he referring to any change in a contract in which he entered into, as far as redividing, redividing the new quota allocation that is available to the provinces, he makes a good point. I am again more or less astonished at his comments to suggest that after an agreement which he entered into, which he indicated he burnt the midnight oil to assure the people of Manitoba that they would be able to share on the same percentage basis as they initially entered a program to share the national quota, that any deviation from that could, in fact, be allowed. Well, in fact, he is indicating, Mr. Chairman, that if that is the case that we should take the position that we will immediately opt out of the national programs.

Well, Mr. Chairman, at this particular point I indicated in my opening remarks, I've indicated that one of the first things that will be done will be a meeting will be held with the responsible producer people, the producer boards, to get their position to see really what did happen and if, in fact, it appears to me as the Minister, and to us as a government, that there is a contravention of an agreement that was entered into by the last government which, in fact, he has indicated was a tight-knit deal that they entered the national plans under the understanding that under no circumstances could any additional quota be shared any differently than the initial share of the base quota that they entered into. And I do say that that to me is a position that he should have taken that, in fact, if in signing an agreement that that didn't take place, then I can assure you the producers of those commodities are in trouble in Manitoba; that if it is indicated as far as the turkey producers are concerned, if we do have to share somewhat less of the new quota then it will have to be reassessed and we may have to take that position. But, until Mr. Chairman, —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, again the member is coming back and indicating that I should make the decision here tonight that —(Interjection)— Well, he's indicating that we should immediately do that. I think it should be given consideration and I think that that is the type of a position that is very defensible, but I first of all would like to have an explanation from the Provincial Producer Boards to —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. George said I spoke to them. I did not speak to them — well, Mr. Chairman, I spoke to them as a speaker at their Annual Meeting but I did not have brought to my attention what had really taken place.

What it requires at this particular point is a meeting held with the national people, with our provincial boards first of all, to really clearly clarify where we're at. We have to have the clarification made of the agreement that was entered into as far as the last government was concerned with the national plans. As far as I'm concerned we have not changed our position as a government on the sharing of any national market percentage. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, as far as the base quota is concerned —(Interjection)— Well, the Member for Lac du Bonnet says we should. I would say at this particular point to this particular date we would have liked to have seen an increase in the total quota supply which, in fact, is now taking place because of the shortfall in some of the meat products, and I would indicate that it is time that we sat down and made our position clear, but, Mr. Chairman, at this particular point it appears that there has been or could have been a final decision made as far as the Turkey Board is concerned and if there has been a contravention of the initial agreement or the original agreement then I would say that after discussion with the Provincial Turkey Board that we will assess where we're at and give the proper notice after I have a chance to discuss with my colleagues what has taken place. I think that that is a fair approach as far as the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency is concerned I also have been made aware that there are some changes to take place there.

Again what we'll require will be a meeting with those Producer Boards to find out in fact what has taken place and if in fact the Producer Boards have agreed to backing off of sharing on the overall growth to a new formula, then I would expect a clear explanation from them for taking that position. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. George asks me if I will rescind that position. He knows that I, as the Minister, have the capacity to do that under the Natural Products Marketing Act which we are debating. I am not prepared to make that decision until I have a lot more of the facts brought before me. Again the Member for Lac du Bonnet suggests it should be an automatic. Well he said earlier in his comments — I am sure I heard him correctly — that

a notice should be given right now that we would in fact withdraw from the national plan.

Well, Mr. Chairman, again, in giving notice the intent would be there to completely withdraw from that plan. In giving notice I think that's what he is indicating. I have clarified my position. I will be meeting with the people involved to find out the reasoning behind the position that they have taken and base my decision on that particular meeting with the individual boards.

I am concerned because here we have a situation again where we have supply management, a supply management industry, agricultural industry where in fact there is delegated power to Producer Boards, there is delegated power to National Producer Boards, Provincial Producer Boards, and there is always a continual fight for the right to produce and there always will be as long as you have the supply management controls. If in fact the province were forced to give notice, to become uninvolved in the national plans, then that is a decision that would have to be taken and one that would have major consequences, Mr. Chairman. As far as the producers of the province and the total concept of a supply management, national supply management program which the last government in Manitoba participated in and in fact we participated in one as far as the Broiler Agencies are concerned, given the fact that we are able to have some room to move in the development of markets outside of the national quota base.

So I think that we will be meeting with the individual boards that are affected immediately. Let them clarify their positions and as the member has —(Interjection)— well I have indicated that and I want to again go back and state that we have to clearly find out the type of agreement that was entered into between the last government or the government, which is the Manitoba government and the federal government and get clarification on if what has happened is in contravention of that agreement, then we have a reasonable request or it in fact has broken the intent of the agreement and no one can stand for that. So I think as far as the importance of it, it is important, but I do have to meet and have a thorough discussion with those producer boards who have the authority, the power to do what in fact has taken place. But again as has been clearly indicated here, as I have indicated, the Minister, the government has the power to rescind that kind of a move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Everyone knows that no national agency can operate without an agreement as between the federal government and the provincial governments and their respective marketing boards. Every one of our national plans is put together that way for a constitutional reason, Mr. Chairman. All right, that's obvious, which means to me that any change that takes place with regard to allocation of market share can only be accommodated through an amendment to an agreement or through a new agreement. If the Minister is telling me that he has not concurred in this change then I accept that. Mr. Chairman, what has bothered me is that the Minister got up in the House the other day, today, and he said yes there is a change in the turkey quota, it's available to Manitoba. He said the Board did the negotiating, that he had nothing to do with it and that the basic quota will not change but there will be changes with respect to new allocations. That was his statement this afternoon, Mr. Chairman. Well, Mr. Chairman, you're a party to this agreement and how can that happen without your knowledge? I don't accept that, Mr. Chairman.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I want to remind the Minister of one reality, that perhaps he has yet to learn, and I am not faulting him for not knowing it today but he will learn, Mr. Chairman, that there is a difference of responsibility as between his role to the people of Manitoba and the board's role to their respective members. I am talking about the Turkey Board now. There is quite a clear difference of responsibility. He is telling me that he is going to negotiate with this board what is good for the province of Manitoba. That's not good enough, Mr. Chairman, because I know that in the negotiations that led up to all of the national plans that were established that the boards were panicky, Mr. Chairman, and the politicians were cool and the boards wanted an agreement at any price. Yes, Manitoba boards pressured me to agree to anything as long as they get a national plan because they were going broke without a marketing plan. That's right and we held firm and we did not give in on that issue even though we had telegrams, delegations going all the way to Ottawa from Manitoba to meet our Minister, who was there negotiating to try to make sure that we don't jeopardize this plan, Mr. Chairman. The Boards have one thing in mind. We are a club of 80 producers or 90 or 100 and as long as we protect our individual interest, that is all that we are interested in.

Mr. Chairman, that is the way a board functions and, Mr. Chairman, I don't blame them for functioning that way but that doesn't mean that the Minister has to be co-opted by that kind of narrow minded thinking because, Mr. Chairman, the Minister's responsibility has to do with the people of Manitoba as a whole who have a greater interest in what happens to the economy of this province and what happens to our production capacity in all of these commodities. That's his

role. He has to be above the biased position of the individual boards and I don't fault him for being biased, that is there job but I fault the Minister if he falls into the trap of being a yes man to any particular group that is not interested in the public interest but is only interested in their own particular issue, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjection)—That's right.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister astonishes me further. I read to him his press release dated November 25th, and he said, "Oh, yes, but that's an old release, I've since changed that. Well, Mr. Chairman, I now want to read to him another statement in the Legislative Assembly given by him, because he thought it was a very important thing to do, Mr. Chairman. I will read it to him, and I don't know what the date of it was, Mr. Chairman, but he goes on to say, "Mr. Speaker, I have a statement which I should like to make to the House at this time. Copies are being provided to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and to the Liberal Member. It is in respect of the national Chicken Broiler Marketing Plan. I wish to state, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba will enter into such an agreement only if two conditions are met." Mr. Chairman, if I interrupt this is not November, this is February or March, February, yes not November. What are the conditions, Mr. Chairman, well let's read on? "First that Manitoba's share of the quota increased $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 percent per year for the first five years". Not any different than it was in November. "And that there be further consideration at the end of that period. Second that Manitoba can move live and processed products interprovincially without restriction.

"Insofar as quotas are concerned the proposed agreement established quotas for each province based on the average sales of respective chicken boards and agencies during the 71-75 period. The quota set for Manitoba was 3.92 percent of the national figure, but we want as a condition of our entry the right to increase this by $\frac{1}{2}$ a percent a year, to reach 6 percent of the national quota in 5 years with further consideration beyond that, Mr. Chairman. Our insistence in being able to move both live and processed product interprovincially without restriction is to ensure that we are not left in the situation whereby we supply live chickens for processing elsewhere. We want to ensure that our chicken broiler processing industry will not suffer as a result of our entry into the national plan."

Well, Mr. Chairman, who did this Minister think that he was going to compromise in the national market quota arrangement by making these demands? Was he going to tell Ontario, you know, please give us an extra portion of your historical quota allocation, or Alberta? Who should move aside to give in extra privilege in Canadian marketplace under a manage marketing system? Mr. Chairman, this very position, is a position that is now haunting this Minister because it is now being demanded in spades by the province of Alberta, and is being capitulated to by the rest of the country. Yes in spades those demands are being asked, Mr. Chairman, by the province of Alberta. They are saying yes if we don't get these things we are opting out of the national plan. That's what they are saying in Alberta, Mr. Chairman.

But let this Minister not tell me here, Mr. Chairman, that yes this is a problem that the former Minister was right and we agree with him. Mr. Chairman, he hasn't agreed with him, he only now finds himself in a position where he must agree with him, but everything that he has done to date was contrary to the principles that were laid down several years ago and these are his own two statements, Mr. Chairman, and I ask him now to review those positions not only with respect to broilers, it has to be across the board, Mr. Chairman. Every commodity wherein we enter into a national marketing plan has to be based on original, historical, patterns or we are dead, Mr. Chairman, as a producer for future markets yet to be developed, yet to be created by new consumption or increased consumption.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, the member again brings up the statement that is read and the press release that was put out in November and I think we took a strong position. Well, we took a strong position, Mr. Chairman. I suppose he would think that you should start low and try and go higher in your demands to support total development of the provincial live broiler position. We were in a bargaining position as he is well aware. I'm sure he made statements when he was discussing the clause in which he insisted be removed from the national conditions of entering the national plan. Well, Mr. Chairman, we took a position and it's a very defensible position. We did not enter the plan —(Interjection)— well, Mr. Chairman, it was not a disastrous position it was a very defensible position for the producers of Manitoba. We took a responsible position that we wanted in fact —(Interjection)— well, Mr. Chairman, the member said just like this one. I'll get to that one in a minute.

I want also to clarify that I did not say that we were playing to the needs of the producers that we had to negotiate, he said negotiate with the producer boards so that we would have the type of a —(Interjection)— no I said discuss, Mr. Chairman, let us look at it. I want to discuss and as far as the turkey program that has been referred to here tonight and when I answered in the House. In fact that is what has taken place to this date. I have no clear indication — if it was

a contravention of the initial agreement, then in fact we will have to take the position that it is in contravention of an agreement between province . . .

MR. USKIW: You shouldn't be getting it from us, you should be getting it from your department.

MR. DOWNEY: But, Mr. Chairman, I am getting it from my department. In fact, I said earlier in the Committee today . . . —(Interjection)— Well, no, Mr. Chairman, I said earlier in the Committee today that in fact I had some information brought to my attention by my department . . . —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, he is talking about knowing it long ago and all this. We are in a position of having an opportunity to discuss with the producers where we're at. He knows that we are in the position that we can review our agreement with the national agency. We can rescind the position that was taken by the Producer Board. We are reviewing it, and we're meeting with them, okay, and I think that that is totally a defensible position. I am not here to defend what the responsible people have done; I am here as the Minister of Agriculture to discuss with those individuals what has taken place. And if it has been irresponsible, then we will have to act accordingly.

Mr. Chairman, if the agreement that was entered into . . . Let's go back to that. If the agreement that was entered into by the government of the day, the NDP Government, in entering a national program was so air-tight as he is trying to let on, then I don't know what their major concerns are. —(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairn, we changed nothing. We did not change an agreement.

A MEMBER: You made a demand.

MR. DOWNEY: Oh, Mr. Chairman, we made a demand; we took a position as far as entering of another plan, which, really, was a negotiable position. —(Interjection)— And in fact we ended up . . . No, Mr. Chairman, we ended up in fact better than any agreement that they ever ended up in, because we do have the capacity to provide and develop markets for our producers outside of the national plan, sitting in the same position that he is referring to . . . —(Interjection)— Well, if the Member for St. George didn't have . . . I guess he has a real personal interest in this, because he might have been cut back in his turkey quota. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, he will not be cut back in his turkey quota if in fact he has been a member of the base quota, because anything he will get will be an increase over in fact what he had, not on a percentage basis but will be an increase of production capacity. So it isn't a decrease; it will be in fact an increase. But as I go back and say, if, in fact, the Member for Lac du Bonnet put forward such an air-tight position that nothing could change it, then I don't know what his major concern is. —(Interjection)— No, Mr. Chairman, we did not enter under that; that was a negotiable position, a position which we took that we would enter the program, and it was not accepted. Well, Mr. Chairman, it was not accepted, and we entered it under the conditions that we could provide for markets outside of Canada, sitting tight with our provincial share of the Canadian quota that was available. That did not change. We have not changed the position, as far as we're concerned, on any provincial sharing of any national quota; that has not changed. It has not changed, Mr. Chairman, and I will go back again and say that we want to discuss with the Turkey Board; we want to discuss with the Egg Board, and we want to discuss with the legal people that if in fact . . . —(Interjection)— Well, the Member for St. George says we're a little late.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we're not a little late. We are living in a country where an agreement hasn't been honoured. —(Interjection)— Well, the statement I made today is a statement of what has taken place. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, if it's not all right, if fact . . . Well, if, Mr. Chairman, it is not in line with the agreement that was entered into . . . —(Interjection)— Well, if it is not in order then it is an agreement that has been broken, and I am going to review that. I would think that the people who had the — and this is an assumption only — that the individuals who are members of the provincial Turkey Producers' Board have that capacity then they acted in a responsible manner. You know, the Member for St. George is a member of the Turkey Producers' organization. He has the right to vote. He has the right to vote on who is his Director and that Director is answerable to him. —(Interjection)— I would allow the member to do that, but I want to clearly put it on the record that what I indicated today was in fact information that had been given to me that had been negotiated by — and I said it in the House — had been negotiated by the Producer Board.

Now, if in fact, on reviewing that, the Manitoba Marketing Board has the power to recommend to me, and we have the power, as government, to change that particular action, it will be considered. But until I have a chance to review it and discuss it with the Producer Boards then I can take no further action at this time.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I, again, have to remind the Minister that he is digging his hole deeper. He said just a moment ago, Mr. Chairman, that if the actions of the Board is not in line with the agreement that he will act. Mr. Chairman, I would have hoped to hear from him that even if it was in line with the agreement that he should have scolded the hell out of the previous government for having that kind of agreement. That's what he should have been doing.

But, Mr. Chairman, that's not what he did in the House. He merely said that this was a negotiated thing amongst the Boards and that he really wasn't involved. That was his answer, Mr. Chairman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, why wouldn't the Boards negotiate such an agreement when they have, as public statements, Statement No. 1, dated November 25th, this Minister's statement, and then another one in the House confirming the same position in February, stating that this little province of Manitoba was going to make huge demands on the nation for a greater slice of the national pie, of the national market, of its agricultural commodities, Mr. Chairman. They were going to make these big demands. Mr. Chairman, that was beautiful music to Ontario, Quebec and Alberta. That's the kind of music they wanted to hear from Manitoba from Day One, and this Minister provided it for them, Mr. Chairman, and today's statement further confirms it, Mr. Chairman. And now he is trying to extricate himself from a position that he has put himself into over the last several months in his silly nonsense about thinking that a province the size of Manitoba can somehow carry a big stick and tell the other provinces that they had been better move aside in a controlled market and give this province some extra privilege in the marketplace.

You know, that was the attitude that he has displayed with respect to the Commodity Boards that have been entering into national plans.

So, Mr. Chairman, he has to appreciate the impact of his own statements. It is a Ministerial Statement. The other Ministers of the other provinces have read the statement, and they said, well, finally Manitoba is getting out of our way. They were our roadblock all along but now they, too, want to compromise the national market plan arrangement and now we are in a position to make the same demands that we made several years ago and insist that from here on in we amend all of our plans — and they're starting with Alberta making the demands — that all of our market share plans will be amended to reflect the human population in each province, on which would be the base of the production of eggs, of broilers, of turkeys, and all the other national plans that come into play in the future.

Mr. Chairman, that's a disaster for this province. I think the First Minister should be aware of it. I'm sure that if he knew the implications, Mr. Chairman, of what is happening, he would have an emergency Cabinet Meeting to try to sort this thing out because this thing cannot be allowed to pass, Mr. Chairman, another day without some swift action on the part of this government, this Minister, to remind the other provinces and the other Boards that we are not going to back away from the position that we are going to insist that the original formula shall be sustained and we will not accept a formula based on the human population and the growth of human population as between the provinces in this country. Because if we don't do that then Alberta, British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec are going to produce almost everything that is to be produced from here on in, notwithstanding the fact that you have abundant supplies of feed grain, cheap at its source, Mr. Chairman, because it doesn't have to be transported and then fed but can be fed right here

And the final product can be transported, which is a value-added operation — and the Minister should appreciate what I am saying there, Mr. Chairman. We are going to deny all of those value-added opportunities with this kind of posture on the part of our Minister. So he had better get on track, Mr. Chairman, and get back to the status quo ante on this issue and renounce some of these things that he has been pushing for the last few months, Mr. Chairman, because that is the policy that is being demanded by Alberta, by Ontario and by Quebec. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I remember so clearly the Minister from Quebec saying, but, we have several million people and we only produce 40 percent of the hogs for our population's consumption, so you owe us the other 60. Mr. Chairman, I remember that like it was yesterday and this Minister is capitulating to that.

So, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that there is something to be done but it shouldn't be done on the basis of, first, negotiating with the Board and then the Board saying, well, all right, we're going to set up a national meeting and we will decide it at a national Board meeting. Because we had plenty of those, Mr. Chairman, before we set up these national plans and in every one of them,

Mr. Chairman, in every one of those conferences the Boards were willing to succumb while the Ministers held firm. And the Ministers were catching a lot of hell from the Boards for holding firm, but it worked to our advantage in the end, Mr. Chairman.

So don't get taken up by the fact that you have a Producer Board that knows what is good for the people of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, because they know only what is good to protect their own self-interest and may have a very short-sighted viewpoint with respect to the opportunities that are yet to be made for new production, for new processing in the Province of Manitoba and the Province of Saskatchewan. And that is something that we cannot overlook, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe this evening the Member for Lac du Bonnet was just a bit too nice with our Minister. I first, Mr. Chairman, want to declare that I may have a conflict of interest in terms that I am a registered producer, however, this issue has much greater implications for all other producers who are organized nationally, in terms of national marketing agencies.

Mr. Chairman, let's bring a bit of the history into perspective on this very issue. One should realize that the Province of Alberta gave notice to the turkey producers of the national turkey marketing agency that they would be pulling out of the agency if certain conditions were not met. These conditions were spelled out. I believe even the government of Alberta was behind that move, in terms of telling their Board that either you give notice to get out or we will serve notice on the national Board that we will pull out and we will serve the consequences, whatever the consequences might be, whether there be product flowing into our province for a period of time or not, and we will try and rough it out.

But, Mr. Chairman, this Minister today in the House — and I wasn't there but he issued a statement to the Legislature . . .

MR. DOWNEY: I answered a question . . .

MR. URUSKI: Yes, yes, Mr. Chairman, he answered my question that I posed over a week ago when I asked him, amongst other things, if he would protect the interests of Manitoba producers by the signing of the agreement that I indicated was signed by the turkey producers. If he checks Hansard he will know the question that I posed of him. And he indicated, Mr. Chairman, that the quota available to the Producer Board, that the Producer Board did the negotiating, that the government was not responsible, that the basic . . .

MR. DOWNEY: I didn't say that.

MR. URUSKI: Well, that the provincial government was not responsible for the negotiations. I assume that's what he said. I am reading from notes that were made by the Member for Lac du Bonnet. I will have to admit that I am paraphrasing and if I am wrong the Minister will correct me, that the basic quota will not change — the base quota will not change, but there is a change with respect to the new allocations, I suppose. Mr. Chairman, that's precisely the nub of the whole argument.

The Minister has made arguments with respect to flexing his position about the Province of Manitoba in other commodities being able to gain much more of the national market and much more in terms of international markets. Well, what is this change that is being agreed to? I'd like to know whether my information is accurate or not, that the future changes in quota will be made in three ways: One-third for the original market share — in other words, each province will get one-third of an increase of the original market share; one third of the new sharing will be of the percentage of national population that the province has, and one-third of the share of population increase as it relates nationally. So Mr. Chairman, the change in the increase, and I want to know whether my advice is correct, whether the increase in future increases in quota will be based on those one-third, one-third formula. If that is the case then Manitoba really loses substantially in terms of its future position in the marketplace.

For example, if the market increase will be roughly 10 percent' if the national quota increases by 10 percent, and it has in certain years increased by 10 percent, Manitoba's share of that national quota under the present agreement in turkeys, will only increase approximately 3 percent if there's a national increase by 10 percent — 3.3 percent to be exact. The one-third of the original market share would be the only percentage that it would increase by because if you look at the one-third share of the national population, Manitoba has lost population so there would be virtually no increase in terms of its national population, or it has 1/24th or 1/25th of that one-third. And thirdly, the

share of the population increase. Well, as I said, Manitoba has lost population so there'll be no increase there. So that the only share that Manitoba would have would be in terms of the original market share and nothing else, so there will be a net loss, Mr. Chairman, of real growth of roughly 60 percent of any increase. So that Manitoba's increase will only be 40 percent of whatever increase there would be normally allocated to the province; rather than receiving 100 percent of the increase that the province would receive on its original market share, it would only receive 40 percent of that increase under this new formula.

Mr. Chairman, it has very grave implications for all the producer boards in this province because if the Minister allows, and certainly he hasn't today in answer to that question, hasn't indicated whether he disagreed with that agreement. He just indicated that this was the situation. He said that we had nothing to do with it and that the change is with respect to the new allocations. Well, that's precisely the argument, Mr. Chairman. The Minister must have accepted the positions of the boards' agreements because he didn't say he didn't disagree with them.. Only tonight upon questioning by members on this side that he said, "Look, if that's the case, I really want to have a talk to those boards. I want to meet with them". But today, in answer to the question that was posed to him last week, he didn't say he disagreed with that. He just said that there was a change and he accepted it. And Mr. Chairman, the statement that he made with respect to the chicken/broiler certainly sets the tone, really falls into the hands of Alberta's position with respect to getting out of the national turkey marketing agency.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that it would have been in Manitoba's interests to also serve notice on the national board to get out of the turkey marketing agency and dump the birds onto Alberta if Alberta was really intent on pulling out of the marketing agency, if they're intent on increasing production. Because there is no doubt that we have a favourable production situation in Manitoba in terms of producing turkeys in this province and it would be to our advantage, to our processors' advantage, and to the entire industry, to move that product as the Minister so suggested it. He wants the freedom to move the produce unilaterally anywhere in Canada. Then if that's the case, that's what Manitoba should have done — should have moved the product into Alberta saying, "If you want to get out of the national scheme, get out. We will fill your market and see whether you can compete if that's your interest in national marketing schemes".

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. George refers to the statement I made in the House and I, in fact, clearly stated that it was the board's position, that that was at that particular —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, I indicated truly in the House that it was, in fact, the Producer Board that had taken the position on the proposal that I introduced — or that I didn't introduce — that I discussed or answered in Questions in the House today. I did not say that it was the government position to support that. I've indicated clearly here tonight that we will be meeting with the Producer Boards to, in fact, discuss the position that they have taken. —(Interjection)— no, Mr. Chairman, I clearly stated in the House that what I was indicating was the Board's position, and the Member for Lac du Bonnet — and if, in fact, the agreement that was entered into, if, in fact, the agreement that was entered into by the last government, if it allows, if it in fact allows to take place what the members opposite sat there and said that it couldn't allow, then I will roast their ass, Mr. Chairman, I will roast their ass because they acted irresponsibly to the people of Manitoba. —(Interjection)— Well, no Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lac du Bonnet said he should have his ass roasted and I'll tell you we will because he sat here tonight saying that they entered agreement that that couldn't happen. Well, Mr. Chairman, I have indicated how we are going to find out whether that in fact could happen.

Our position as a government, as I clearly stated, that at this point we will be discussing with the Board the position that they've taken. I stated in the House, in fact, that this was a negotiated position by the Producer Board. We will, in fact, be meeting with the Producer Board. I've said it. I'll say it over again and, in fact, if the agreement that they've entered into, if that can take place, as the Member for Lac du Bonnet has indicated that it shouldn't be able to take place because of the airtight agreement that he entered into, then he will get his ass roasted and it'll be by the producers or the people of the province who have seen the gaping hole that he has left in it.

Mr. Chairman, as far as the total discussion of the position that we have taken is now getting repetitious, to further discuss it I think is totally not adding to the benefit of the debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Minister did not answer my question that I posed in my comments to him. I asked him whether the agreement that I quoted to him was the information that I had received — was my information accurate in terms of the agreement that was arrived at in the National Turkey Board, the agreement of sharing one-third, one-third, one-third in the formula that I have

outlined — the information that I have presented here tonight, is it basically accurate?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, being a turkey producer, as the member has indicated, being a member of the Producer Board — I think he is fairly accurate from what the information I had provided to me, that what he has said is fairly accurate. That is the position that the Producer Board have taken. He's a producer. He should know. Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is the information that has been given to me.

MR. URUSKI: I'm glad that the Minister indicates that my information is correct. Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the Minister that I was not able to attend the Annual Meeting of the Turkey Board. We were snowed in. We attempted to go to that meeting. We were not able to leave our premises as a result of a snowstorm and the roads being blocked in our area, Mr. Chairman. So that I wanted to basically find out whether the Minister knew, and if the Minister knew that basically this is the change, I ask the Minister what is his position because he certainly didn't indicate his position to the Legislature when he answered my question that I posed a week ago to him. He said he wasn't involved. But I asked him a week ago what was he going to do to protect the interests of Manitoba producers. He didn't answer that question. Can he answer it now? What does he intend to do to protect the interests of Manitoba producers with respect to this agreement because it has implications on all the other commodities?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, in case the member hasn't been listening to what I've said all night, I am going to be meeting with the Producer Board to discuss, not negotiate, as the Member for Lac du Bonnet would like to continually say, but to discuss the position that they've taken at this particular time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister either isn't seeing through the debate or he doesn't want to acknowledge. What we are telling him is that if he is going to go back to the position that we held several years ago and over the last several years which we have been operating under, then he has to renounce his two statements. That's his position. His position is the Alberta position, Mr. Chairman, so in order to go back to where we were he has to disassociate himself from these two statements that he, himself, made. That's the dilemma that we're in, Mr. Chairman, and he doesn't seem to get the drift of our argument.

Mr. Chairman, that how can he now go to the Government of Canada and to the other provincial governments and to their marketing boards and say, "You know, we've really got to protect the old agreement", when he has been making demands that would compromise those agreements completely, Mr. Chairman. He has to renounce these demands in order to accomplish what must be accomplished for the benefit of the people of this province. That's the dilemma. And he hasn't said to this Committee that he is going to renounce these demands, that he doesn't want extra concessions from the other provinces. He is saying, "These are my demands", Alberta is saying, "But these are my demands", and Ontario is saying, "These are our demands". Mr. Chairman, when they all make demands I can tell my friend who is going to win. It isn't going to be Manitoba unless it's based on the original formula. Unless it's consistent there's no way that you can ask for an extra favour because in the end, Mr. Chairman, the provinces with the clout get the most favours, and that's a position that he should not be putting him himself into.

Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the First Minister to review with his Minister of Agriculture the position of his government with respect to the marketing boards and the national plans that they're operating under, to make certain that Manitoba's future production rights are protected, and that is what is at issue at the moment. It is not a phony issue. It is a serious problem, and if we're not going to move on this one very quickly, Mr. Chairman, Alberta, Ontario, and Quebec, will seize the initiative and we will be in a position of producing for a market restricted within our own boundaries. That's really what we will be ending up with doing. It's not an imaginary thing, Mr. Chairman. It's a very real thing. And we can't afford to be put in that position. We have been traditionally net exporters of these commodities. We have had a growing export position over the years. We should at least protect our historical rights, Mr. Chairman.

Now I invite the Minister of Agriculture to read Hansard, and if he hasn't the time, get his Executive Assistant to read — Hansard. The Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Highways, the Member for Morris, the Minister of Consumer Affairs, all of those gentlemen, Mr. Chairman, gave speeches forewarning our government that we must be careful not to give up our rights to produce and expand our production. We must build in those protective devices, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOWNEY: No, but you didn't.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, that was done, but it's been undone by this Minister with two statements within the last four months, Mr. Chairman. He has the presumption that he can now make demands —(Interjection)— 14 months, sorry, but the latest one is only two months old. Is that a year old? I'm sorry. All right. I stand corrected then, Mr. Chairman. So within the last year we have two statements by this Minister that indicate that his policy is a policy of demanding from the other provinces a part of their share of the market based on historical production patterns. That's his position.

Well, that is Alberta's current position, and they are saying if they don't get that position they are opting out of the national plan. That's what they are saying, in Alberta, Mr. Chairman. And I'm saying that this Minister has to say that if they get their position, Manitoba opts out of the plan. That is the position we have to take. We cannot allow them to bluff their way into another 3 million pounds of production rights, which is what they're after — I believe it's 3 million, I may be wrong, somewhere in that ballpark — they are dreaming, Mr. Chairman, in Alberta, about adding another 10 large production units and adding to their processing facilities. That's their dream in Alberta today.

If they could get the national agreement altered so that that agreement would take into account the fact that Alberta has had a population increase, a significant population increase — as a matter of fact I think between Alberta and British Columbia it's near a half a million additional people that they are talking about and Ontario and Quebec make up the other half, there's only 100,000 left for the rest of Canada, Mr. Chairman. That kind of population breakdown, tied to our production rights, Mr. Chairman, or vice-versa, is a disaster for this province. And this Minister and this Premier have a responsibility to make sure that we don't get led down the garden path. And one of the ways to do that, Mr. Chairman, is for this Minister to completely back away from his demands of having the right to a greater share of Canada's market, based on the fact that other provinces have to compromise their traditional rights to the marketplace, based on formulas that have been established and agreed to.

That is our dilemma. We have a Minister that will have to admit his wrong in order to correct the situation, and I fear, Mr. Chairman, that he will not want to do that, and we will fall into that position of giving in to Alberta, British Columbia and Quebec.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I think the dilemma that we face — it's not a — dilemma, it's a phenomenon that Peter Loughheed and Sam Uskiw speak with the same voice. And this comes from somebody who has, for eight years, piloted Manitoba agricultural industry into these national managed schemes of agriculture production that have boxed the present Minister into the present arrangements. —(Interjection)— And I apologize, Mr. Chairman, for not being here earlier, but in the summary of the Member for Lac du Bonnet's statement, I must say that I find myself in that unique position of all of a sudden agreeing with him that we should be, we should fundamentally be utilizing our capability of producing what we can best produce; namely foodstuffs, chickens, broilers, turkeys, and we should not be tying ourselves into the kind of supply management groups. Then I think that when the Member for Lac du Bonnet meets with his cohorts in the National Farmers' Union for instance, or the Jackie Skeletons of this world that believe in that kind of philosophy, that what he is doing unwittingly is aiding and abetting the kind of support that the Minister quite frankly welcomes and needs in terms of when he says that he wants to expand the overall agricultural production in this province and I know that to be the Minister's aim. I know that to be his aim. I know that to be his aim.

So Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that I find myself in that rather awkward position of supporting the Member for Lac du Bonnet. I want to add my weight to his arguments, in opposition to my colleague the Minister. I certainly support everything that the honourable member is pressing on him. I think that we should be taking many second looks at the agreements that we have been signing with the federal agencies in this respect because I believe that while we accept the fact that industrial Ontario will, for years to come, as they've have in years to pass, provide the cars, the refrigerators and the other hard industrial items for our use. But surely, I think we in western Canada can provide eastern Canada with the bacon and eggs on their breakfast plates, whether they're in Toronto or they're in Montreal.

And arbitrarily to be held up by rigid marketing quotas as to our entry into these markets, that's one of the problems that we're confronted with when we engage in these CEMA and national marketing board agencies.

The former Minister is quite right. I, and the Member for Morris, we've made, and we're on

record, we've made many speeches about those problems. I see the shaking of the heads of the Member for St. George and the Member for Lac du Bonnet, they are now saying, fine, now we should be worried about it. But Mr. Chairman, they led us into this garden path.

MR. USKIW: No, no. That's not correct.

MR. ENNS: They led us into this garden path. And I want them to stand up and say that they have concerns about supply and management. —(Interjection)— no, I just want to finish. I support the Minister in terms of his endeavours to acquire for Manitoba and for Manitoba producers, every possible advantage that we have geographically, and that we have physically, in terms of being able to produce those goods, and we should exercise that right to do it economically, not just in the interests of the producers of Manitoba, but in the interests of the consumers of this country.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)(1)—pass — the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be only proper for me to at least bring the Member for Lakeside up-to-date. The Member for Lakeside has only heard a very small part of the debate. What we are talking about is the fact that this Minister of Agriculture has already deviated from the insurance that was built into the national marketing agreements, or the plans, the assurance that we would allocate quotas on the basis of our historical production pattern. And he has deviated from that by issuing two statements in the last 14 months, statements which are making demands on the other provinces to give in part of their production rights to Manitoba.

Now, we were always worried about that possibility, and we never dared to do that, Mr. Chairman, because we knew that if we played that role we would be the losers, that Manitoba is not in a position to demand. We now have the demands of this Minister delivered to us in spades by the province of Alberta, who want another 3 million pounds of turkey production, or they are opting out of the national plan, because their population went up and they want to produce for their population, and in no way — and they say so, in their documents, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could I caution the member against repetition. The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Oh, Mr. Chairman, but the Member for Lakeside had just entered into the debate, Mr. Chairman, and the province of Alberta . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I advise the Member for Lac du Bonnet to address his remarks to the Chair and to the Minister.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Highways, doesn't realize that the province of Alberta is making demands much greater than the demands that have been made by this Minister, but they have a reason to do so because this Minister is making demands, demands that would deny the province of Manitoba, and they say so in their paper, from expanding their production and their processing facilities and shipping to the province of Alberta. It is in their documentation that they want this stopped, or they are opting out of the national plan.

Mr. Chairman, I want the Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Highways, to know that my advice to this Minister and to this government is that if the formula is tampered with, and if we adopt the policy that has already been adopted by the turkey boards in Canada — perhaps the Member for Lakeside doesn't know what it is, but it is a policy . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could we have a recess for two minutes while the transcriber changes the master tape?

Order please. The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the Member for Lakeside, I was merely trying to point out that the new quota arrangements by the turkey boards is such that determines the expansion of quota rights, new quota rights, on the basis of human population in each province. —(Interjection)— Yes.

MR. ENNS: It comes down to the turkeys and us, eh.

MR. USKIW: That's right. It's now a fight between turkeys and people. So Mr. Chairman, I know

that the Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Highways, would appreciate the impact of that point and I draw it to his attention, because I think he, too, has to talk to his Minister of Agriculture to fortify him in a strong statement but which is a statement that has to contradict his other statements, Mr. Chairman. He cannot on one hand demand concessions of the national market and then give a statement that if others get concessions he is opting out. He can only opt out if he doesn't demand concessions himself. That's the position that we are in and it's almost an impossible one, because somewhere along the line, this Minister has to eat some crow.

A MEMBER: Turkey.

MR. USKIW: Oh, it's turkey. Well, it's a relative, anyway, Mr. Chairman. They're related anyway. It's one bird or the other. But anyway, Mr. Chairman, I know that if the Minister would get together with the Minister of Highways and the Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Member for Rock Lake, who made many speeches on this very point that I am making today, Mr. Chairman. In support of what I am saying, Mr. Chairman, perhaps this Minister should do a bit of reading, or get someone to do the reading for him, he will recognize that we are not far apart on this kind of an issue, if any. Oh, yes, there's no politics here, Mr. Chairman. There is a provincial interest regardless of which government is in power in Manitoba, this interest overrides them all, Mr. Chairman, because it's going to determine the future of agricultural commodity production in this province. And this has to be an all-party issue vis-a-vis the rest of the country. It cannot be a Conservative issue or a New Democratic Party issue. It has to be a Manitoba issue versus the rest of the country. And that's the point that we're trying to make, and I hope that this Minister will take that as a constructive criticism of the operation of his department on this issue to date, Mr. Chairman, because it is indeed, intended to be constructive.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)(1)—pass; (a)(2)—pass; (a)—pass; (b)(1)—pass — the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman I would like the Minister to tell us what we're talking about if you want to get into the Marketing Branch.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the Marketing Branch of the department encompasses the area of market research and information within the agricultural community. It also is involved in the market development for agriculture products that are produced in the province, to work with the development of sales opportunities for the people involved in marketing. We, as I indicated earlier in the opening of the marketing Estimates, we in fact are not in the business of marketing. We leave that to the private sector, to the people who do the selling and trading of agriculture commodities. We leave that to them but we are totally supportive of the overall development of sales opportunities for agriculture products in Manitoba.

The numbers of staff that are in the marketing branch are the same as they were last year. There is a request for 10 people, as I've indicated there is presently one vacant position within the department, in the marketing branch, Mr. Chairman, and I again just want to emphasize the desire by our government to further develop market opportunities, both within Manitoba, within Canada, and internationally for the producers of agriculture goods in the province.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the minister as to what thrusts he sees this branch making or has made in the past year, since he has reorganized the department in terms of market development and the like?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, as far as the reorganization of the department, as I indicated earlier in the Estimates, we are in the process of doing some reorganization. As far as this branch of the department is concerned, I know that in the area of promotion of vegetables, particularly introducing them into a market south of us, into the Minneapolis area, has been one of the major projects that have been part of the department's emphasis. We are continuing on with the development of breeding stock to countries such as Mexico. There has been a fairly intensive program in that area to work with the breeders, the breeders of both hogs and beef cattle. There has been a real interest in continuing trade with Manitoba producers and users of breeding stock in particular in countries such as Mexico. As far as the development of sales of special crops, we are continually trying to monitor the areas where potential sales are possible. With the development of broiler meat, for example, there have been some successful sales to Japan over the past few months in co-operation of the department and the Producer Board, and some of the —(Interjection)— that's right, and turkeys also to the Japanese market.

I think that it's also fair to point out that there is a real need, as far as I, as the minister, in some of the discussions that have taken place, a need for a market development type of institute that could introduce people to products that we have in Manitoba, right here in Manitoba, working in conjunction with some of the producer boards, or in fact with some of the people in the sales business — packing house industries for example — a co-operative type of approach to show individuals how to use products that they can purchase in Manitoba, whether it be in the special crops, whether it be in the use of livestock meats or poultry products. I think we have an opportunity to display to potential buyers, through the efforts of the Market Development Division within the department, to further encourage sales of a product outside of Manitoba, in both other parts of Canada and international markets.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the minister indicate who is in charge of the entire division, the Agriculture Marketing Development Division?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, we do not have an appointed person in that position at this time. I believe I've indicated that earlier.

MR. URUSKI: Is there someone in an acting position, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DOWNEY: Not at this time, Mr. Chairman. We are, as I said, in the process of reorganizing and we do not have anybody in the acting capacity yet.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, has this position been bulletined and been advertised?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Could the minister indicate, you know, how long this structure — I mean he made announcements several months ago, with respect to the reorganization of the department. I believe the announcements go back several months. Surely, in the time-frame that he has made the announcements, that he would have made certain moves in terms of his reorganization and staffing of the branches. Could he indicate what the holdup is in terms of putting the staff into position?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, the member refers to reorganization announcements. I believe it has been something like the last month or so, or two months that we've been in discussion. We are now getting to the stage where we will be completing and finalizing some of the filling of the positions, as the member is well aware. That is one of the positions that will be filled by the government, and does not necessarily have to be bulletined.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6. The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, while I recognize the government's right to appoint, in terms of Deputy Ministers and the like, has the position been advertised in terms of prospective candidates for the ADM's position, or is it going to be without advertising, an internal promotion that the minister will make, or is he seeking the advice of candidates within and without the Province of Manitoba?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, for the member's benefit, I'm sure that in discussion of reorganization individuals, if you want to refer to that being a type of advertising, individuals know that there will be possibly a position there. That is the only type of advertising. As far as bulleting or anything of that nature, there hasn't been any. And from within, again the people who are involved within the department know that there will be a position available and will be considered. He's well aware of the prerogative the government has to fill that position, and how we do it will be by order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the Member for St. George finished?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the minister indicate, in terms of approximate dollar amounts, the amount of sales? He indicated that there was a move in terms of supplying vegetables to the, I think, Minneapolis, south of the border market — what kind of sales have been translated to Manitoba producers or firms that the department has been involved in? What kind of market potential, not potential, but actual market have Manitoba products produced?

MR. DOWNEY: Well as far as monitoring the actual sales, it's pretty difficult to do that because the selling of the goods takes place by the Vegetable Producers Board, and we really work as a facilitator to work with them. As far as the actual monitoring of dollars, I don't have that figure with me, but I think I could indicate to the member, and he referred to the market potential, particularly in some of the vegetable crops, that the big opportunity, particularly in the potato production and marketing area, the biggest opportunity is in the processed products — the vegetables that can be processed and moved out as that kind of a commodity. As far as the production or the market for table potato stock or for that kind of a market, is very limited. The big opportunity is through the processed type of crops that can be grown in direct relationship to —(Interjection)— that's right, and of course that is where we are emphasizing our support, as far as government is concerned, to further add to processing of the agricultural goods that are grown in the province for job creation and the spin-off effect that they add to the provincial economy. It is the base industry that when you have more work done to the goods that you are growing here, it's an automatic benefit to the majority of Manitobans.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, in terms of the specifics of the commodities of vegetables south of the border, is this a new entry for the branch in terms of opening up new markets or is this a continuation and an expansion of something that they have already done a while back?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, it's indicated to me that Minneapolis is a continuation of a market, but I've also indicated that they have now introduced some product to Kansas City and to Washington, so there are some products moving into new areas, new market areas, south of the border.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, what kind of strategy does the branch employ in terms of securing your markets? Do they travel to food conventions or do they make a direct distributor as a liaison between wholesalers and distributors between Manitoba and the prospective cities that are involved? What kind of approach is used by the department?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's indicated to me that they use more than one approach. The contact of large wholesale firms, participate in food fairs, trade shows and that type of approach to introduce Manitoba products to the market that there's some indication is there.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the minister indicated that Mexico is very interested in continuing the purchase of breeding stock both in cattle and hogs, I believe he mentioned. My information is this has been going on for a number of years now, I believe. Has there been an increase in the last couple of years or last two-three years in the buying by the Mexicans of our breeding stock, and if so, could the minister elaborate on that a bit.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think that there's one other area that I will mention for the member's benefit. Swine is relatively new last year, and there has been a tremendous interest in the purchase of breeding stock and swine out of Manitoba. For example, one particular production unit down there are looking at stocking that unit with 800 sows of Manitoba stock. One unit himself as a one-shot deal that — well I say one shot but they're satisfied enough with the Manitoba stock that they have seen that they are going to go in that size of a volume. I might also indicate to the member that there is interest in purchasing turkey poult from Manitoba also. They have had to rely to some extent on France, and they are now interested in looking at turkey poult from Manitoba.

So, you know, I think it's very important that we continue to keep up our relationship with potential markets such as that, particularly Mexico, it's a country with 60 to 70 million people. We're all quite familiar with the fact they have a large reserve of oil, and the balance of trade between the two countries has narrowed somewhat. We at one time were a major exporter, and exporter only, and imported very little. It's now pretty well balanced off, and I would think that they would be a lot easier to sell to if we were purchasing more goods from them, in fact, they are very desirous of entering into other areas of trade. And it also is, of course, on the doorstep of another market which is South America, that is interested in purchasing certain kinds of legume crops or peas and that type of crop.

I guess we'd have to say that some of the limiting factors would be the supplies of certain desirable types of livestock, swine in particular in Manitoba, that are the limiting factors right now as far as them purchasing more than we actually have available to them. We are facilitating them to purchase in other provinces, too. We're not totally saying that we want to sell Manitoba and Manitoba

only. If we can't supply it, we will work with the other provinces to coordinate sales of their goods to that same market, which I think is an approach which any Canadian could subscribe to.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the minister indicate in terms of dealing and specifically with the Mexican people, when you were in a position of coordinating sales you indicated that there was some 800 swine that had been purchased already from Manitoba — or approximately are in the process

MR. DOWNEY: They were interested in purchasing that kind of . . .

MR. URUSKI: They were interested, it's not known if that purchase has been consummated as yet. When you deal with the people from Mexico, are you dealing with individual farmers, are you dealing with large corporations, or who are you actually dealing with in terms of Mexican food production?

MR. DOWNEY: To this point, Mr. Chairman, it's basically the individual producers who are working through their Agriculture Development Bank. They have been the individuals to this point who have been interested in purchasing the breeding stock. They are, basically, individual producers who in some cases make up the collective farm system that they have. The moneys in most cases are provided by the Development Bank which is orientated towards the development of their livestock industry.

MR. URUSKI: So, in other words, the minister is indicating that the dealings do go on with the National Government, in effect, through the Development Bank which would be a Mexican national agency that does the coordinating on behalf of all its producers for the country and handles the agency. Would the minister consider, or at least be open to — let's say the Development Bank of Mexico wanted to enter into an agreement with the Province of Manitoba to supply them a number of swine annually, would the Province of Manitoba be in a position to enter into agreements with the National Development Bank of Mexico? Would the minister consider that kind of an approach if that would mean that markets could be cornered for Manitoba producers?

MR. DOWNEY: No, as a government I would not propose that we should enter into a contract with the Development Bank. I would think that we should work with the producers and the Development Bank to come together on a form of a contractual agreement that we could create the environment in which that type of process could take place. You know, I do not want to get the government into the position where we, in fact, are held responsible for supplying a product which in fact the producers are unable or, you know, we aren't in the business of marketing as such. We want to work as a facilitator to encourage that kind of development. I think that there's a lot of work that has to be done with the federal government to liaison between the producers who are desirous of doing business in Canada and the reverse, that our job is to coordinate the efforts of the purchasers and the sellers at this end.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I have a number of questions yet if it's agreeable. I'm sure that the other members have questions as well that, if you wish, we Move Committee rise and we come back to this tomorrow because I have a while yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. (No vote.) The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the federal government, as I understand in many instances in terms of national trade with many nations does become involved I believe directly in terms of coordinating firms and actually becoming the agent on behalf of many commercial firms in order to secure contracts with other nations. The minister has indicated to me — and I hope I'm not misrepresenting him — that he rejects flatly that the province, that he as a minister, would not want to get involved at all in any such scheme or even thinking of such a scheme irrespective of how beneficial it might be for producers or for firms in the Province of Manitoba. I would hope that if the opportunity, because I do believe that there are governments of countries that would prefer to deal with the elected representatives from those countries over and above private individuals, that they would prefer to enter into agreements for products or goods and services — well, it could even be black beans, Mr. Chairman, it can be any kind of commodity; it can be swine, it can be beef, it can be turkeys, it can be any type of commodity — whether the minister would or is in a position to

indicate whether such approaches have been made to him and whether he rejects that kind of concept out of hand.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, I think I indicated clearly that we as the government and I as the minister, do not foresee us getting into . the contracting of agriculture goods and the marketing of goods out of Manitoba. I can again go back and state what I stated earlier — the coordination and the facilitating of that kind of agreement between desirous purchasers and desirous sales people in the province is the role in which I feel we should play, not to get involved in direct contracting of agriculture goods as government. That is not the way in which we will be proceeding.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, there's no doubt that in many instances in order to facilitate a contract , many producers would have to be contacted. Would the government not facilitate a provision of a contract even though they may not be directly involved by pooling the producers into a contract to supply goods if it takes 10, 20 or 30 producers? Would the minister indicate that that would be in the cards, if he would be favourable to that, at least, to that approach, if it was desired by different countries?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, in fact, that is taking place as far as the hog producers are concerned. I understand there's some coordination being done by the Hog Producers Association to, in fact, facilitate purchasers and that is the kind of approach that is. . . I have not had any request directed to me as a minister to provide that kind of a service and again I would like to indicate that I am not desirous of getting into the marketing of agricultural goods as a government. I want to make that very plain.

MR. URUSKI: Could the minister indicate what kind of special crops his department has been involved in in terms of international sales in the last year? What new areas have they broken and what kind of markets have they broken?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, as far as new areas, I would really find it difficult to say that there were really any new types of crops that are being introduced to any new areas. I would say that one of the crops, of course, that he's mainly familiar with, and that's buckwheat — the continued interest that has been shown by the Japanese we, in fact, do not want to see that potential market turned away, but would like to encourage the development of buckwheat sales from Manitoba to these particular people.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, could the minister explain what the present — is there a contract now with the Buckwheat Producers and the Japanese firms or what is the situation with respect to the buckwheat sales to Japan?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I am just going to answer to the Member for St. George. The government does not have a contract with Japan —(Interjection)— no, we don't have a contract with Japan as far as the Buckwheat Millers Association is concerned. We have been encouraging the contacting of producers through the Buckwheat Millers Association trying to facilitate a contracting between those two individuals. —(Interjection)—no, we're not getting involved in that.

MR. URUSKI: . . . a guaranteed price in terms of a contract between Japan and the producers, that's what you're trying to facilitate or what . . .

MR. DOWNEY: No, we're not guaranteeing any producer price on any commodity. We're trying to encourage the direct producers to buckwheat purchasers in Japan. We, as a government, are not in the business of guaranteeing contracts for producers or for Japanese.

MR. URUSKI: Surely, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways has been trying desperately to get in.

MR. ENNS: Thank you to the Honourable Member for St. George for deferring. I believe the honourable minister is either being overly modest or less than candid. I would like him to divulge to the Committee the secret trade agreements that he has entered into with the President of Mexico as a result of his recent trip to that country. I know they are substantial and have significant bearing to the welfare of the agriculture industry in Manitoba and I think the minister is being, as I say,

either overly modest or less than candid to the Committee right now. I invite the minister to indicate his contacts with the Government of Mexico and, in particular, that intimate evening that he spent with the President of Mexico in discussing the potential trade agreements that Manitoba agriculture had with that country which are exciting, I might say, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, I'm quite aware that the Honourable Minister of Highways was visiting with the Member for Lac du Bonnet when I was discussing some of the market development that has taken place with Mexico. I'd have to indicate to the Committee that I did not meet with the President of Mexico, but in fact, we did have several meetings with the Development Bank and some of the interested purchasers of not only agriculture crops, but as I indicated, livestock from Manitoba and also viewed some of the livestock that had been sent down prior to other year's purchases by the Mexicans. I must say that they are very acceptable to the Mexican people, and doing a good job, very well accepted and feel that there is, as I indicated earlier, a growing demand for breeding stock from Manitoba.

I also indicated, the Member for St. George might be interested, that there is a big demand for turkey poulters and would . . . —(Interjection)— Well, we will have to —(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(b) — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Minister was indicating that he was not involved in guaranteeing any prices on what were the terms of their trade to Japan. Mr. Chairman, would the Minister reject if a group of producers came to him and said, look, will you assist us in negotiating a contract with Japanese firms in terms of the buckwheat market for supplying? Would the Minister reject that request from producers?

MR. DOWNEY: No, I wouldn't; that would be handled through the Marketing Development Branch and I wouldn't reject that kind of approach, but I would definitely refrain from putting the government in the position of guaranteeing either one way or the other the volume that were to be shipped to that country or the price. I, again, would think that part of our role would be to facilitate discussion between the desirous purchaser and the desirous seller.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister object if the producers wanted some assistance from the government in terms of negotiating and if there were any need to co-ordinate transportation facilities and the like, would he reject that kind of a request from producers, in terms of solidifying an agreement or a long-term agreement, whether it be primarily Japanese in terms of buckwheat?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, I'm glad the member clarified that; I didn't want to commit myself into the development of a turkey exchange. I would like to indicate to the member that part of the department's role is, in fact, that kind of work, to co-ordinate transportation, whether it be testing of sampling and that type of thing. It is where I see the government's role being played.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister whether there is any research being done with respect to further processing of products, where the Minister indicated that there are market potentials outside the country but we may not have the capacity for further processing many items in terms of meats and vegetables that I believe we have a long way to go in terms of not only supplying our local markets but in terms of creating new markets for a further processed product? What work and development is being done by the Branch in this area?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, some of the work that is being done is being co-ordinated through the Food Sciences Centre at the University to develop a product that can be further processed in Manitoba. I would also say there is some work being done, or plans of work being done, at the Research Station at Portage — I just forget the name of it — in co-ordination with the Economic Development Branch of government. There is co-ordination between the two departments in developing a product for further processing a product in Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(1)(b) — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Is there a follow-up being done by the department? All right, the research is being done, as the Minister indicates, either at the University or at the Food Products Lab., or whatever they call it, in Portage. How is this being followed up in terms of making sure that there is some or attempting to get some commercial development of the product on a commercial basis? Is the

Marketing Branch involved in this area, or do they do any work in terms of trying to create further processing of products within the province? Or is your Branch involved in that at all? The research is being done by government, primarily, either by the University or by a Branch of the Economic Development Department. But, fine, the research is there, but as far as putting it together commercially, of someone actually putting it on the market and doing something with it, as a follow-up, what work is being done in that area?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is the responsibility of the department to follow-up with that type of work, to not see that meaningful work done by the Food Development Institute or research work falls between the stools. It is the responsibility of the department to carry on and to encourage the actual development of the processing will have to take place to come into commercial viability. And, of course, we have a committee struck between the Department of Agriculture and Economic Development to see that that type of thing is carried out or encouraged to be carried out; we can't force it to be carried out but to encourage it to be carried out.

MR. URUSKI: Has there been any development or any new firms, in terms of further processing of either meat products or vegetables, that have made some expansion into new areas in this province in the last, say, one year or two years, in terms of Manitoba?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman, not to my knowledge. As far as any major breakthrough in any type of thing, I know that there is continually discussion taking place. When we look at the oilseed crushing facilities that are available in the province, that type of interest has been shown over the past few months and no decision by anyone to proceed to build has been made at this particular time, to my knowledge, but there is always a continuing interest in people that are interested expanding the food processing, particularly, as we have debated earlier, with the increase in meat products there is a definite interest in those particular areas.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the general strategy, as I gather, in the department is to promote and to try and co-ordinate. In terms of strategy, is there any specific thrust, other than what I have outlined, in terms of the department, any new approaches that the department is undertaking that it has not done to date?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, I just want to again indicate, I think I indicated earlier that I could see a — and this is very preliminary at this time but an area which could be developed and co-ordinated as far as the department of Market Development is concerned — is the development of a Market Development Institute where, in fact, you work with people who are interested in purchasing a product to work with them for two weeks or something, prior to the purchase, or in the time in which they are purchasing, to show them how to use our products. For example, we could look at the development of the hog industry or the selling of breeding stock if, for example, a group came in to purchase hogs that they could understand a little bit better, after two weeks of involvement in an institute, an educational program, that that particular process would in fact give them better husbandry handling techniques of the product after getting it. And I think that's the kind of support that I can see taking place, and development in that area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development. Did he not ask for the floor? I'm sorry. 6.(b)(1)—pass — the Honourable Minister for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to indicate to the Committee just how he has viewed the operation of the Marketing Branch and how he foresees their evolution over the years ahead. I know it's a tough area and it sometimes takes a long time to pin down some real good success stories. I think they have had a fair amount of success over the years, if you compare it with the efforts of other departments in government in other areas, Mr. Chairman. But I wonder if the Minister can tell us just what his policy or viewpoint is as to where the Marketing Branch is really heading. Has there been any policy change with respect to the operation in the last year, and what is contemplated?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I have indicated in the past half hour the type of work that I can see the Marketing Branch continuing on with. I think we can definitely foresee them supporting and to work with the private sector in creating an environment which is conducive to expanding the sales of all agricultural goods, both within Canada and with Manitoba and Canada and, of course, internationally. Because of our capacity to produce we have to look at markets that are outside of Manitoba and particularly out of Canada, because of some of the things that

have been highlighted earlier in the nationally quota commodities, nationally-controlled commodities, that we have to further develop outside markets. And that will be one of the main thrusts. And the way in which that is accomplished, I indicated, could be done through co-ordination, be it transportation, working through an Agricultural Development Institute, through educational-type programs to work with potential purchasers of goods, of Manitoba products, to work with them to make them able to be able to use what we in fact produce here in the province.

So I think that is the major area in which we are working. I am confident that we have to have an expansive type approach to market development. Again, that is the area where we reach the end result, as far as the returns to farm people.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister talks about looking for markets beyond the boundaries of the country in order to expand the sale of those commodities that are controlled by national marketing agencies. And that's fine, but I'm wondering what happens, if we are successful in increasing the market for some of these commodities, which could happen for a time period, but then what happens with the production of those commodities after that time period expires? Where do we unload those commodities or those surpluses?

A MEMBER: Well, if they are black beans we unload them to Cuba.

MR. USKIW: Well, that's not a bad suggestion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

MR. USKIW: The Minister would have an opportunity to visit and open his eyes a little bit.

A MEMBER: You'd like to go there?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Oh, it's a nice place to go, Mr. Chairman, much more so than it ever was.
—(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lakeside should know that it is more democratic in Cuba today than it was under its Fascist Regime prior.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I want that on the record that the Member for Lac du Bonnet states that Cuba a more democratic country than many others. I want that on the record, Mr. Chairman. They have not had an election there for 17 years or 20 years, and I want that on the record that the Member for Lac du Bonnet, the former Minister of Agriculture, believes that that is the kind of government that we should aspire to, a great democratic government that doesn't have elections. I want that on the record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: . . . Member for Lakeside that when he rudely interrupted me, Mr. Chairman, I was trying to tell him that it is more democratic today than it has been under the Fascist Regime of the past, but that's neither here nor there, Mr. Chairman, that is not what we are debating.

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, on a point of order.

MR. USKIW: What's the point of order, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Highways on a point of order.

MR. ENNS: Well, on a point of privilege, I just want the member to know that, again, the Member, the former Minister of Agriculture, the Member for Lac du Bonnet, states on the record, publicly in the Province of Manitoba that a regime that does not put itself up for election for 20 years is more democratic than any other regime than he can think of. Thank you.

MR. USKIW: I didn't say that. I never said that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: He can have his fun, Mr. Chairman, and introduce into the debate matters that are not relevant or that have not been stated. We appreciate the hour is late, Mr. Chairman, and the member is perhaps a bit weary, a bit weary, but in any event, Mr. Chairman, we are not here to debate the merits of one Cuban system over another.

Mr. Chairman, to set the members straight, Mr. Chairman, to set the Member for Lakeside straight, I would advise him to consult the Member for Morris, who believes that the present arrangement in Cuba is better than the one that was there prior. So let him get his information first-hand from the Member for Morris, who was there on more than one occasion, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)(1)—pass?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, no, we were in the middle of something, Mr. Chairman; I don't know what it was.

We wanted to know from the Minister, Mr. Chairman, just what his position will be if we do develop markets for a time period that are then lost to us and we have established some production capacity in the meantime, if those commodities are indeed controlled by national marketing quotas and so on. Where does that put our province, relative to the disposition of product?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, it's a question of assumption, where will we be at if that in fact takes place. I am fully confident that we are in a world of growing demand for food and that the ability for the market to keep up to the production will, in fact, be a reality. There always are cyclical problems. I think those individuals that do enter into markets such as that are quite aware of the situation in which they are producing the product for. That's in relationship to the type of supply-managed product that they are in presently, within this country.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, yes, my concern only arises out of the fact that the Minister might be pressured into, or he may even willingly want to go that route, into making other announcements that would ask for greater compromises on the part of the National Market Share Program, in which case further jeopardize our position within the country itself. That's the reason for my question and that's the point of caution that I raise. If we are developing these markets on the basis that they may be turned off from time to time and our producers are aware of that, that's fine, but I would hope the Minister isn't thinking in terms of developing markets for commodities that are under control marketing in Canada with the view that he might be able to dump them on the Canadian market, should they become a surplus commodity at some point in time.

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman, I think I clearly indicated that the individuals who entered into that would have to fully realize the position that they were in when they were providing for that kind of a market.

MR. USKIW: Yes, the other point that I have picked up from the Minister's comments has to do with the Marketing Branch's involvement with the private sector. He used the term "private sector". Is the Minister saying that the Marketing Branch is limited only to working with the private sector, or is he simply saying that's one of their options or possibilities?

MR. DOWNEY: I don't know in what reference he is referring, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: Well, it was your statement.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, working with the private sector, I would say, whether it be a private company or a producer association or whatever, that the Marketing Branch would in fact work to facilitate sales of agricultural goods for Manitobans, the producers, for the betterment and the interests of the producers.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister confirming then that they will not be operating exclusively within the private sector arrangement, that if they see an opportunity that they will not be hamstrung from seizing on it, through their own agency, if necessary, in order to capture a market

or two to take advantage of what is available from time to time. I would hope that there is no restriction on the Branch that they can't operate other than through some private arrangement, in which case they might have to bypass some sales' opportunities.

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman. I will clearly state again that we are not going to be involved in the actual marketing of product, as a government. I don't know how much more plainly I can state it; I have stated it prior to this, that in fact they are there to facilitate and identify market opportunities for farm people, for people in the marketing of agricultural goods. We are not in the business of buying and selling agricultural products.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I didn't suggest that the Minister should be buying and selling commodities, but I did indicate or suggest to him that there may be a situation where the Marketing Branch would have to be involved unilaterally, so to speak, or without the aid or partnership or co-operation of a private company in the filling of a certain market — or the supplying, rather, of a certain market, that whether they are going to be precluded from doing that by government policy. Now, if that isn't what he said, that's fine, but if he indicates that they are precluded from that then I would want to debate it further.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, the member again refers to us having the capacity to get involved in the actual trading of agricultural goods, buying and selling. Well, if he isn't saying that, I don't know what he is. But we are not in that business; we are here to co-ordinate and facilitate the development of sales of agricultural products, not to capture markets as a government, going out to capture a market. We will go out and encourage people to do business with Manitoba people, but we will not be going out as a government to get involved in the actual contracting or involvement of that type of business.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)(1)—pass — the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, obviously the Minister doesn't understand my point. You know, there can be a situation where there isn't market opportunity but in which case there is a ready vehicle to put the pieces together to make it happen. Someone has to be able to make the right contacts, to make the right arrangements and so on, as between the seller and the buyer. I would hope that the Minister isn't telling me that unless the Branch can find a private entrepreneur to do that that they would not become involved.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, to answer the member, who says, you know, I cannot foresee what kind of involvement. If we can use an example where an individual wanted to buy X-numbers of pounds of product, that we, as a government, would clearly indicate to the people in the province, the producer or organization or association, their marketing agency, that that our job is to identify that for those people, but not to say that we, as a government, had X-number of pounds of product to sell to that particular purchaser because we are not in that business.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, we have had proposals put forward in the past where certain buyers of certain commodities have indicated to us that they were not able to rely on the marketplace, as it were, here to guarantee certain supplies of certain commodities, notwithstanding the fact that the production of those commodities was sufficient to meet those demands, that there had to be some co-ordinating role undertaken by someone responsible. I think the buckwheat example is probably a good one in that sense, where the Japanese Millers' Association simply didn't have the confidence in our private sector in delivering the product and tried to convince government here to be the co-ordinating authority to make sure that they, in fact, can have continuity of supply and that that wouldn't be jeopardized. And I believe that in the period of time that there were arrangements made to facilitate that, that was in the best interests of the people of Manitoba. I would hope that this Minister isn't telling us that even though he is convinced that it's a good arrangement that he will not permit his Branch to enter into that kind of arrangement. Is that what he is saying?

MR. DOWNEY: That's what I am saying, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, can the Minister then illustrate for us why he would take such a dogmatic position and why he would want to tie the hands of his own department from doing something that, in his own mind, could be determined to be a good thing for the people of this province?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, we get into a point where we are again discussing the philosophy of where government should . . . —(Interjection)— Well, it is philosophy, Mr. Chairman, because, you know, I will go back to the example of the buckwheat contract which he has referred to. That wasn't a very successful program as far as the involvement of the Department of Agriculture and the people of Japan. It has truly been indicated to me that there was a shortfall of product, that they were never able to get the amount of product that was guaranteed by the Minister of the Day, the Member for Lac du Bonnet, at that time. There was a continuous shortfall because the government are not in the business of producing and contracting. It is not our government in the business of producing and contracting or contracting with producers. In fact, we feel that it is the responsibility of the grain co-ops, of the Buckwheat Producers' Association, that those are the people that should be contracting with the Buckwheat Millers of Japan. And then I would say that there has been a successful agreement between some of the individuals. I guess it was Mr. Krueger last year, of Winkler, who was involved in some of the negotiations between the Japanese Millers and some of the farm people, it's my understanding.

We are not involved in that business, Mr. Chairman, I want to make it very clear to the Committee and to the people of Manitoba.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, you know, we talk about being dogmatic, this particular Minister is of course displaying again the philosophy of his government. What's the point of order, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

MR. JOHNSTON: The point of order is, Mr. Chairman, that the member is now discussing Economic Development, which he will have an opportunity to question under Section 37.(j) Market Development. It provides for co-ordination and export sales activities and other promotional support designed to increase the sale of Manitoba-made merchandises and services. As a matter of fact, he could do it under (h) and he can do it anywhere in that particular area.

A MEMBER: What's the point of order?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, the point of order, are we discussing agricultural Estimates or are we discussing Economic Development?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet on that same point of order.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, on that point of order, simply because the Minister of Economic Development doesn't know the programs of the Department of Agriculture doesn't give him the right to tell us that we are out of order on these Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development on the same point of order.

MR. JOHNSTON: The Minister of Agriculture said very clearly there is a committee working together between Agriculture and Economic Development.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, we are debating the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture and we are dealing with this Minister; we are not terribly interested in the viewpoints of the Minister of Economic Development, at the moment. If he wants to enter into the debate, Mr. Chairman, if he wants to enter into the debate, that's fine, but Mr. Chairman, we don't have to receive any admonitions from him.

Mr. Chairman, I am terribly disappointed that this government pursues a policy based on dogma, on the fact that they believe that nothing should be done in the public interest by government, even if they are satisfied that it would be in the public interest. That is somewhat unreal, Mr. Chairman. It's not the real world that we're living in, Mr. Chairman. We're not living in a black and white world. It's a lot of gray. And this Minister is trying to tell us that we are going to stay clear of pragmatic approaches, that even though we have presented to us an opportunity that would auger well for the economy of this province, would benefit many people in this province, that because of his ideology he is not going to permit his marketing branch to get involved. That's essentially what he has just said, Mr. Chairman. You know, it was our government that was accused of being dogmatic over the years. Heavens, you know, we don't come close. We couldn't match the

performance of this government with respect to dogmatism and ideological hang-ups, Mr. Chairman.

The idea that the government can sit here and say, this is good for the people of Manitoba but we won't touch it, because heavens this really should be done by some private entrepreneur, even though he's not there, we are not going to do it. That is an insane approach to governing this province, Mr. Chairman.

That is not the kind of thing that is expected of government today. We haven't had that kind of approach in the history of this province that I can recall, Mr. Chairman. That's right. We haven't really had that. We have had a fairly mixed approach to Canada's economic development over the last century. This Minister is trying to make us believe that we are now going to go way back before our early history, Mr. Chairman, and hope that we are going to evolve economically on the basis that everything is going to be left to someone else, that the government is going to play no role at all or a very minute role in giving direction to the economy and to what should take place.

Well, Mr. Chairman, that's a lazy approach. That's a lazy approach. I don't think it has ever worked and I don't think it ever will work. We will see how long that is going to be the policy of this government before they find that they are in a situation whereby there are demands made of them to do something about the situation, but that they will not want to bend because of that hang-up. And we will see how long they will sustain that position, Mr. Chairman. Because this is not the way in which Manitobans have been accustomed over the last any number of decades. They have been accustomed to using the instrument of government from time to time for a good purpose. For a good purpose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)(1)—pass; (b)(2)—pass; (b)—pass. (c) (1) Grain Transportation and Marketing—pass. Did I hear a motion committee rise? Committee rise.

SUPPLY — EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would draw the honourable members' attention to Page 30 of the Main Estimates, Department of Education. Item I. — Departmental Administrative Support Services, Resolution 40, we are on Item (b) General Administration: (1) Salaries. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to address a few questions to the Minister under this section, where I assume that information is put together, and that will relate to some of the items further on in his Estimates, and hopefully by that time he'll have the opportunity to provide some of the information that we on this side might need to more effectively provide a worthwhile critique of the department and how it's operating.

However, Mr. Chairman, I'm not quite clear where the Frontier School Division comes in under there, and I wonder if the Minister could just give me a clue as to —(Interjection)— I suppose, Mr. Chairman, one question that came to mind today in regard to Frontier School Division, in light of my comments earlier today about what's happening in northern Manitoba and the situation in northern Manitoba, whether or not Frontier School Division was providing a new course in remote communities in the north, and that is a course on how to apply for welfare, since that seems to be the option that's being left open by the government in office and members opposite.

Mr. Chairman, one of the areas that I would like to question the Minister further on, and perhaps he would like to have his staff ensure that the information is available, is on the adult basic education program and what's happening to it in terms of federal dollars, and the reductions in that program because of a reduction in federal dollars, so that's an advance notice of that item.

The other, Mr. Chairman, is some information on a number of programs that basically would be considered, I suppose, adult education programs. Some of these, perhaps a couple of these, have been transferred from this Minister, and as my colleague for Winnipeg Centre mentioned, it is confusing for us when things keep jumping back and forth, because this Minister made some commitments in regards to some programs last year that might now be transferred to somebody else, and therefore the Minister doesn't have to live up to his commitments in regard to those programs because it's been transferred to a colleague of his, who hasn't made commitments in regard to the continuation of certain programs, or the level of continuation of certain programs.

What I would like, if possible, from the Minister, Mr. Chairman, is some information that would give us some historical account. I have some information, I believe, from an Order for Return from one of my other colleagues on this side of the House in the past, that covers 1977-78 amounts in a number of categories, and 1978-79. In order that we can get a more accurate record, and in order to use his staff instead of myself, I wonder if it would be possible to get information from 1975 up until the current fiscal year in a number of categories, so that we can see the increase or decline, or the level of how those programs are working.

And I'm assuming that that information is fairly readily available to his staff; if it's not, then of course I would accept it if the Minister wasn't able to provide it. But if it's fairly easily accessible to them, and not to us, then I would certainly appreciate that kind of information. The type of categories I'm looking at here, Mr. Chairman, is the special mature student program, University of Manitoba, so a year by year tracing of the dollar amount in that program and the number of students who are in the program, the special mature student program at Brandon University, special mature student at Brandon General Hospital, the Winnipeg Centre Project, the Native Family Life Counselling Project, the IMPACTE Program, the Worker Training and Education Program, the special mature student program at Red River Community College, the Support Services, the New Careers Program — I believe that's one that the Minister had last year; this has been transferred to his colleague.

The Community Education section — that is the Parklands Project and the Focus Program. It may be worthwhile, Mr. Chairman, if one of those programs is continuing to divide those two categories. There's also a distinction, Mr. Chairman, between those programs that receive some Northlands funding, so there's, I believe, a distinction in his records, between a special mature student program at University of Manitoba, Northern, that receives the Manitoba Northlands funding, the special mature student program at Brandon University, Northern, receives Northlands funding. And the same, the special mature student program at Brandon General Hospital.

Also, Mr. Chairman, of course, the BUNTEP Program and the level of funding there. The Support Services, I assume, I in relation to that program, and the New Careers that's cost shared under the Northlands, or the Northern New Careers part of the program. That's the way they were broken down in the past, and I would assume that it would be easiest to match up those categories that were used in past years to continue to get some sort of pattern of what's going on.

The other program that I would like more detail on, Mr. Chairman, is the Inter-universities North Program, and of course, Mr. Chairman, there'll be a number of others that we'll be requesting from this side, more detailed information as we get to that section. But I wanted to give the Minister those questions so that it would give him some time to begin to prepare his answers on those, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Winnipeg Centre brought forth a number of questions before we recessed for the dinner hour, and I would like to attend to those at this time.

His first question dealt with staffing comparisons, and if he has a pencil handy at this time, I would attempt to give him those figures. I will not use the terminology of so many bodies, I find that term not very applicable when we're talking about people who are working in given positions. I will then speak in regard to this as to people employed by the department, Mr. Chairman.

As of January, 1978, in the education part of the department — I am speaking of two portions, now, the education portion and the community college portion, just to separate those two. As of January, 1978, there were some 513 people employed in the education portion of the department, and as of January, 1979, some 443 people — a reduction there, Mr. Chairman, of some 70 people.

In the community colleges division, and I am sorry the dates don't quite coincide here, but I think they're close enough, I would hope, to be acceptable to the Member for Winnipeg Centre; April, 1978, the community colleges division, total number of people employed, 1,029.99 — let's call it 1,030; and March of 1979, approximately a year later, in the community colleges division, total people employed, 1,024.25, a reduction there of six people. Resulting, Mr. Chairman, in a net total reduction in the department of some 76 people.

Now I can break those figures down. I can break those down, Mr. Chairman, into permanent term contract for the Member for Winnipeg Centre, if he so desires, but those are the gross figures. While he is considering those figures, I will move along to some of the other topics that he mentioned.

He made some reference to student aid, and I would suggest to him that I'll be quite prepared to discuss that under the appropriate topic, which is Student Aid over in Section 4. of the

He also requested a copy of the letter that was sent out to school boards in January, outlining the grants that would be going out to school divisions and districts in the coming year — I have a copy of that letter for him.

The Member for Winnipeg Centre, Mr. Chairman, made some other remarks which certainly weren't questions. He stated, reorganization has been going on in the Department of Education for some time. I have to agree with him; certainly, that was quite obvious. I suppose there is planned reorganization and chaotic reorganization; I won't go into what type of reorganization he has been referring to. I can say that we have carried through with the reorganization of the Department at this time, however, in any large organization of some 1,500 people, 1,400 people, there may be times that there is a necessity for some reorganization of a minor sort, but I believe he is talking about major reorganization.

I believe the last comment of the Member for Winnipeg Centre had something to do with School Board autonomy. He referred to the fact that I have mentioned, that I felt this certainly was something that we as a government respected, and that I personally respected, and then he made reference to a Task Force recommendation that he felt did not respect that autonomy. I can only say, Mr. Chairman, that that particular recommendation does not follow any Legislation that existed in The Public Schools Act. As far as the Public Schools Finance Board reducing grants to School Boards, that Legislation does not exist in the Act nor will it be present in the new Legislation that will be placed before this House in the very near future.

I might also while I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, thank the Member for The Pas for giving me advance notice of information that he would like to have in connection with the Estimates. He's interested in Frontier School Division, understandably so. Under 3.(a) I will be dealing with that particular area. He is also interested in Adult Basic Education and we will be dealing with that under the appropriate section in Community Colleges. He has made some reference to programs jumping back and forth. I don't think that's quite the terminology he should be using. Programs have jumped across from one department to another but they haven't gone back and forth and certainly there are some programs that he has made reference to that have been transferred to the Department of Labour and Manpower. He desires information in regard to a number of the programs that come under the heading Special Projects, and I will make every effort, Mr. Chairman, to provide him with that information, so that we can discuss those particular topics under the heading Special Projects in the Estimates.

IUN of course falls under the Universities Grants Commission and we will be quite prepared to discuss it at that time, but I will give him the information ahead of time as to the funding and so on that applies to these different programs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could make just a few general comments in reply to the Minister's remarks this afternoon, and sort of follow up on what my colleague from Winnipeg Centre was saying.

The Minister invited us towards the end of his remarks this afternoon to offer any constructive criticism that we might have. I believe those were the words he used, and we will certainly attempt to accommodate him, Mr. Chairman, but in order to do so, it will be necessary for us to know just what the minister's position is and what his policy direction is, what new policies he has brought in, in the 18 months that he has had this particular portfolio. I recall last year in the Estimates, there were a number of topics brought up and the minister was questioned on a number of different subjects and in most cases, we got a fairly standard answer, Mr. Chairman, and that was, "Well, yes, that's very interesting and I will certainly look into that," or "It's under review," or "It's under discussion," or "We're monitoring it," and expressions of that nature. Well, Mr. Chairman, the minister won't be able to get away with those sorts of replies this year, I trust, since he has now been the minister for 18 months and we expect him to show some clear policy directions in which he wants education to go.

He did mention this afternoon in his remarks, that he was instituting a number of tests or random screening in the area of grammar and composition, and if this indicates a particular concern on the minister's part for the use and misuse of the English language, then I will concur with him wholeheartedly. It's a particular concern of mine as well and I would expect that the answers that the minister gives to our questions will be concise and plain and couched in proper grammatical English, somewhat different from the rather flowery language that he used this afternoon in his remarks. Hearing from the minister before, I would suspect that those were not his words that he read into the record this afternoon.

The minister ended his remarks in a rather firm commitment to what he called "quality education." Now, I've heard the expression mentioned before, Mr. Chairman, and it's never been really explained

to me what quality education is. So, first of all, I would like to ask the minister, what is quality education, do we not now have it or do we have it and it's being made of higher quality? Can he tell us what quality education is?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, to the Member for St. Vital, there is always that problem of communication that seems to exist between this side of the House and that, and I think it stems from the fact that sometimes we don't want to hear certain things or we don't hear those things that don't sit well with us. I felt that last year I had enunciated the policy, the directions that we were going rather clearly, particularly as they pertained to the different sections within my Estimates. I'll be quite prepared to do that again and on top of that, in 18 months I think I will have the pleasure of being able to point out some rather clear policy directions that we have taken. So, I can dispel any apprehension that he might have at this time, that we have nothing to say in that regard — we do have.

I'm sure that he's not being facetious when he says he would like to know what quality education is. I would suggest to him that perhaps there may have been other members on his side of the House who weren't sure of what it was either in the years past, because there was some confusion in that particular regard, and I would suggest to the Member for St. Vital, without going into a long philosophical discourse on the topic, that quality education is education that maintains a high standard; that challenges young people in our schools; that provides them with a solid skill base, an interesting, provocative amount of content in the subjects that they are studying; that causes them to think and develop thought processes.

All of those things, Mr. Chairman, provided by dedicated, well-trained professionals in our system. And I would suggest to the Member for St. Vital that the key to the word quality is standards, standards that say what is the desired goal, what would be the desired objectives at different learning levels in the system. Without some semblance of standards, I would suggest to the Member for St. Vital, quality suffers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, the Minister was speaking a little too quickly for me to get down all of the items that he mentioned there under quality education, but he started off with, "maintains high standards and challenges the student, developing the mechanism to think for themselves." And there might have been a couple of others in there. I'm wondering now if he is suggesting to us that those conditions did not exist in the schools before, that we did not have teachers who were maintaining high standards or that they were failing to challenge their students — whether the school boards were really failing in this area — is this what he is suggesting, that there was no such thing as quality education in the past and that this is what we must have for the future?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, one of the saving graces of any educational system, I suppose, is the devoted professionals that work in that system, regardless of what governments may be in power. They carry on with the learning process, the teaching process in the classrooms of this province. But what governments can do is interfere to a certain extent or cloud that process or distort that process by policies and curriculum, policies in assessment, different policies that prevent that professional from maintaining particular standards of achievement in the pupils in their classrooms. There has been considerable indication, Mr. Chairman, school boards, educators, parents, yes, even students, Mr. Chairman, in the province, in fact — I don't know if I told this story last year but at the time that the university students came down to visit us last year I was engaged in conversation with a group of, I think they were young democrats they told me, and one of the things that was of paramount concern to those young people was the fact that they felt that they hadn't been fully challenged in their high school careers and they mentioned to me at that time that that was one of their main concerns, and these were University students.

So I would say to the Member for St. Vital, Mr. Chairman, that certainly, the professionals in our schools have laboured long and hard over the years, over the past eight years, nine years, ten, back into history. There have been times that they have had their work distorted to some extent by educational messiahs, so-called innovators who have said, well, the basics aren't important, you don't have to know how to read, you don't have to know how to write, those things aren't really important. Testing, exams, aren't important, these things are really not vital to the system, and these types of directions and policies that have emanated from governments, Mr. Chairman, have had some effect in certain sections of the system, and have caused some concern, Mr.

The Member for Inkster takes some exception to that. I'll sit down and give him an opportunity if he wishes to address himself to that.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the only person who said that basics are not important and you don't have to know how to read, and you don't have to know how to write, is the Minister of Education. And he probably says that because he is lacking in both those facilities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please.

MR. GREEN: . . . and say that Lionel Orlikow said that people do not have to know how to read, people do not have to know to write, and waste parliamentary privilege, and subject himself to a suit for slander, which I will be happy to take on a contingency fee, because I will make a lot of money.

A MEMBER: No advertising . . .

MR. GREEN: It's all right, go ahead and say it outside the House outside in the hall. They just haven't got anything to say so they make up junk.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just cannot remain seated when the Minister makes those sort of comments in this House. To start with, he didn't answer the question for a second time, so maybe I should ask him again, is he saying that we have not had quality education in the past and that this is something that is starting from now or from October of 1977, he mentioned something about government blurring the standards. Now, that's a blurred statement if ever I heard one, Mr. Chairman, and if the Minister is anxious to make an argument to make it stick, then perhaps he should clarify just what he means by that.

I'd like to follow up on what my colleagues said from their seats, as to whoever said, from our party, or when we were in government, that it was not important to be able to read and to write well, or to do simple arithmetic. I've never heard anyone say that and I don't believe it to be true. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, just to digress for a moment, the Minister said that last year, yes, he did answer the questions and that he told us what his policies were, etc., etc. You might recall, Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure whether you were in that particular Chair at the time, that I asked the Minister under a different section of the Act, about adult illiteracy. I want to come back to this a little bit later when we get there.

The Minister was kind enough to send me a letter on February 16, 1979, coming out of his research department, a research paper, called Educational Attainment in Manitoba, an Overview. It did not address itself to the question that I raised a year ago, but it gives, at the beginning of this, a summary of findings that you might be interested in, Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues here. Maybe the Minister would like to reflect on it, too, when he talks about the blurring of standards and impediments being put in the way of teachers and other educators. On this summary of findings, it says, in part, since 1961, the level of educational attainment has been increasing in both Canada and Manitoba. It says, within Manitoba, all age groups have demonstrated increased levels of educational attainment since 1961. The older age groups contain disproportionately high numbers of the population having less than Grade 9 education. This implies that people now completing their education are more likely to achieve at least a Grade 9 level.

It goes into some detail in this paper, Mr. Chairman, but the conclusions that it comes to, and they're fairly clear, both in numbers and percentages, given for the years 1961 and 1971-76, which show increasing numbers of Manitobans coming out of school with that Grade 9 education. The whole important suggestion of the paper is that the educational levels of Manitobans are increasing and not, as the Minister is trying to suggest to us, have been in jeopardy over the past. So I ask him for a third time just what he means by quality education, whether we have it now, or have not had it. Can he be a little more specific please?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I would be very pleased to repeat, for the Member for St. Vital, what I said earlier, that if you are going to have quality education, then you must have some standards, that of attainment, so that those people involved in the system, whether they be the

students or the instructors, have some guideposts as to what type of attainment should be reached in the school system. And when I said to him earlier that I had had some feedback, some considerable feedback from different sectors of the community, including students, that they felt that they hadn't been exposed to standards that were high enough, that is what I'm talking about when I said that we had had some blurring, some watering down of the system that had caused concern to people across the province.

I certainly cannot quarrel with them that we have more people staying longer in school, and I applaud that, I think that's certainly something that we are striving for, and this has been happening all across this country, particularly in the last 15 years. The fact that the stay longer in school is not the only thing that we should applaud, Mr. Chairman. We would hope that while they are there that they are being challenged and that they are receiving an education that will enable them to go out in the world, well prepared with those skills that are necessary to enter post-secondary education, or certain vocations.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would be kind enough to inform the committee what are these standards that he is speaking of and who should, and who does set those standards?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, to the Member for St. Vital, in the past 8 years, they have been set by the individual teacher in the classroom, or at most by a particular school. There has been no provincial standards, and so or at most by a particular school. There has been no provincial standards, and so a student, in choosing a particular school to attend, may or may not have been attending a school that had standards that were, what we would call, high enough. They may have been attending one where the standards were a bit lower. They may in fact, have been attending one where the standards were a little higher than the norm, and I would suggest that the only way that these can be established is through some type of provincial testing program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I believe I am at last beginning to understand what quality education is. Quality education, according to the minister, is some provincial standard of education, something that is set by the province — that I take to be the final conclusion that he came to at the end of those remarks. Now he mentioned that there might be different standards set by different teachers, and I can understand that happening since each teacher has a class of individuals, and they would presumably be different from the children in the next class or in the next division. He mentioned also that schools might have different standards, and that too, I can understand happening. For there are divisions in this province that have different socio-economic mix from other divisions. There are certainly schools, whose main population is totally different from other schools in the same division. So I can understand there being different standards involved there.

Now, that apparently, and according to the minister, really is not what we're concerned with — with quality education. And he has told us at the end of his remarks there, that quality education means provincial testing. Now, I will sit down and ask him to confirm that, and if he means anything different or if I've misunderstood him, perhaps again he would clarify.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Vital seems to over-simplify. I'm not prepared to say that quality education of course, is just testing, but I said that one of the components of it is the maintenance of certain standards within the educational system, that all students can strive for. And I might say, Mr. Chairman, that I take great exception to people who feel that, for some reason, that if you are in a different socio-economic level than certain other people, you should be exposed to a different school system, and a different type of education, and that in fact, you shouldn't be expected to achieve at the same level as someone in a higher socio-economic level. I can only say, Mr. Chairman, that I am very pleased that people with that type of thinking weren't around when I was going to school, because I didn't know at the time I was a poor kid. No one bothered telling me, and I wrote the same tests as everyone else, and the teacher didn't treat me one bit differently than the so-called student, who came from a little higher socio-economic level. And, as a result, I had the same opportunities. I take great exception, Mr. Chairman, to those who would suggest that if you live in a poor part of a city or in an area that is economically not as fortunate as some other area, that you should be exposed to a different type of education. I say that is rank discrimination, Mr. Chairman, rank discrimination, and I take great exception to it. I find it hard to believe that the Member for St. Vital is suggesting that this is something that any educational system should be adhering to, that it should be teaching those, who are in a so-called different socio-economic level differently than those who happen to be more fortunate economically,

but not necessarily more fortunate, Mr. Chairman, as far as learning ability is concerned. You know, intellect is something that does not favour those who have money over those who do not. It is probably the learning process that is one of the great equalizers, and I hope that is a point that the Member for St. Vital has not ignored.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, the minister has just dragged his first red herring into the debate. He was attempting to put words into my mouth, and I never suggested anything like what he is suggesting. The whole point that I was making was that I would expect teachers to take account of the differing abilities of the students within their class. He knows as well as I do that a teacher has 20-25, 30-35 individuals in the class, with different abilities, different learning skills, different rates of absorption of knowledge. All that I was suggesting is that a good teacher will take account of those differences, and make allowances for them. That's the only point that I was making, Mr. Chairman. And the same thing for a school itself, that would make allowances for the students that it has.

I'd like to go on to a slightly different area with the minister, and ask him about his general policy of, for want of a better word, local autonomy, as far as School Boards. And I get the impression from statements that the minister has made and news releases that have come out that he is leaving more of the research or curriculum development or sphere of, what's the word I want, capacity, capability, in the hands of the local School Board. If this is what the minister's policy is, I'd like him just to enlarge on that a little more please, and make it clear, just what the policy is in that regard.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I'd be very pleased to enlarge on this particular policy. As far as School Boards are concerned, I think I have made it eminently clear that we do respect the autonomy of these elected officials, in the running of the School Divisions, where they've been elected. In the matter of curriculum school programs, in particular, those that we class as the core programs, I see the department taking the major thrust, the major responsibility in this regard, and it's a responsibility that I find School Boards quite prepared to leave to the department. The drafting of curriculum guides is something that requires a great deal of expertise, a great deal of time, and a great deal of money, Mr. Chairman, and I found no great inclination at all on the part of School Boards to want to take over that particular function. In fact, they see it as properly resting with the Department of Education, and it is certainly a responsibility that we see as resting primarily with the department.

We do not rule out the fact that local divisions may draft programs that are pertinent to their own particular situations, but certainly in the area of the core program, shall we call it required, mandatory programs in our school system, we see the department taking the chief responsibility.

MR. WALDING: I'd like to ask the Minister if it is part of his policy to cut back on the amount of money that is being spent on education as far as his department is concerned, cutting down the number of employees in that department so that more of the burden of education is falling on the local school division. Would this be a proper assessment of the Minister's policy?

MR. COSENS: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WALDING: If that is not the case, is the Minister suggesting that he is maintaining the status quo, or that his department is assuming a larger proportion of the costs of education, as opposed to the local divisions?

MR. COSENS: I have some problem, Mr. Chairman, understanding the Member for St. Vital when he talks about a larger proportion of the cost of education. Is he talking about the school grants under the foundation program that we will be discussing under (3)(a), is he talking about curriculum development, program development, would he clarify his particular concern here?

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I guess what I was getting at indirectly was the matter, or the relative importance, perhaps I'll put it that way, of the Department of Education setting certain standards, providing certain services of an educational policy research nature, to all the divisions and all of the students in the province, generally coming under the expression "quality of opportunity" I understand, which is a form of centralism, I suppose, as opposed to what the Minister has said is his policy of a more decentralized provision of educational services in that more of the weight and responsibility falls upon the school division itself. Now, whether he sees a dichotomy in those terms, centralism versus de-centralization, I wonder if he'd care to comment on that.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify, for the Member for St. Vital again, when I speak of autonomy for school boards, I am talking about those areas that are properly their jurisdiction and their responsibility, which I say we respect, and we have no intention of interfering in those areas of what we consider are their proper jurisdiction and responsibility. To me, that is autonomy, and the recognition of autonomy. It is not de-centralization as such, merely a recognition of what is an area of responsibility.

By the same token, I see the area of responsibility of the department to be one that takes a very strong and forceful form in the formation of curriculum and program formation for the school systems of this province. The actual running of the schools and so on, always has been, and always will be under the jurisdiction and responsibility of the boards. I do not see, Mr. Chairman, the sort of thing happening where the department will go into different schools and say, here is a program we want you to put in and here are X number of dollars, and sell the program. I say that is interfering with local autonomy.

And whether the Member for St. Vital wants to call that centralization or de-centralization, I would say it is neither, it is a recognition of the proper responsibilities of the school boards and the school divisions, as opposed to the responsibilities of the department. I can see the curriculum, the program formation function being more centralized in the department, because there we have those resources necessary for that curriculum formation. But as far as the operation of the schools, that is the proper jurisdiction of the school divisions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I give the Minister just one example. There were three school divisions in the Winnipeg area, I believe St. Vital was one of them — I don't have a note here of what the others were — who developed between them, or did a study into school bus safety measures. And they suggest, from this study, that it would be important that a transportation consultant be appointed to design and develop a curriculum for a provincial school bus driver-training program, to assist boards at the local level. Would this be the sort of program that the Minister would see as a proper area for the department to be involved in, or would this be the sort of thing that he thinks should be a matter of local autonomy and for each school division or group of divisions to do for themselves?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that this is the type of initiative that should be taken by the department, where there are enough personnel and resources to undertake that type of study. I'm not sure as to what date this particular study was undertaken, I do know that my colleague, the Minister of Highways, worked rather closely in putting out a bus driver manual last year that went out to all school divisions and bus transportation supervisors through the province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, before supper I had asked the Minister to perhaps enlighten us as far as his view of the Task Force Report was concerned, and he alluded to it briefly, but I would remind him that last year when we were discussing the introduction of his Estimates, he had said, in response to a question from the Member for Elmwood — the Member for Elmwood had a question regarding my feelings regarding the Task Force Report and some of its recommendations, I would inform him at this time that I have not had the opportunity to study at length or depth the recommendations, because I have not had the opportunity at this time. I do not intend to remark on those particular recommendations any more than to say that some, such as the study on financing of education, are timely and I'm sure would meet with the approval of all persons, regardless of where they sit.

Now, I had asked him specifically about a recommendation without editorial comment on what I thought of the recommendation, Mr. Chairman, on what he had thought of one of the recommendations of this Task Force Report. You know, if the Minister says that he is rejecting this recommendation, that is one thing, but as this task force report reference to and I quoted the section they referred to on page 77 of their report, Mr. Chairman. "The Finance Board should use Section P260—8(4) of the Public Schools Finance Board Act to withhold grants to a school division to require more efficient operations. Applications of these powers should also be made in cases where special levies at the local level cannot be justified". I continue quoting, Mr. Chairman, "The Finance Board should initiate a program of external management." So I was asking the minister if he was prepared at this time to go through the recommendations of the task force report which doubtless reflected the thinking of some of his colleagues in government of how the financing of

education should be carried on.

But, Mr. Chairman, I was very interested in the questions of my colleague, the Member for St. Vital, because we have heard other people say that talking to this government is like talking to the wind and when everybody says that they are for quality education it sounds nice. When we define the goals of education — I recall in the teaching of English it used to say in the program of studies, that the program of English studies was designed to inculcate democratic principles and develop broad literacy. That used to be the statement of the objective of teaching education, but I could never find out how they tested to see how effective we had reached that objective. When the Minister was commenting that he had gone through a system that didn't have some discrimination built into it, he says that you know not having people reach a standard is discrimination. I wonder if the Minister is familiar with some of the studies that have been done in how discrimination takes place by setting a standard. I should back up a little bit, Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe that we have in place in Manitoba a thoroughly developed professional teaching group and the more that we can leave professionally to the teachers in the classroom pedagogically the better off we would be. The more resources that we can deploy for these people, the better off we will be.

But there was an article in the Toronto Star in February of last year and I would like to quote from this particular article, "A public school system should prepare all its students for an equal chance in life according to their abilities". This is something along the lines that the Minister said earlier when he was introducing his estimates. "A public school system should prepare all its students for an equal chance in life according to their abilities. It is a sad commentary on metro schools," doubtless referring to Toronto schools but I don't think it's any different in the metropolitan area of the City of Winnipeg. "It is a sad commentary on metro schools and all the money that they cost have the result too often is that the rich get better and the poor are still the losers."

Now one of the objectives of a prior government, whether they meant it or not, or how well they meant it is debatable, but nevertheless they had an objective and the objective of the educational system was to put in place, processes, procedures, systems, people, money, to help people develop to their best potential and in the final analysis the best person to evaluate that potential is the teacher and the school with whom that youngster is involved. So it is fine to say that we are going to set a standard, and we are going to set provincial standards.

I am sorry I haven't got the article with me here tonight. I planned on bringing it in with the papers that I was bringing tomorrow but one of the teachers, well it was a new teacher in one of the schools in British Columbia gave the class an intelligence test and one of the students happened to take one home with him, and so the neighbours got talking about it and this intelligence test included such questions as how do you apply for welfare? The test had been designed for the poor black ghettos of metropolitan American cities, and in relating this, Mr. Chairman, what I am getting at is, if I define intelligence as how fast you can climb a tree then those people who can climb trees fast are intelligent. So that if we set standards or set objectives and we devise tools which really are useless in some areas, then perhaps we are discriminating in a worse manner than the Minister thinks by setting a provincial standard and testing people against that standard. So when they keep pressing the Minister, you know, what are the objectives of this government?

We had a suggestion from a task force established by the government when they first came into office, who was going to reorganize everything in the name of efficiency and here we have one of the recommendations of this task force. I don't know how they had intended to measure just exactly how they would evaluate it but nevertheless applications of these powers should also be made in cases where special levies at the local level cannot be justified. Justified by whom?

You know I don't want to take up the time of the committee by quoting into the record the task force, or as some people have named it task farce report but nevertheless I think it is incumbent upon the Minister to advise the people of the province of Manitoba where he stands now with reference to these recommendations.

Last year we accepted the fact that the task force was filed while he was in his estimates and he was busy, he didn't have the opportunity to read it, but surely to goodness, Mr. Chairman, a year has gone by and the Minister should be in a position to tell the people of the province of Manitoba just exactly where he stands vis-a-vis this task force report.

They refer in the report that financing was — you know the present system was initiated in 1967; we'll get into the details of the financing down further in the Minister's estimates.

The Minister also in replying to questions earlier has said that he was bringing forth the Act which will amend the Public Schools Act and it's getting later on in the session and that is quite a large Act; it's a very complex Act and I wonder is it the government's intention to introduce the Bill in the House and perhaps go through second reading but refer it to an intersessional committee so that the public can have an opportunity to comment on this before we enact a new Public Schools

Act.

When the Minister gave us the figures earlier on the 513 in 1978 in Education and 443 in 1979, were these actually people in position, or were they allocated positions? What was the vacancy rate relative to those two sets of figures, well actually four sets of figures, the two for 1978 and the two for 1979, relative to education and community colleges.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, to the Member for Winnipeg Centre, first of all on his reference to one of the Task Force recommendations which I believe had to do with school boards receiving sums of money from the Public Schools' Finance Board, I thought I'd answered that earlier, but I'll repeat that. That particular recommendation made some reference to legislation and the Member for Winnipeg Centre has pointed out that particular legislation. I would suggest to him that it is quite possible that that legislation was misinterpreted by those making the recommendations. Certainly that particular legislation did not empower the Public Schools' Finance Board or this Minister, or any other with the right to withhold moneys for the reasons given. And I can tell him, and I will repeat, that there is no intention in the revised legislation that will be placed before this House, to give the Public Schools' Finance Board or this Minister that particular power.

As far as the other Task Force recommendations, we have considered these, and some of them we have acted upon, in the reorganization of our department and some of the policies within our department. Others, we have not seen fit to act upon at this time, and quite possibly will not, at any time, act upon them. If the Member for Winnipeg Centre is asking that we go through the Task Force Report on education clause by clause and tell him those that we have adopted and those that we have not adopted, I can give him that particular information. It will take a day or so to gather it together.

I would make those remarks at this time, Mr. Chairman, on those particular Task Force recommendations. A number of them, as I have said before, we have adopted, and have become part of department policy and part of our reorganization of the department.

The Member for Winnipeg Centre has asked whether those figures that I had given him at the start of this particular session, were in regard to people who were actually on staff and not in regard to vacancies, I can tell him that these were people actually on staff. I mentioned 513 as of January 1978 in the education section of the department, as opposed to the community college section, and as of January 1979, 443 people actually on staff. And the same would apply in the community college division for the totals that I gave him there for 1978 and 1979.

The only figure that I have not included is the number of people who would be classed as contract employees at the community colleges. As the Member for Winnipeg Centre well realizes, there are a great number of people there, sometimes close to 100 who are hired for short-term teaching for courses that may last a few days, or a matter of a few short weeks. It's very difficult to nail that down, Mr. Chairman, to an absolute figure. So I have not included that in the community colleges, either in 1978 or 1979. It's a figure that does fluctuate during the year.

The figures I have given him, Mr. Chairman, I repeat, were actual people employed.

MR. BOYCE: With reference to 1978, last year during the Estimates, the Minister is quoted on Page 1337 of Hansard saying that he was asking for an authorization of 1,542.43 staff man years. So he's telling us that he had an occupancy rate in that authorization of 100 percent. There were no vacancies. At least this is my interpretation of the figures given by the Minister.

If he can't tell us the actual number of people in community colleges who were on contract at any particular time, could he tell us the number of staff man years for which authorization was granted on a yearly basis. How many staff man years did you have in addition to these 1,543, for example in 1978, and 1,467 in 1979?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, it will take me a minute to get that particular information. I think we'll find that the SMYs equate quite closely to those figures that I have given the Member for Winnipeg Centre, with the exception of course, that there are vacancies, as he realizes, that take up part of the total number when we begin talking about SMYs. I think it's always simpler and more understandable to deal with actual people than it is to get into that land of SMYs where we have those that are occupied and those that aren't occupied and have some difficulty coming to a common understanding. But if he requires the SMYs, Mr. Chairman, it will take a few minutes, but I can get him that information.

MR. BOYCE: Yes, before we move on on this, Mr. Chairman, the Minister as yet hasn't defined, I don't think, to the satisfaction of the Member for St. Vital or myself, just exactly what he means as, you know, standards in education. It's very nice, Mr. Chairman, for someone to come along and say, you know, back to the basics. But what does this really mean? What are the basics in

education? We're talking about the 3 R's, we're talking about basics which were designed in the milieu which is entirely removed from the realities of 1979 and 1980, and one of the things that is being expressed to me, Mr. Chairman, is that we're going to reimpose an inspectorial system on the schools which was comparable to that which existed in the 20s and 30s and 40s. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I should go back. Someone may take that as a derogatory remark, relative to the system in that time. And it is not intended to be such. Because during that period of time, Mr. Chairman, outside of the city of Winnipeg, there were very few qualified teachers, qualified in the sense that they had much beyond an elementary schooling themselves.

I don't know just exactly how many teachers are teaching on permit now, but perhaps the Minister could take as notice the question and share that information with the committee, on how many people are teaching on permit in the province of Manitoba in this year, and how many does he anticipate for next year? But the inspectorial system, Mr. Chairman, was relative to that kind of a lack of qualified teaching situation which existed during the 20s, 30s and 40s, even up until the 50s. And when the Minister said earlier that he came from a poor family, I did too, in relative terms, and I found out later in life that teachers weren't mean, they were hungry because they weren't paid very much in those days. In fact until about 1956 or so until they put a sputnik up and scared the devil out of the people in western society, teachers were ignored.

But back to my point, Mr. Chairman, the inspectors were the departmental support system for a rather shaky educational system. But I wonder just exactly what the government has in mind and so does everyone else in the province, what they mean by the basics, what do they mean by standards, who is to assess these standards, and we're not talking about the kind of skill-testing which doubtless most people would support, to see how well people can write or figure or calculate or anything else, but nevertheless there is an apprehension, Mr. Chairman, that the intention of the government is to centralize more and more authority in some way which will put pressure on the profession to perform in a particular way. And as I had said earlier, in most areas in the western world, they are putting more and more responsibility where it should be, on the teacher, to provide a professional service. And it is up to the teacher to understand just exactly what the potential of these youngsters or this particular youngster may have, and to help that individual develop.

So when the Minister comes out and says, you know, general statements, we're all for quality education, people in the province are asking the Minister to define, in the name of the government, just exactly what they mean by quality of education. When I said earlier that there was an aim and objective for the English program, to inculcate democratic principles and develop broad literacy, what does the government intend to have as the objective in providing the different courses of study and the different evaluative techniques that they are going to impose on the system, toward what goal? Is it a complete reversal of what has taken place in the last 20, 25 years in the educational field, where the whole system once again is going to be skewed towards gearing people toward a university education because the push in this regard, Mr. Chairman, is coming back to haunt us.

Many people in the educational field were pushing youngsters to perform academically with no other reason than stay in school, get a good education, go to university, and get a good job. That was the whole thrust of the educational system in our country from 1956-57, and is the Minister now telling us on behalf of the government that this is what they intend to do? They intend to go back 20 some years as if nothing had happened, that they're going to set standards which very, very few people can achieve. And I don't think that by — no one should misconstrue what I say, that those people who can strive for those standards shouldn't be challenged so they can meet them, because if we don't have a system which is a challenge to the individuals, then we do them a disservice, so it's a reverse discrimination. You know, what good it does me, as an individual, at some 55 years old in 1979, to know how to say amo, amas, amat, amamus, amatus amant, I don't know. But I learned one thing, that I could do something even if I hated it. That's one thing that I learned from studying Latin.

So to those people who have to be pushed, cajoled, to meet a standard, I think that this should occur, but nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I don't think we have to develop a system that only appeals to a very, very small segment of our population. Because if that is the case, then we do the people of the province of Manitoba a great disservice, a great disservice.

We had a demonstration in this Legislature earlier today, by people who for some reason or other had been disenfranchised, to a large degree, and when the Minister was speaking earlier in response to the Member for St. Vital, it came to mind that they used to strap people for speaking cree in school systems. So that how we're going to deal with the problems. . . I think it's incumbent upon the government, Mr. Chairman, for them to clearly enunciate, not just to say that we're going to go back to the basics, and that we're going to establish standards; what are these standards going to mean, in real terms? In real terms.

The City of Winnipeg schools, as I said when I was quoting from that article in The Star, the

study that was done there, I don't think it's that much different in metropolitan Winnipeg than it is in metropolitan Toronto relative to the problems that they have. And the attitude of the government has been in these areas, to pull back. Not just to freeze or not just to give them a 2.9 or a 3.2 or a 6 percent increase, but to actually reduce funding in some of the areas, and we'll get into the specifics of these reductions as we proceed. The government in other areas, Mr. Chairman, has indicated that they're not philosophically inclined to be involved in preventative programs as far as the Department of Health and Social Development is concerned. It took us some 60 hours to get the position of the government on the record. I hope it doesn't take us this long in Education, to have the Minister, on behalf of the government, enunciate clearly and succinctly what they mean by standards, what they mean by basics, and what they mean on how they're going to evaluate the attaining of these objectives.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Winnipeg Centre has ranged over quite a number of topics in his most recent remarks, and I will attempt to react to some of the statements that he has made. First of all, let me say that I think he has attempted to distort the picture somewhat. He says that this government will attempt to put pressure on the profession — I'm sure he is making reference to the teaching profession — to perform in a certain way.

Mr. Chairman, that is absolute nonsense. There is no intention of this sort at all. We see the department's function as being one of assisting, of helping, the people in the profession to do that very demanding job that they have in the classrooms of this province. And certainly when we talk about standards, then we look on provincial testing as a means of assisting those people in the classroom.

Mr. Chairman, I might say, and I will be pleased to go into this in more detail when we get to that particular section, that the reaction I have received from educators throughout the province, to provincial testing and in particular the test on writing that we will be bringing forth this May, has been, on the whole, positive. Highly positive. And where we have suggested only a sample, some ten percent of the students in classes throughout the provinces — teachers are being given the option, if they so wish, to give the test to all their students, and many teachers have embraced that opportunity and have welcomed it, in fact, and I've been rather heartened by that particular reception. So far from pressuring anyone, Mr. Chairman, what we are doing is attempting to assist and I would tell the Member for Winnipeg Centre that by and large, the assistance is being well received and welcomed by the majority of educators in this province.

They see the establishment of standards as guideposts that they may use in their work in the classroom, no infringement on their responsibilities or on their teaching, but something there to assist them, something that will enable them to say that my students are performing at a particular level, below, above, this particular student is achieving at a standard above the provincial norm, perhaps a bit below; it will give them some idea, as I said, a guidepost, as to what type of achievement they are really attaining in their classrooms. Because this is something, Mr. Chairman, that haunts the instructor in the classroom. They live with this from day to day, and they say, am I expecting too much of these young people, or am I not expecting enough? Am I challenging them fully, or am I letting them float along.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that many educators live with this particular doubt a great deal of the time. In other words, they walk a tight wire between too much or too little, and at the same time they have to regard each individual in their class, according to their abilities and according to what type of challenge that individual can meet and what particular achievement can be expected from that individual. So when I talk about standards, I'm talking about guideposts to assist the person in the classroom, not to threaten, whatsoever, not to pressure, but to assist them.

And of course, Mr. Chairman, we've heard a great deal about basics in the last few years, not just in this province, across North America, and quite simply, what people have been saying is that they have had the feeling, the students in schools in North America, were not receiving as much grounding in those basic skills, whether it be in reading, writing, arithmetic, science, any other subject, as they should be receiving, the basic skills, those skills on which we can build through the learning process. If there is no base there, there is nothing to build on. And we have been hearing from all segments of the public, and again, many educators, and from students, who feel that in that regard, the last number of years they have been short-changed to some extent. Not all of them, but some.

I think the reaction that we are seeing in our society to that is a move towards more attention to those basic skills in those core subjects that are essential if you are going to build on the learning process through the child's development.

Now, of course if the Member for Winnipeg Centre wishes to pursue that, we can. He has a question about teaching permits, and I would be pleased to provide that information for him when we get to the teacher certification records and GED section where that information is contained.

Certainly that's not a large function of the department any more as he might well understand.

Of course, I can't subscribe, and I'm sure he doesn't seriously think that anyone today would suggest that education should just be for university-going students, those whose orientation is towards university education. We have passed that particular point long ago. In fact, there was a time that those were the only students that attended our high schools, Mr. Chairman, were those who were thinking of going on to university, with the odd exception. Those who weren't going there, quit and went out into the world of work. We, of course, progressed a long way from that, Mr. Chairman, and our educational system today is looking at vocational education for students.

There are many students taking business education; we have education for those who find learning very, very difficult through no fault of their own we have programs that are aimed particular; those who might be classed as slow learners for all sorts of given reasons; and we of course have an education system that attempts to provide educational opportunities for those who are handicapped in many ways. So to say that anyone today who is thinking at all about education would suggest that we want to produce a system that will enable people to go on to university and that's that, is absolute ridiculousness, Mr. Chairman. Absolutely ridiculous.

We recognize that there are more opportunities in this world than university and I think our schools today reflect that and reflect it in a large way and it is probably the reason that today, Mr. Chairman, we have some four out of five students who begin in Grade one who complete high school. Now, they don't complete it necessarily in a program that will lead them on to further academic learning or university-type learning; they may complete it in a vocational area, they may complete it in business education area. They may complete it in an occupational entrance type course. A great variety of courses, Mr. Chairman, certainly, that gear our young people to go out into the world and to cope with it very, very effectively, and certainly not confined, as the member suggests, just to university-oriented students.

I was interested in the member's comment on the use of the Cree language. I can tell him that we now have, I believe it is six schools in northern Manitoba where they are teaching Cree, and Saulteaux and there is some move to consider expanding that within the department and within the schools of the province where there are a number of students who would be interested in that particular option.

MR. BOYCE: I just want to clarify one point that I think my colleague, the Member for Elmwood has some questions, but they aren't my words, I'm not misconstruing anything. And I was glad that the Minister had undertaken to go through this Task Force Report and tell me what his position is relative to each one of the recommendations, because this is the Sword for more Damocles which has been hanging over the system ever since the government tabled this report, and until it is dealt with then it is still hanging over the heads of people, and I don't doubt that his colleagues don't understand the Public Schools' Finance Board Act. But nevertheless, it is not for me to point this out, it is for the government.

The Minister and I doubtless could get into an argument on many things and we could pile up our authorities on the lefts and rights on any argument, nature, nurture and everything. But my particular opinion is not of consequence at the moment. It's the Minister's responsibility to articulate the government's position, and when the government hangs this Task Force Report over the public school system and doesn't remove that cloud, then it is no wonder that the people are apprehensive just exactly what the government means by back to the basics and all the rest of it.

Because Mr. Chairman, up until 1967 or so, even after the multi-district divisions, which I would credit the former government for having done, because that was a mammoth task and they organized all facets of the Manitoba scene in arriving at that, and in fact I even think there were some New Democrats involved in that. They didn't look at New Democrats or socialists as a bad thing then, and I'm not accusing this particular Minister of going on witch hunts, but nevertheless, the First Minister has set forth his view on this subject.

One other thing that I would just like to mention relative to my questions of the Task Force words, which is causing problems, the Finance Board should initiate a program of external management audit in school divisions. I mean, these are the things that are hanging over the public. And Mr. Chairman, the old adage of he that pays the piper calls the tune sort of thing, there's a lot of truth in it; that's why that cliché survives, because of the truth in it. And it's still hanging there. So that I really welcome the Minister's suggestion that he will, before his Estimates are completed, give us an analysis of where he intends to take some of the recommendations.

The main thrust of the government in all of the areas we can go through line-by-line, but the Minister, in his last remarks alluded to vocational education and we see that there is a decrease in that amount too, but we'll get to that when the item comes up for discussion. I'm going to yield the floor to my colleague for Elmwood because I had a couple of more questions that I wanted to ask the Minister on another subject before we leave this item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to direct some questions to the Minister concerning some presentations that he has had by the province's school trustees and the members of the Manitoba Teachers' Society in relation to their concern for government funding which they believe is inadequate; also in their concern about what is happening in regard to the funding of private and parochial schools and the fact that this may have an adverse effect on the quality of education in Manitoba in general and the quality of education in terms of the students in those private and parochial schools.

I would refer the Minister to a press release from the MAST organization in which the President, Ed Hart, is quoted as saying that a 6 percent increase in grants is not enough. And then he pointed out that there will be some \$12.9 million increase in grants in the coming fiscal year, of which \$1.5 million is increased aid to private schools.

So therefore, you're talking about an increase of \$11 million to the public school system and \$1.5 million to the private and parochial school system. This is causing some concern. Also he points out that your policy, your alleged policy and your election promise of moving towards 80 percent of support for the Public School Education System is going the other way. It's slipping. And this was a crucial factor in terms of the election, the support of many teachers in this province, of many trustees and taxpayers.

The Minister and his colleagues dangled this carrot in front of the electorate that 80 percent of school costs were going to be picked up by the province — well, in fact, we know what happened. In 1978 their support went down to 74 percent, and in 1979 it's down to 71 percent, so the arrow was supposed to go up, but instead it's going down. Well, the Minister says that the figures are wrong, so I would ask him if he could provide us with his set of figures?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I would be very pleased to supply figures to the Member for Elmwood. This whole topic of funding, school grants and other assistance to school divisions of the province, funding of private schools, the 6 percent increase, the percentage of support of the government toward the schools of the province, falls under 3.(a).

I would ask your direction, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to discuss 3.(a) at this point, or whether this falls under 1.(b)?

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen (Crescentwood): To the Minister and to the Member for Elmwood, I would prefer it if the members would stick to 1.(b), if possible. I know that the title is a very broad title, and so on.

The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I just wanted to mention that in passing, and would be happy to look at it in greater detail, but just let me say now for the record, that in the opinion of the Teachers Society, that they have argued that the government has "clearly abandoned" its 1977 election promise. This was also said by MAST in terms of the amount of funding that has been offered by the province.

There has also been a concern, I might point out by the Teachers Society, that some of the cuts in terms of staff have been greater than the proportional funding reductions, that although they have had a difficulty living within the amount of money provided by the province, that the numbers of teachers being laid off are greater than even those particular figures. And we know there is a pretty serious — if not a crisis — a serious situation in regard to opportunities for teachers in the province.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to deal with the general policy of the government in regard to private and parochial schools, and I wanted to read to the Minister a couple of briefs that were presented to our caucus, that were obviously presented to him before, and that came out of the annual conventions of these organizations. A concern first of all, for the shift in emphasis and the shift in financing away from the public school system to an enrichment of private and parochial schools, and the fact that there is very little control and very little authority being exercised over these schools. For example, I look at one headline that came out of the press in October of last year, a large article about alternate schools springing up all over, and I read to the Minister several points, and I would ask if he could make a general comment, or perhaps he could tell us more simply what he said to these organizations, either face-to-face or perhaps he may have responded through correspondence.

But for example, the trustees, who usually have the ear of the Minister, passed the following six resolutions in regard to private schools, and I would ask the Minister how he responds to

1. That the Minister of Education develop criteria for private schools.
2. That all private schools now in operation, or any additional private schools, meet said criteria and be approved by the Minister.
3. That teachers in private schools teaching the curriculum offered by the public schools have a valid teaching certificate.
4. That the program offered in private schools include a curriculum and a standard of education comparable to that described by the Department of Education for public schools.
5. That private school facilities be approved by the Public Health Authorities, and the Fire Commissioner.
6. That any funding of private schools be by stated formula and by agreement between the private school and the Minister of Education.

Those are the MAST points. The Teachers Society points included the following:

They recommended that The Education Administration Act be amended to include the following important section: "That the Minister must give approval prior to the establishment of a private school." I believe that the present system is that any school can spring up and then, after some evolution and existence, I suppose it's examined by the department, or actually by the school division. This seems to be the wrong approach, and what they want is an establishment of criteria so that prior to the establishment of a private school, this is approved by the Minister.

And these points were made, some of them very similar to what the trustees said:

1. That all teachers be certified.
2. That the establishment of schools be subject to the approval of the Minister.
3. That the curriculum and standard of education be comparable to that offered by the public schools.
4. That the physical characteristics of the schools reflect the health, comfort and safety of all children.
5. That all schools be subject to inspection.
6. That all schools be governed by the same attendance requirements.

They point out, Mr. Chairman, in their brief, that the current laws are ineffective in guaranteeing the quality of education in private schools. That is a very serious observation by the Teachers Society, of which my honourable friend and myself, as well as other members of the Assembly were once members. I'm not so sure now about my colleague, because I'm, I suppose, still to a certain extent reflecting the days when I taught. The Minister — I'm not sure whether he takes that position. He told us in debate in Question Period that he took a position as a teacher, but now that he is a Minister he has a totally different outlook. I don't know what that means, whether —(Interjection)— a broader outlook, he had a narrower outlook before, and so he certainly expanded his outlook, I hope not to the breaking point though.

But the main point made here by the Teachers Society is that the current laws are ineffective in guaranteeing the quality of education in private schools. And then they make a couple of points: That the Minister does not have the power to supervise private schools nor to affect the standards of teacher certification; and secondly, that The School Attendance Act provides a legal though hardly enforceable control over the quality of education in private schools.

So, the Minister might want to comment specifically or maybe he would care to give us a general answer as to how he responded to these requests from the MAST organization, and from MTS?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Member for Elmwood, he has made several statements that are incorrect. His figures in some cases are not right; his references in other cases to what other people have said cover areas that have been taken care of by this government, and have been covered by legislation that we brought in. But the question I have, Mr. Chairman, is that this whole area under discussion by the Member for Elmwood falls under 3.(a) in our Estimates. Are we going to range over the whole Estimate area in 1.(b), or will we confine these topics to their proper spot in the Estimate process? As I say, I'm quite prepared to discuss these in their proper place, and I certainly want to set the record straight, and to correct some of the statements that are not right at all that the Member for Elmwood has placed before us. I would ask you for your direction in that regard, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: I think that's a point of order that the Minister is bringing up.

Mr. Chairman, under (b) one deals with General Administration — they set the policies. What follows are the dollars assigned to different areas, but the decisions for that are the Minister and the Minister's office, and therefore it's inevitable that there has to be a wide ranging debate on

this particular item. No one wants to repeat arguments that are made tonight on some other night, but if members — and I haven't discussed it with them — but if members are seeking information in order to establish the administration's guidance through the pattern to be set and the rationale for the dollars that flow from there on in, then I think it's in order that that rationale has to be established now, because the administration decides that. It isn't just a line standing unto itself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: On the same point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Minister's last response to, or the presenting of his point of order, I suppose, whether we should discuss this under this item or under 3.(a), has pointed out the difficulty because in his remarks he said that the government was introducing amendments to take care of some of the concerns of the Member for Elmwood.

Now the piece of legislation which has the greatest impact on this whole department is The Public Schools Act, and we are advised that they are going to be tabling that, and I had asked the Minister earlier if he could give us an indication just exactly when we would have a copy of their proposed Act, because it will have a great influence. I support the position of my colleague, the Member for Seven Oaks, that it is necessary to understand the philosophy of education that the Minister is articulating on behalf of the government, and also to test their attitude, and put on the record their attitude relative to the questions raised by the Member for Elmwood.

Further, the Member for Seven Oaks has put it that we certainly don't intend to prolong the debates of this department by repeating debates as we go through the line-by-line Estimates, but nevertheless it is crucial at this time if we are going to discharge our responsibility to give a critique genuinely given, as the Minister pointed out to us, that we understand just exactly what the Minister intends as far as the whole department is concerned under this administrative item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Members of the Committee, this is a very broad title, as the Member for Seven Oaks pointed out, but there are specific questions that could be asked as we go through the Estimates in other areas. But the Member for Seven Oaks is correct when he says that this is an area for various members to expand and enunciate their philosophies, etc.

But the specific questions, as the Minister of Education has said, should be asked and answered at their allotted place. Does the Minister of Education wish to reply to the Member for Winnipeg Centre?

The Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'll attempt to accommodate the honourable gentlemen opposite. I think it's a mistake to begin ranging over the whole area of the Estimates in one particular area, because we certainly miss details that are more applicable as we move along. However, I will respond to many of the points that the Member for Elmwood has brought out. He first of all referred to the government funding this year to the schools of the province and made statements about the level of funding being less this year than last. When we get to 3.(a) and I am able to place those actual figures before him, I think he will find that the funding is approximately the same level as last year and not disastrously lower as he suggests. He suggests the figure of 71 percent. Mr. Chairman, he will find that when we get to 3.(a), that is not correct, and I will be very pleased to provide those figures to him at that point.

He is quite correct when he says that certainly there has been an increased funding for private schools in this province, and he knows why; he was here when the Legislation was passed last July that clarified the hypocrisy that existed in the shared service Legislation that his government had lived with for eight years and had overlooked the hypocrisy, so that some schools in certain school divisions were more favoured than others depending on what particular school division they were in.

He knew full well that over those eight years the amount that his government provided in funding to private schools increased and if he likes, I can provide that increase in funding that his government provided in those eight years. He also was well aware that in the clarification of the Legislation as it pertained to the shared service Legislation, that it was inherent in that clarification, that more schools would have the opportunity to come under the shared service Legislation and they would have the opportunity to receive funding on an equal basis with those that had been receiving it under his administration for a great number of years. We provided that equality in the Legislation. Certainly it was going to cost more money and we stated that at the time. Mind you, it was costing more money from year to year when his government was in power for that particular funding as well, and I will make sure when we get to 3.(a), Mr. Chairman, that I have that information with me to prove that point to him.

He makes some allusion to the remarks of the President of the Manitoba Association of School Trustees in regard of the 6 percent increase by this government in funding to the schools of this

province, and I don't know that he should be surprised that the Chairman of that organization would say it wasn't enough. I'm not sure if we have ever had a year in the history of this province when the President of the Trustees Association said that the government had provided enough money. I can't remember when that particular year would be, so I find that as not a great surprise, Mr. Chairman, at all, that that would be his reaction. I think it is what I would expect, and by the same token, I am not surprised when the Teachers' Society suggests that the government has not provided enough money.

I can well remember over the years, that as a member of that organization, I never felt that governments had provided enough money for education either, and I am not sure in what particular year I might have felt that they had provided enough. In fact, what is enough, Mr. Chairman? Now he makes allusion of course to the 80 percent support that was mentioned during the last election campaign. It was mentioned by the now Premier of this province that that was a goal and certainly it is still a goal and it is something that we would like to have achieved much sooner than it would appear possible. But when we made that statement, Mr. Chairman, we weren't aware that we were also facing a \$214 million deficit. It was supposed to be decidedly less. We've had to revise how soon we can approach our goals in relation to the reality of the fiscal situation. That is still a goal, and I enunciate it once again and it is one that I hope that we can move to as the economy of this province improves, and there is every indication that it is.

The member also of course has made some allusion to teacher layoffs throughout the province and he is quite correct, the size of the teaching staff over the Province of Manitoba will probably drop by some 200 teachers in this particular year. I don't think that is particularly surprising, Mr. Chairman, in relation to the pattern that we are seeing developing in student enrolment in the province. We're seeing a decline of anywhere from, well, 4,000 to 5,000 students a year across the province and in spite of that decline last year, there were very few teacher layoffs. I suppose this year is a catch-up year, we might say. But I can tell the member, Mr. Chairman, that we will see that happening perhaps every year from now on until 1984, because there is every indication that it will be 1984 when our school population once again levels off and so I would expect that that will become a characteristic of our staffing pattern.

I should also tell the member because I think he infers this as a black day when this is happening, that we now have the lowest pupil-teacher ratio in this province that we have ever had even with these particular layoffs that he refers to. In this year, it will be 16.9; the lowest, Mr. Chairman, that we have had in the Province of Manitoba for many many years. I don't know if it has ever been lower. Those are actual figures.

The Member for Elmwood of course, also alludes to certain statements by the Manitoba Association of Trustees in regard to private schools. I don't have that particular resolution in front of me. I would have to examine it more carefully but from what he has said, some of the points that were mentioned there, I think are more a position paper than a resolution, in that as far as the control, the authority, over private schools in this province by the Legislation that we passed last July, we now have the particular right to inspect those schools to see that a reasonable curriculum is being followed and to require that certified teachers are in the classroom. This is something that never existed before, I might add, under his government. It is something that came in with the Legislation last July.

As far as the inspection of the premises by the Health and Fire authorities, this is a requirement for any public buildings in Manitoba and I would be surprised that private schools would be ignored in this regard. I have no indication, Mr. Chairman, that this is happening, but the Member for Elmwood did mention this. So without having that particular resolution that he refers to in front of me, I would touch on those particular points, Mr. Chairman. When we get to 3.(a), I would be very pleased to go into greater detail on the figures as far as funding to the schools of this province are concerned, and we can once again return to those percents that the Member for Elmwood has referred to, but I would make those comments at this particular time.

I should mention also that the Member for Winnipeg Centre misunderstood me. He inferred that I said there is Legislation coming that bears on the remarks of the Member for Elmwood. My remark was that we have Legislation passed of last July that bears on the remarks of the Member for Elmwood.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is — I have to say, a very suave member of the front bench, debonair, perhaps. As I said to him before, I believe that in the old days when I talked with him, he wore a curling sweater; now he has a three-piece suit at all times and he gears in accordance with his style of sartorial splendour. But he says to us, Mr. Chairman, that when he was a teacher, he always took the position that there wasn't enough; not enough. But, you know,

I say to him that the charges made and the criticisms made by the Teachers Society and by the Trustees organization is much more serious than that. They not only said it wasn't enough; they said that you broke a promise. This was an election promise. I take that to be a serious commitment and I don't think that the impression given by the members of the Conservative Party, by the present Premier, was that some day when we're piling up surplus after surplus, we're going to increase the amount of funding to 80 percent. Surely, that wasn't the kind of impression that was created, because that isn't worth a hill of beans. Some day, as they used to say in the old days when D.L. Campbell was Premier: "If the crops are good, get a good crop, we're going to make some increases in budgeting and so on." Well, I think that there was an impression created that they were going to provide additional adequate funding for educational purposes, and I am worried, Mr. Chairman, about this Minister because I have a feeling that he is, first of all, holding the fort. When it comes to progress, he's not really going to move very much in any particular direction. I don't know what he's like in Cabinet; I know he's articulate and I know he's intelligent, but I'm very suspicious of whether or not he is going to fight hard for his department in relation to his colleagues, and as to whether or not he is going to get out-manuevered by some of the old smoothies in Highways and other departments, who will get more money for their departments and are getting more money for their departments, and are also reflecting the priorities. They can yell louder and they of course are better actors and performers; Thesbians, as my colleague from St. Vital. . . —(Interjections)— No, not Lesbians; Thesbians, there's quite a difference.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few general comments. I will attempt to avoid dollar discussions at this point, but I am quite concerned about the fact that the Minister is, in my judgment, not getting sufficient moneys for the public school system, and secondly, funding to a greater extent the component going towards private and parochial schools.

The teachers, for example, have said in their recent convention in March, that private schools are now getting government funds that should go to the public schools and that this is weakening the public school system. Now that is a very serious charge, Mr. Chairman, that private schools are getting funds that should be going to public schools and thereby they are being weakened, and I'll give you a concrete example of that in a moment. And also they are on record as being opposed to public funds being channelled to private schools. And when we look at some of the responses of the private and parochial school supporters, they appear to be almost jubilant according to Patrick McKinley in the Tribune in February. He said that they are going to get aid several times higher than it was last year, and Mr. Stangl, the President of the Private School Federation says that they've attracted increasing numbers of students in recent years. So, I'll ignore the dollar amounts for the moment, but those are the tendencies.

Then when it comes to enforcement, the minister says he is now going to have legislation in place to do something about monitoring and acting, in terms of the number of private schools. But yet, when there was a problem with this McQuay College, where we had Asian students coming to Winnipeg, Mr. Davies, the ADM, said that the — and I'm now quoting from September 30, 1978, the Free Press, Mr. Davies, the ADM, said that the department has no formal control over private schools, except to ensure that children of compulsory school age conform to attendance laws. Even that seems to be cast in doubt by the teachers and trustees, but his point was that there is no control, other than attendance as recent ago as six months.

And then, Mr. Chairman, you know, the minister is really a semantic debater. I don't know if he's talking much substance, but he talks a lot of semantics, which I think is appropriate to an English teacher and he talks about hypocrisy, and he says that all that his government did — all that they did, was that they brought in a clarification. They just clarified a situation that had evolved over the past decade. He calls it a clarification. Mr. Chairman, I call that a change, a fundamental change with wide-reaching consequences and I think it was put very well by Frances Russell, in a column that she wrote and very poorly by someone who wrote an editorial in the Free Press, who I don't think realized what had happened. The Free Press editorial writers in November, last year, said that this change in government regulations allows the provincial Minister of Education to approve the public financing of certain shared services in private schools and it doesn't change the general position of the province. It was just a minor adjustment, that's what the minister keeps telling us. And then the Free Press editorial winds up saying that the agreements recognize what has been going on, in fact, for nearly a decade but the assistance does not mean that Manitoba is reversing its traditional aversion to giving public money to maintain a separate school system.

Mr. Chairman, that is precisely what happened. This Free Press writer doesn't understand what happened. He completely missed the boat. The change has been made by this minister who was a supporter of the public school system, who is the defender of the public school system, and I would say is suspect in that regard, because I say that he brought about, he legislated and he spearheaded and fronted a move which made a fundamental change from shared services which

was a good concept to direct funding of private and parochial schools.

Mr. Chairman, you know, Winston Churchill once said that he didn't want to preside over the breakup of the British Empire, but I say that this minister is unhappily going to go down in history as the Minister of Education who formally introduced direct aid to private and parochial schools in the province of Manitoba. A concept that was rejected in the last century of Manitoba history and which has now been reintroduced by this particular minister. I just quote in passing, Mr. Chairman, what Frances Russell said in her column, she said that Manitoba now has public aid to private schools, whether it knows about it or agrees with it, and it got it after 90 years at a time of unprecedented government spending restraint, when funding for education and hospitals is being kept at below inflation levels. So, every time I hear the minister say this, I don't know whether he believes it. You know, the Member for Roblin, he says that if you say something long enough, you'll eventually believe it and . . .

A MEMBER: The big lie.

MR. DOERN: The big lie is precise, that was a concept from another source in another country, some 30 to 40 years ago and what is happening is that we are now going to have, we have and we are going to have more direct public funding of, first of all, private, elite, upper class schools, where no financial assistance is required but there now is public funding and we're going to have public funding of church schools, religious oriented schools.

Mr. Chairman, I think a number of interesting questions and positions can be made in that regard. Again, I see no need for people who are sending their children to private schools and colleges, whether they be in the province of Manitoba or in another province or in another country to receive state aid. I say, Mr. Chairman, that this is a violation of a fundamental position that has been in this country and in the United States, that there should not be a — that there should be, I'm putting it in the positive, a separation of church and state. And one of the interesting things I think that we'll look at later, is whether or not, by the minister funding church based schools, he is not in fact, funding or supporting the churches that back them up, because it has been said that in British Columbia, it has been alleged by members of the teaching profession, who reported to the convention of the Manitoba Teachers Society, that this, in effect, is what is happening, that the moneys are put in to these private and parochial schools and therefore, there are cutbacks by the church funding and therefore, it logically follows that the government is in effect, giving money to the various churches. I'd like to know the minister's position on that.

The other points, Mr. Chairman, are that by funding private and parochial schools, you are, in effect, supporting a splintering or fragmentation of people and this is not a desirable direction in which to move. So, if you have more money for private and parochial schools, is this going to mean what has been said by other spokesmen, in addition to myself — less money for the public school system. It will be very interesting to see, when we go through the Estimates, where that amount is and I think I would like to see, because I don't see it now, a separate line for that type of funding. It should not be confused by the taxpayers as part of the public school system or funding for the public school system. And if it's important for taxpayers to know how much goes to municipal taxes, how much to their school taxes, they should also know how much goes to the private and parochial schools.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say that what we had in the 1960s was a logical system, it was a reasonable system. It was that any student could partake of any portion of the public school curriculum, providing it was taken in the public school system. And there were some agreements worked out whereby students went and took courses in the public school system. That was the shared services concept, it was introduced by Duff Roblin. It was seen as a solution to the problems that had gone on in this province for many years and it was a particular solution for the Manitoba scene. Some changes were made, there was some deviation from that, but the minister says that he only had one way to go, to extend, to clarify. But he didn't clarify, Mr. Chairman, he made what I regard as a quantum leap and he reintroduced direct funding of private and parochial schools.

Now, we see other undesirable things happening and we're going to watch very closely, what the minister does in terms of — if he's not going to reverse himself, in terms of that direction, what controls he is going to put into place and that is going to be one thing. Thesecond thing will be, we'll see whether he will enforce those controls. Because, you know, I see things happening in the government where, when the government is pressured to crack the whip, the Attorney-General is asked whether he is going to crack the whip in terms of violations of the Ombudsman's Report. He says he's studying it, he's been studying it for two months, talking it over with his colleagues, but not reacting and not enforcing the law, which is his responsibility. Now, we have the Minister of Education, he's going to be in the hot seat and we'll see whether he has the courage to crack the whip on particular schools in the private and parochial system.

My final point here, Mr. Chairman, is this, that I have been aggravated as have many of my constituents by the fact that one of the schools in our area has been told that the cupboard is bare. Now, the minister said when he went to the cupboard in 1977, that it was bare, but there is money there, some \$1.6 or \$1.7 billion. The government has that type of revenue; it's up to them to allocate the priorities and they have seen fit to provide funding for private and parochial schools, while they've said no to many other demands made on them. And people in my area are very much annoyed at the fact that when they went to the Public Schools Finance Board for money to have some structural repairs made to a local school, George V, that they have been given an incredible run-around by the Public Schools Finance Board, which is of course, an arm of the government and by the Winnipeg School Board, which says it doesn't have enough money and so on.

I have talked to these people, I guess since last fall. I attended one of their public meetings which was held in Elmwood High School and, you know, the democratic process is I believe, the best process but it can be very painful at times and when people are ragged around and given the run-around over a reasonable request, when they fight it over a long period of time and all kinds of road blocks and red tape is thrown in their way, they can be discouraged. And some of these people — I really am impressed with their doggedness, but I also see them being quite dispirited at this particular time. So, when they go to the Winnipeg School Division, the division says, "We don't have the money, we have to go to the Public Schools Finance Board." When they go to the Public Schools Finance Board, they are given the run-around back and forth, but ultimately their position is, of course, that there just isn't enough money for this kind of thing. So, they in effect, are told that when it comes to \$100,000 or \$200,000, depending on which requirement is met, they're told there isn't money available, and then they pick up the paper and there are several millions of dollars being made available to private and parochial schools.

So, I simply say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that you know, I am prepared to listen to my honourable friend, I'm prepared to debate him, but when he says that all he did was bring in a clarification, I cannot accept that statement and I don't believe for a minute that he believes that. Because if he believes that then this is a case of self-delusion. He is allowing provincial moneys, public moneys to flow directly through private and parochial schools. That has never been done before, at least not in this century, and I don't see how he can for a moment defend that position as being a clarification and somehow or other intimating it's just some sort of more sophisticated version of shared services. It's a fundamental change. And I believe it is one that will become increasingly problematic for this Minister and for future Ministers of Education. But I say that it will be to his discredit regardless of what good he does in his term. It will be on the black side of his ledger that this is something that he introduced which was undesirable and something that I believe he will regret.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the position of the Member for Elmwood, of course, is not one that surprises me at all. He is one of a small group on the other side of the House who voted against this legislation last July. I might say a small group within his own Party who voted against that legislation. And I would remind him that when that legislation was before this House it received the support of his leader at that time, a former premier of this province, and a large number of his colleagues on that side of the House. He seems to forget this point.

And I'm quite sure, Mr. Chairman, that if we were to come back to this topic 30 years from now the the Member for Elmwood will still be standing in the same position and taking the same strong unswerving stand in this particular issue. I'm not going to enter into debate with him on it again and go through the same debate that we went through last spring. Because I don't think that anyone is going to change his mind. He has a firm belief here and he's going to stick to it. I would say that it is not one that is shared by a majority of people in this province by a long shot. It's not one that is shared by a majority of people within his own Party, by a majority of his colleagues, if we are to take the vote as any indication that we had on this particular issue last spring.

He uses this ridiculous argument of robbing Peter to pay Paul and says, "Well, you don't have money for this but you have money for that." And he knows that is an old old argument and it's a cheap argument, Mr. Chairman. I'm sure in the days when his government was paying out some, let's say, half a million dollars in shared-service agreements or very close to it, that if some one came to his government and asked for a certain project and they said, "No," that he then would have said, "Well, the reason we are saying no is because we're paying that half a million dollars to private schools through shared service agreements, many of them in some doubt as to their validity. Although that didn't bother him at the time apparently, he could live with that hypocrisy. Mind you he's critical of us for removing the hypocrisy of that legislation, very critical, I might

Well, Mr. Chairman, as I have mentioned I'm not going to go through the whole argument again with him because I'm not going to change his mind. I'm sure that he will be arguing the same old arguments on this particular theme years from now. But I would suggest to him also that if he wants to see this particular item, the only reason and one of the main reasons it's under 3: (a) is that's where his government always placed it. And I suppose in government and within our bureaucracy of government that we traditionally follow certain patterns. That's where it was placed when his government was in power, that's where it is now. So there's no problem, Mr. Chairman, with why it is there. It's not being hidden at all. We are merely following a practice that has been adhered to by this particular House for many many years.

I can assure the member that I have no problem with the enforcement of the regulations as they pertain to private schools in this province, the regulations that we brought in, not his government. In all his disturbance, Mr. Chairman, over this situation that he deplores so greatly, during the eight years that he sat in the government they did not do one thing about this situation. We have done something. We had the intestinal fortitude to do it and he is very very critical of it. And I say, Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat disappointed in the hypocrisy of his position.

I can assure him that our field representatives have been visiting private schools in this province that have applied for shared-service funding. They have been ascertaining the certification of the teachers in those schools. They have been looking closely at the curriculum that is being offered in those schools. That's something new. That's something that hasn't happened before, Mr. Chairman. And I'm glad to say that's one of the things that this government is doing.

He mentions also a situation that pertains to his own constituency. I expect him to be an advocate for the people who in some cases elected him and he refers to a certain renovation of a school in his area. And I can tell him at this time that the Public Schools Finance Board has, in fact, placed a proposal before the School Division in question for the renovation of that school. And I would suggest to him that it will go forth. Certainly it has taken some time. These things seem to take time in many cases. I don't know if anyone in particular is to blame. It is a matter of a proposal going from the Public Schools Finance Board to a School Division, who in turn find that their clients, the taxpayers of their area, are not satisfied with that particular move. And another proposal is looked at and other alternatives are considered. And by the time you go through this process it can take several months. However I assure the Honourable Member for Elmwood that the Public Schools Finance Board has made a funding proposal to Winnipeg School Division No. 1 in regard to George V School and I would hope that that renovation does go forth.

Beyond that point, Mr. Chairman, I don't think I will pursue the topic with the Member for Elmwood. If I though I could change his mind, if I though I could remove some of the misconceptions I think he has, I might attempt to. But I have the feeling that that would be rather futile.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: May I ask a question of the Minister? These new regulations or whatever they are in regard to control of the private and parochial school system to insure that they are providing a proper standard of education and meeting all the expectations that the Minister says that he has. I'm not going to use the word hypocrite, Mr. Chairman, because I believe it is unparliamentary, but the Minister uses it all too freely. And I would just ask him whether in terms of these controls that he sees being put into place to insure that these private and parochial school, some long established and some brand new springing up like dandelions, I would like to know whether this will be done by regulation or whether this will be introduced in a new Department of Education Act. I understand we are going to have a new Act. Where will we see these regulations?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure what member was making some allusion to flowery language earlier in our discussion, but certainly the Member for St. Vital possibly, certainly the mention by the Member for Elmwood of springing up like dandelions is a distortion of what's happening, definitely a distortion. We have not seen in the last eight years any huge increase in the number of students in the private schools of this province. I haven't seen any indication of that happening this year. So in spite of the gloom and doom that the Member for Elmwood speaks of, the terrible situation that he suggests will occur, there is no indication that we are going to have a huge shift in that direction at all.

So I can assure him that also on the point that he mentions regarding the regulations that he doesn't have to wait for a new Public Schools Act. He can take a look at the regulations and the legislation that was passed last July. In fact I will provide him with a copy of that tomorrow so that he knows that those particular regulations already exist. I'm sure he wasn't aware of that as of this evening. They do exist. They are being enforced. Our field representatives have been in those schools, are visiting those schools and I hope that particular information reassures the Member

for Elmwood.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I would like to get off the topic if I may and refer to the appropriation (b)(1) General Administration, and ask the Minister if he could give us the total staff man year complement for the department for this coming year. If he gave it, I must have missed it and I would like to ask him if he could give it to us again. Perhaps as an additional assistance to members of the opposition he could give us the breakdown for his department by appropriation in advance so that we wouldn't have to waste time at every appropriation asking for it again. But I note that the number for last year was 1,542 and I wonder if the Minister could give it to me for this year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I'd be glad to share that information with the Member for St. Vital. He was out of the room when the Minister provided that information and in the interest of progress I'll be glad to show him that while the Member for Seven Oaks has some questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I don't think the information that I provided to the Member for Winnipeg Centre gives the breakdown by appropriation. If the Member for St. Vital requires that, I will have a copy of that duplicated for him and provided tomorrow if that would be soon enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, my attention was momentarily distracted. Did the Minister repeat the number of staff man years for this coming year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, to the Member for St. Vital, I stated that the information that the Member for Winnipeg Centre had did not include the breakdown by appropriation but was an overall figure for the department. The information of the breakdown by appropriation is something that I will provide the Member for St. Vital tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister give me the total for the Department at this time?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the total for this year is 1,637.32 SMs approved.

MR. WALDING: I assume that the Minister does not include contract personnel within that number. Can he tell the Committee how many contract personnel he would expect to employ during the coming year?

MR. COSENS: It will take a few minutes to get that particular information, Mr. Chairman. If the members opposite would like to proceed through the Estimates, I'll provide that as soon as I have it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, the Minister gave us some figures earlier today of relative numbers of persons from January, 1978 to January of 1979 in the education part of his portfolio, and from April, 1978 to March of 1979. I notice in the Reconciliation Statement at the beginning of his Estimates that there was an amount of nearly \$9 million that was transferred to several other departments. Can the Minister tell me whether those amounts were transferred after the 1978 figure that he gave us, and if so, how many persons were involved in that transfer?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the SMYs that went with that particular money in the transfer to the Department of Labour and Manpower were not included in either the 1978 figures or 1979 figures.

MR. WALDING: Can the Minister give us a breakdown of this amount of \$1.1 million that's going for salaries, please?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Member for St. Vital would clarify his reference here to salaries. Is he talking about 1.(b)?

MR. WALDING: 1.(b)(1).

MR. COSENS: In 1.(b), Mr. Chairman, the salaries allocation encompasses some 64 SMYs.

MR. WALDING: Can the Minister indicate to us how many of these persons are in the Minister's office, and his deputy's office, and what other positions, what other places, the remainder are employed in?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, in the Minister's office, there are four SMYs; the Deputy Minister's office, four SMYs, one vacant in the executive under the Assistant Deputy Minister; Secretarial Assistants, two SMYs; under the Administration Section here we have 15 SMYs; under the Accounting function, nine SMYs; under the Public Schools, Finance area of this particular appropriation, 16 SMYs; under the Capital Facilities function, three SMYs; the Personnel Section, eight SMYs; and the Information Office, three SMYs, for a total, Mr. Chairman, of 64 SMYs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would run down the Reconciliation Statement with me, so we can better understand the statement itself. The first three items, of course, are clear. The transfer of functions to Labour and Manpower, \$8,700,000 odd, could the Minister advise us of the nature of that transfer. What was the scope of the work; was it an entire section, an entire branch; and exactly what did it consist of? And the same for Northern Affairs and Government Services.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I'll go through the Reconciliation Statement completely and try to cover all those particular areas that the Member for Seven Oaks refers to.

First of all, under the 1978-79 Supplementary Estimates, there's some \$3,100,000 — that was under the Youth Employment Plan, the private sector, as I'm sure he is aware. The general salary increase is self-explanatory. In transfers of functions to Labour and Manpower, some \$8,749,800 — this encompasses the complete Manpower function that existed formerly in our department, as well as the Youth Employment and the Summer Employment Programs as they referred to young people and students in the province.

The Northern Affairs reference here to some \$60,000 is an administration grant that has customarily gone to the Manitoba Metis Federation, and was provided, along with other grants from my department, the Department of Education, to different organizations in the province. But the \$60,000, Mr. Chairman, refers to the grant to the Manitoba Metis Federation for administration of programs.

The reference to the government services, the transfer of functions to that particular department of some \$43,000 — this was covering plant maintenance at Assiniboine Community College. The allocation of funds to the Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote, the \$372,500 represents the 15 percent holdback that resides Northern Affairs, and of course, that's included, along with the other figure of \$2,110,700 under the Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreement.

The carry-over of capital authority for acquisition and construction of physical assets, \$1,573,300, covers a variety of areas, Mr. Chairman. I can go into the detail of these — (Interjection) — no, the member doesn't require them. They're made up of about nine different areas where there was money that was carried out.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the last item, the carry-over of capital authority, the one-and-a-half million, by taking that amount, one-and-a-half million, and the \$4.6 million, which was actually voted last year, by combining these, you achieve that figure of 6.228 million which you now show in the

left-hand side as a 1979 amount under acquisitions and construction — that's Item 7. Do you have the Reconciliation Statement in front of you? What I'm saying is, you show \$6,228,300 in Item No. 7. Now that is shown as for the year ending March 31, 1979. Looking at last year's figure, we of course have 4.665, so I assume the reason why last year's print and this year's are not the same is because of this \$1.573 million, which was carry-over of capital authority. By combining those, that gives you the \$6.228 million. That's it — okay.

Now, is there any amount of money in the carry-over which has not yet been expended, and which will be expended in 1979-80?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, in looking very quickly at the list of areas here where there is carry-over, capital equipment purchases at, say, the community colleges, 45.3 — certainly this will probably be utilized.

MR. MILLER: Is that \$45 million? \$45,300,000, is that what you're saying?

MR. COSENS: No, no — \$45,000.00.

MR. MILLER: \$45,000 — there's quite a difference. Are you saying that \$45,300 is still in carry-over capital which was not expended last year, but that still is authority which you can use for this coming year, and that it's not being asked for in this year's Estimates, but rather, it's an amount over and above what you might be asking for in the final item of your Estimates?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that, in this case, this is equipment that has been ordered for the community colleges, it has not arrived, and at such as it arrives, it will then be paid for. The amounts that I show here, in this year's appropriation, are over and above this amount.

MR MILLER: Is there any other, in addition to this \$45,300, or is that it?

MR. COSENS: No, there are several others.

MR. MILLER: Could we have a list . . .

MR. COSENS: It amounts to \$1,573,000.00.

MR. MILLER: \$1 million . . .

MR. COSENS: It's shown in the last item on the Reconciliation Statement, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I guess we're not on the same wavelength. What you show of \$1,573,000, I accept, I mean that's there, it's printed. What I'm asking is this — beyond this amount, is there still capital authority, whether it be from the year 1977 or '76 or '75 — capital authority voted by the Legislature, and approved by the Legislature, which has not yet been touched; that's what I'm asking?

MR. COSENS: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MILLER: Then we can assume that any unspent money in any authority has now lapsed, and that any more moneys that will be required would appear in the normal course of events. Is that right?

MR. COSENS: That's right, okay.\$

MR. MILLER: Now, with regard to the transfer of functions to Manpower, you indicated that the complete Manpower function was transferred to Labour and Manpower, and that included the Youth Employment Program, so that the funding for that would appear in their Estimates, rather than yours. Did the staff go with that as well, or was it just dollars for programs, just the dollars involved?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the staff accompanied that as well, some 376 SMYs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)(1)—pass. The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, in following the questions of the Member for St. Vital and the Member for Seven Oaks, I think it might help the committee if, in this matter of reconciliation, that we be provided with actually the appropriation from which they were transferred, and the number of staff that were transferred, and the dates of such transfer.

Now I realize that this may pose a problem as far as, I wouldn't expect the minute and the time and the minute of the day that they were transferred, but nevertheless the Minister undertook to give a breakdown of the staff man years relative to the appropriations that we're going to vote this year, and it would be helpful to understand just exactly the deployment of the staff relative to these funds. Because when the Minister earlier pointed out that there was a substantial staff decrease, but if they were just transferred, then this isn't actually a decrease as far as the total government is concerned. So I wonder if the Minister could undertake to provide the committee, not necessarily tomorrow, but before we get through his salary, so that we could fully comprehend this reconciliation.

The specific appropriation is under the department as it was formerly structured, for the \$8.7 million in Northern Affairs for \$60,000, Government Services for \$43,000, and where the funds for the Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote of \$372,500 — if he could actually give us the appropriation from which they were transferred, and the appropriation to which they were transferred, and the staff man years involved in such transfer, and the period during which they were transferred.

Mr. Chairman, in dealing with the administration of the department and understanding the philosophy, the Minister I am sure can appreciate some of the apprehensions expressed by the members on this side and I don't intend to enter the grant debate to the various educational components in the province at this time. But when we are faced with the attitude of a government who is just diametrically opposed to all public facilities, we just wonder where they are taking us when it comes to education.

I just happen to have a copy of the latest Manitoba Teachers' Society paper — The Manitoba Teacher — and one of the things that sprung out of the paper was, first of all, that I am advised that Nan Florence has retired from the Winnipeg School Division, that's 37 years that she was with the Division in the Library Services, and other. But Nan points out, that the current restraints on education represent an unwillingness, not inability, to pay for education.

And while the Member for Elmwood, in another vein, was making the argument that perhaps the public system is being somewhat impinged upon by certain thrusts of governments, nevertheless, we have yet to hear from the government a statement in defense of the public school system per se. I think it is necessary at this time for the government to state in unequivocal terms, their position relative to a public school system in the Province of Manitoba. And I am prompted to make that remark, Mr. Chairman, on this particular item because there is a Proposition 13 syndrome that people seem to be using, that public expenditure is bad, and this is drawn forth in Nan's comments; a person who had been in the educational field for a long time and been quite helpful to a number of people and seen what the public school system had done for a goodly number of people in Winnipeg and in Manitoba.

But in this Proposition 13 syndrome, Mr. Chairman, I think it is necessary for the elected people to defend some of the public institutions against which I don't think there are any arguments, but nevertheless I think it's going by default that when we're including in our debates of how to deal with some of the economic problems, there are some institutions in our society which have been in the public sector which have served us well. And there is a distinct danger, for whatever reason, that people will not support the appropriate amount of effort being directed to the sustaining of these institutions, institutions, Mr. Chairman, I think that we can be proud of, that all over the world I have bumped into people who have had their education in and through the Manitoba school system and they stand head and shoulders with people from all over the world. So that if by default this system is impinged upon, I think we do the people a disservice.

In England, for example, Mr. Chairman, there is a direct threat to the public health system because the facilities in the public sector are being strangled and private institutions are once again coming up. In a documentary which was on television the other night, they said that such things as a rupture, that to get into a public hospital for elective surgery was taking up to two years. And I just mention this in this context to show what can happen to public institutions if people don't defend them and if they're not committed to defending them because as Nan points out in this, it isn't that we lack the capacity, the financial capacity to properly fund one of the best public school systems in the world and keep it at that level. It's an unwillingness by some politicians to remind taxpayers that it is in their own self-interest that we sustain this level and when we get down to the items on Educational Finance, I think it's incumbent upon the government and all members of this House to remind people that investment in education is not an expenditure in just throwing money at a problem.

When we talk about restraint, I don't think anybody argues or anybody would argue with the Minister on the readjustment which is necessary because of the baby bulge that has worked its way through the system. We have to come to grips with that problem. But nevertheless, it can't be at the expense of the system. So that when you're talking about restraint, I think it would make much more sense if we, the government, all of us, made the case that perhaps we should eat a half a pound less of imported tomatoes, not locally grown tomatoes, but imported tomatoes; one less bottle of booze a year; maybe myself, one less package of cigarettes. The cost of my cigarettes went up a nickel a day. I smoke a pack a day, and that's a nickel a day 365 days, what is that? Eighteen dollars a year? That's my cost of cigarettes. I don't see any campaign going out that people should smoke a package of cigarettes less or cut back on their cigarettes.

So that when we're talking about the administration of the system and I notice that there is three staff man years deployed in this item on Information. What kind of Information are we talking about? This is a Legislative Assembly, there's a government and an opposition, who in the interests of the people are supposed to propose and oppose, so that the interests of the public will be protected. So that when we're talking about the whole system and the administration of that system, I think it comes into that item, or under that item, the question of just exactly what is the policy of the government as far as support of the public education system, and as a matter of priorities, Mr. Chairman.

We know that they have a priority in Highways, how much they have increased their appropriation is for Highways. We know how, in another department, they have decreased their priorities relative to Health and Social Development programs, but nevertheless, I think the Minister owes it to the public of Manitoba to state to us once again in no uncertain terms that the public is entitled to a public education system which is second to none, and that the government is willing to be leaders in the community in this regard, that they will accept the responsibility of reminding taxpayers that the taxes that we collect from all of us and direct to this particular appropriation that we're discussing tonight is the fact that we have to be willing to do this. Because as one educator within the system, 37 years of experience reminds us, that the current restraint on education represents unwillingness, not inability to pay for education.

We know that there is a capacity to fund the needs of Manitoba students, but we are encountering an unwillingness to do so. And, Mr. Chairman, I think it's incumbent upon the government to remind Manitobans that it is in all of our collective self-interests to direct the appropriate funds as a matter of high priority into this particular field.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to first of all correct a figure that I gave to the Member for Seven Oaks. I said in the transfer that there was some 376 SMYs; you can add another 43 to that, for a total of 419, but I will give him a copy of this information as he requested tomorrow, so that he will have the particular appropriation.

The Member for Winnipeg Centre, of course, says that he would like to hear a statement concerning the Public School System from this government. Well once again, I think this is a case of the honourable members not listening to what is being said. We have said during the election campaign, we have said since we have been in office, that certainly education, the Public School System, is a priority with this government. We have said that one of our goals is to move to the 80 percent funding, and that we will move there when the financial resources are available. What more explicit statement of confidence and support for a system can you have than that, Mr. Chairman.

Well, beyond that, of course, the Member for Winnipeg Centre has made some highly positive comments about the educational system generally, and I must say, Mr. Chairman, that I appreciate those comments. I think there's always been a danger for us to perhaps become over-critical of our Public School System. Certainly there is always room for improvement. I would suggest that what is good can be made better, can be improved, and that's what we should be striving for, but certainly not in this whole process of criticism, trying to destroy a system. And I believe those are more or less the sentiments that the member was stating in the comments that he has just made.

He made some allusion to the Information Office, where there are three SMYs, and if he is interested in the different functions there, these people are kept quite busy replying to public enquiries regarding education, producing publications within the department that go out to the schools of the province, and to other agencies within the province as well. I can assure him that these people are not sitting idle. They have a job to do and are busy doing it.

I can also say that I don't believe, nor can I support, the thesis that there is a move to undercut or underbudget education, particularly not in this province, and if the member was to take the time

and take a close look at the percent of the total provincial budget that is being spent on education this year, last year, and the year before, he will find, I am sure, that that percentage is not lessening, but in fact, I would suggest to him, that it's being increased — which certainly is not a negative movement, but a positive movement, as far as education is concerned.

Certainly, at a time of restraint, education, along with all other functions in our society, has to take a close look at its operation, and its costs. And, of course, we have asked school boards in this province to do just that, and they have responded. We have asked hospitals to do just that, and they have responded. The amount of funding this year that has gone to the Public School System, the universities, and hospitals, is some 6 percent of an increase. That would indicate to me, Mr. Chairman, that the school system is not being slighted, but is being treated in the same manner as the universities, and the hospitals, of this particular province.

I can't emphasize enough that certainly this government will not see education become a lesser priority in this province. We intend to support it, to continue to support it, to increase our support, as resources become available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JORGENSON: Before the Member for Winnipeg Centre rises again, I think I should draw the House's attention — I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman — that we are on the administrative item, and there seems to be a tendency to want to drift over to the item dealing with the Public Schools, and that is Item No. 42 — Financial Support for Public Schools. And I can tell my honourable friends that if they persist on dealing with the Public School System on that administrative item, then when we get to the item dealing with public schools, we're not going to deal with it a second time, I can tell them that right now. Because we've done that, we've had repetition after repetition on the Health Estimates. We dealt all over the entire set of Estimates, on every item that we went, and there is no way that you can conduct an examination of the Estimates under those circumstances.

If my honourable friends can't wait until they get to the public school item, and if they persist in speaking on that item, on the general administrative item, then I can tell them that they're not going to speak on it on Item 42.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Well, I appreciate the House Leader telling us what we can and cannot say, and we'll cross that bridge when we come to it.

Mr. Chairman, as I indicated earlier, the discussions that I've heard so far have been pretty well limited to the central administration. The actual dollars involved to the schools have not been discussed. The points that the Member for Winnipeg Centre raised a moment ago would not fall under support, that item of dollar support for public schools. He talked about the broader concept of support for the educational system, and certainly that falls under general administration. That's the Deputy Minister's office, that's the ADM's, this is the whole central office. And had the member been present, I think he would have found that, in fact, the discussion has been general. It has not dealt with the grants, it has not discussed grants. I asked questions on the Reconciliation Statement; again, that statement is drawn up by the administration — by the central administration. And that's pretty well the way it's been going.

So, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments made, and I can only tell the Minister that it is the intention to go through these Estimates as thoroughly, but as rapidly as possible. And simply to get up and to threaten this committee — I don't think that will achieve the desired results.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I have absolutely no intention of standing in the House, and having that man over there tell me what I will say and what I will not say in this House. —(Interjection)—

MR. JORGENSON: Under the right item, you can say whatever you want.

MR. BOYCE: If the gentleman will read in Hansard what he has said, he's inclined to stand up and put his mouth in his foot or his foot in his mouth, as I am too, on occasion. This House will tell me, or yourself, Mr. Chairman, if I am in order or out of order. If the House Leader is waving another club, I thought we were making progress, and I thought this item was just about ready to move, in fact. Because if he had been in earlier, we had agreed that what we were discussing,

and questioning the Minister, and the Minister was being most co-operative in answering the questions; we were trying to understand what the philosophy of the government was relative to this department, and we were going to move line by line; we were trying to understand the reconciliation, of where they had transferred the staff and the moneys; but I'm sure the House Leader, when he gets a chance to read what he said, and to reflect on some of the defences of parliament and parliamentary procedure, and the rights of individuals, and the prerogatives of government. But if he wants to start a fight, then, Mr. Chairman, there are ways that oppositons can fight.

MR. JORGENSON: I was making the same observations when I was on that side of the House too, Bud, you know that. I objected to it, and that's when I was even on that side of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Winnipeg Centre on (b)(1).

MR. BOYCE: On (b)(1), Mr. Chairman — the member aggravated me by his arrogance, but I should be . . . he's just been infected by the First Minister, I suppose, on serving on that side, because I found him most reasonable when he was on this side. I forgot the question; it will come back to mind, and I can ask it on the Minister's Salary if necessary, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about the school, and if it's in order, I would guarantee I wouldn't make it repetitious, or repeat the same questions. I think the Minister is very well aware of the situation in Cranberry Portage where we have Frontier Collegiate School; the school that was built by the Conservative government, and the enrolment was high and, of course, they went to great expense, built dorms — girls' dorms, three cottages, enlarged the gym, and it's a well laid-out school.

The trouble with the school is . . . I worked there some years — in fact, my wife still works there. The teachers are very concerned, and the staff; what has happened, the enrolment has gone down drastically from 450 to a very very low number. And I think that you met with these people, I don't know if you discussed it or not, but the problem is, with these reserves and other settlements having their own high school, it cuts down our enrolment.

The Home Placement Program cuts out the residential angle, and they've expanded the education, which is good, and there's nothing wrong with that, to other areas, so the enrolment is small. Now the worry, or the tension, there, is what is going to happen to that school in the future? Will these teachers have any guarantee that it's going to continue. The students in Cranberry, of course, in the high school stage, are concerned — or the parents are concerned, more or less. I wonder if the Minister could give me some indication of future plans for that area?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman' I can understand the member's concern, and it's also my understanding, having visited the school in question, and the community in question, that this is something that has been developing over the last number of years. At one time there was quite an experiment conducted in that particular area, and people were brought in for the resident situation, and unfortunately, that experiment was not successful. The parents who had their children assigned, or sent to that particular school, were becoming a bit disillusioned with what they felt was not a satisfactory situation for their children living away from home in that particular residence, and as a result demanded that facilities be built in their own community, as the member points out.

And this has resulted, of course, in a tremendous drop in the enrolment — not this year any more than what has happened a number of years ago in this regard. I can give the member no assurance that this won't keep happening. After all, it's a trend that we're seeing across the province, as well, where we're seeing a decline in enrolments. I can't give him any encouragement that we're going to see more and more students arriving in that particular situation at all. I think it's a situation we're going to have to live with; we're going to become smaller, in many of these particular situations. That doesn't mean because the institution becomes smaller in enrolment that the quality of the services, the quality of the educational services that it provides will lessen. And the only assurance that I can give him at this time is that we anticipate no change in that particular area. We have no specific plans to make any dramatic change at Cranberry at this time at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)(1)—pass — the Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: I'd like to ask the Minister which appropriation the salary and expenses of the

official trustee of the Frontier School Division come under.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the salary of the official trustee of Frontier School Division comes under 16(1)(b)(i), the appropriation we are now discussing.

MR. WALDING: Do I hear the minister correctly, Mr. Chairman, to say that it is the appropriation that we are now on? 1.(b)(1)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is correct.

MR. WALDING: That being the case, Mr. Chairman, I would have to ask the minister why he told my colleague from The Pas that this was an inappropriate time to raise questions on the Frontier School Division and referred him to a department that makes grants to public schools.

MR. COSENS: The rationale for that, Mr. Chairman, of course, is that this is the only reference at all to Frontier School Division in this particular appropriation. The 5 million and so dollars that are provided by the government to Frontier School Division are found under 3.(a) Financial Support for Public Schools. It would seem to me that that is a major area where we're discussing Frontier School Division.

MR. WALDING: With regard to that same point, it would seem that if I wanted to discuss anything that the Information Branch was doing, that this would be the appropriate place to discuss it, since this is where their Salaries are, or if I wished to talk about anything the Personnel Department were doing, this would again be the appropriate place for it, since this is where their Salaries are. It would seem by the same token that it would be appropriate for my colleague from The Pas to discuss matters having to do with the Frontier School Division, since that's where the Salaries are.

However, —(Interjection)— well, I assume that if that is one Salary and it's an ADM's that's rather an important part and someone who would have a good deal of importance in this regard. However, my colleague will have the opportunity to discuss that at a further spot.

I wnted to bring up a couple of matters under the Public Schools Finance Board and I understand that there are some salaries paid in this appropriation for that particular board, and I'd like to ask the minister, what is the present situation with regard to methane gas at the Harold Hatcher School in Transcona?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not familiar with that particular reference made by the Member for St. Vital. If there is some problem in regard to the operation of a school in any particular division, this problem is usually identified by the school trustees of that division and attended to. If it is not something within their jurisdiction, or if it is a matter that requires additional funding beyond that customarily supplied to a division, then they would make some proposal or some presentation to the Public Schools Finance Board to remedy the situation. I'm not aware that this particular situation has come to the attention of the Public Schools Finance Board. It may well have. If so, it has not been brought to my attention.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I realize that the minister could not be expected to be familiar with every school in the province, but to give him just a little bit of the background that's involved, I understand that this particular school was built on an old landfill site in Transcona and subsequently, it developed problems with methane gas rising from the decomposing material underneath. There have been instances in other locations in the city where they've had similar problems. In fact, the minister might have read in the newspaper where the City Council had purchased back from the owners, certain sites that were being bothered by rising methane gas. I understand that certain remedial steps were taken to protect the children in this school by means of some form of a membrane, perhaps a concrete membrane being placed underneath the school — that holes were made in the wall of the basement and fans have been installed so as to remove the air from the basement and hopefully to remove the gas with it.

The question that arises from it is, what steps does the Public Schools Finance Board take in gathering geological or engineering studies of the site on which a school is to be built? Were there, in fact, such studies made in this particular instance and did they not show that there was a problem involved in it? Perhaps the minister could take that as notice to find out the procedures that are undertaken in such cases. The reason I bring that school up is that I'm informed that there is another school being built in Transcona, whose name escapes me for the moment and I can't find my notes with the name, but I understand it's in the planning or tendering stage at the moment, which is

to be a very large extension to an existing school. I believe it's a high school, which is on the edge of another old landfill site. I wonder if the minister could give the committee any reassurance that there is no danger involved at all, whether or not this extension is, in fact, being built on that landfill site, whether there have been any engineering studies done in the neighborhood to check for the presence of methane gas. Will he take these questions under notice and perhaps report to the committee when we next meet?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I certainly will take the questions as notice. I'm not aware of what particular year Harold Hatcher School was built; that would be useful information to have and certainly information that I can readily gather I'm sure. As far as schools being built today, in that particular area, I'm quite sure that the Building Committee of the Public Schools Finance Board will be aware of that problem on the basis of what has happened at the school mentioned by the Member for St. Vital. I am sure that the school board of that particular division will be well aware of the problem, so that I'm sure with that awareness existing in both those groups, the School Board and the Building Committee of the Public Schools Finance Board, that they are taking that into very serious consideration before they select a site for another school in that particular area. However, Mr. Chairman, I can assure the Member for St. Vital that I will inquire into what studies and what precautions have been taken not to repeat the situation that exists in Harold Hatcher.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)(1)—pass; (b)(2)—pass; (b)—pass — the Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Can the minister tell us what the Other Expenditures are involved here for \$359,000.00?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, it will take me a minute to get that particular information if any of the members opposite would wish to proceed while I'm gathering that.

The expenditures or operating expenditures are broken down in this way, Mr. Chairman: 27,600 opposite the Minister's Office; 15,000 Deputy Minister's; General Administration 121,500; Accounting 69,800; Public Schools Finance Board 4,000. I would just mention to the member that there is an appropriation under 3.(a) that applies to the Public Schools Finance Board as well, if he's questioning that small appropriation there. Under Capital Facilities 3,000; under Personnel and Payroll 25,300; under Information Office 47,500; Information Office under Advisory Committee on Education Finance 5,000; and the Salary of the official trustee of Frontier School Division appears under this particular section as 41,000.00. That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)—pass — the Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Can the minister tell us whether there are any amounts under this appropriation for computer related expenditures?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I would have to confirm this, but my first reaction would be that there are no computer expenses here, although within the Accounting, the Personnel and Payroll, there may be some included under that 25,300; I would have to check that particular section out.

MR. WALDING: One reason that I asked, Mr. Chairman, was that Public Accounts for the year 1977-78 lists under the same appropriation, an amount for computer related expenditures of some \$19,000.00. I wanted to know if there is a similar category this year or whether that has been taken out of this appropriation altogether.

I would like to ask the minister also, whether there is an amount under this appropriation for membership fees for the coming year? Again, I will just quote the Public Accounts for the same year, membership fees for that year were \$183.90.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not aware that there are any particular membership fees paid for anyone within my department to any particular organization.

MR. WALDING: Can the minister inform the . . .

MR. COSENS: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, perhaps there could be some educational organizations, professional organizations related to education, but I'm sure the member is referring to some other types of organizations, having listened to him in the last few days in this House.

MR. WALDING: No, Mr. Chairman, I was referring to precisely those sorts of organizations that the minister referred to, because I'm sure that his department is governed by that Manual of Administration that the government put out, and I would expect that any expenditures in this regard would be totally in conformity with those guidelines. I would just like to ask him — perhaps he could give me the figure for the 1978-79 year of what the expenditures were on fees and perhaps for which organizations.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, that will take some time because we do have a number of people within our organization who, because of their professional training and because of the function they perform, do belong to certain professional educational associations and as a result, it will take some time to gather that information. I'll provide it in due course to the Member for St. Vital.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pass — the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister could tell us then that \$69,000 item for accounting since salaries which are paid are paid under the item relative to salaries, are these moneys for contracting outside accountants and auditing?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I will gather that information for the Member for Winnipeg Centre. Under accounting I can give him the following breakdown: office equipment rentals \$1.9 thousand, this is the breakdown for the \$69,000; printing, stationery and photocopying \$7.7 thousand; telephone, postage \$4 thousand, and the item that the Member for St. Vital was referring to, computer charges \$54 thousand. This is under accounting. Automobile \$1.5 thousand, educational assistance \$.5 thousand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that's quite a jump in two years from 19,000 to 54,000 for computer related expenditures, can the Minister tell us what the nature of these expenditures are? Are they purely to do with payroll and similiar type of expenditures? Perhaps the Minister could also tell us which computer facility these services will be purchased from, whether it is Manitoba Data Services or some other computer?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: I understand, Mr. Chairman, that a large part of this increase is due just to increased charges for the services that are being provided.

MR. WALDING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I also asked the Minister who was the supplier of these services whether it was Manitoba Data Services or whether it is an in-house computer or mini-computer or a private company?

MR. COSENS: Central Computer Services, Mr. Chairman, which is Manitoba Data Services.

MR. WALDING: One further question before we leave this item, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister under which appropriation, or perhaps it is one of these would appear the Minister's entertainment budget for such things as providing lunch for professional associations and school trustees, etc.?

MR. COSENS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I understand it is under the item Promotional Dinners and there's an amount of \$6.5 thousand here. Now I don't believe those dinners are just for the Minister. I would suggest this covers organizations and so on, where we are hosting dinners for organizations such as the Trustees and so on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)—pass, the Member for Winnipeg Center.

MR. BOYCE: Just one question, while we were stumbling around for a couple of answers here, myself included, I was wondering if Mr. Bob Dalton is still with us?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the individual that the Member for Winnipeg Centre refers to is still employed by my department as a technical adviser to the Minister and a very valuable one, I might

add.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)—pass; (c)—pass; (d) External Administrative Support Unit, (d)(1)—pass, the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well on the question that was raised by the Member for St. Vital earlier, there was a problem with George V School in Elmwood also. I was just wondering relative to External Administrative Support Staff, is this not the item under which staff should be deployed to monitor the situations which arise from time to time so that the School Boards and the people in the community can be advised of some of the problems which, for understandable reasons, sometimes we get ourselves into, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Winnipeg Centre brings up one of the functions that are performed by the field representatives of the department. They visit schools where there are proposals for new buildings, renovations and where there may be problems of the nature mentioned by the Member for St. Vital earlier, and report to the Public Schools Finance Board Building Committee as to their observations and data that they have been able to find in that regard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, in looking at last year's print and this year's, I note that last year the print was \$375,800.00. This year it is \$412,000 as under salaries. This year it is printed as \$412,000, is that simply to use the general salary increase? In other words last year's print over this year's printed book show the 1979 figure. I'm talking about the left hand column.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, \$412.8 was last year's figure. This year's is \$520.1 thousand.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I am using last year's print and this year's print and I'm looking at this year's print on the left column to 1979 and it shows \$412,800.00. But last year in the prints it showed \$375,800.00. Now is the difference simply the distribution of the GSI, the general salary increase, or has there been an increase in staff or something of that nature during the course of the year?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, it's broken down in this fashion. Pardon me I don't have that particular breakdown. I thought I had it that would explain that particular figure. The information I have before me, Mr. Chairman, would indicate that under the GSI, an increase of 6.7 thousand and three additional SMYs, one at 11.3, one at 8.3 and one at 10.7, bringing up the figure to \$412.8 that we now have.

MR. MILLER: I thank the Minister for the information. So it's the GSI which is a small factor there, it's under \$7,000 and the rest is made of three additional SMY in other words an increase in the field staff for part of the year. And what we are looking at now is the full year cost for the coming year and that would account for the considerable increase print over print of an excess of \$100,000.00. Or is there intention to increase staff even further?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the increase can be accounted for in this way. Three new positions, two educational consultants or field reps as I choose to call them. One at \$28,400, one at \$25,000 and an administrative secretary at Thompson, I knew that would get a reaction from the Minister of Northern Affairs, at \$11,000 plus additional funding required for a co-ordinator position of \$21,200 and a general salary increase shortfall of approximately \$20,000 due to the large number of positions in a higher salary scale in this particular branch. So when you add those together they amount to some \$105,600.00.

MR. MILLER: Well, can the Minister advise whether with these new additions of three new SMYs and two field reps at \$25,000 and \$28,000 salaries and these others that this pretty well rounds out the size of the unit he anticipates or is this a growing area where there will be more added as the years go by?

MR. COSENS: The size of the unit I would suggest is still not adequate to the job that has to be done. The general reaction to this field unit has been positive from all quarters and particularly so in the rural areas, in the northern areas, but I have also had very favourable reaction from the urban areas as well to the services that are being provided. The people working in the schools of this province, the school trustees, the superintendents and others are very pleased to have this type of service provided to them. I would suggest that it may be necessary in the years ahead to supplement this unit. As I say, the job that is to be done seems to be greater than we can accomplish with this particular staff. We are attempting to cover it but are not covering all the requests that we are receiving from school divisions through the province, again, particularly those school divisions that are smaller, the rural northern divisions that do not have large staff of administrative personnel themselves.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I'm just looking at Page 20 in the Education Department Annual Report. Under this particular heading and I notice in one area, No. 2 - it says that this particular area is involved in investigations for the permanent certification of teachers in private and independent schools. Can the Minister tell me what the nature and the scope of those investigations were?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I think this goes back to the discussion that we had earlier with the Member for Elmwood, and I was informing him at that time that subsequent to the legislation passed last year by this government, the bringing forth of regulations governing the curriculum and the certification of teachers in private schools, and of course the regulations that now enable the Department of Education to send field representatives into the private schools, that for the first time we have been able to send Department of Education personnel in to visit and to ascertain the certification of the teachers in those schools. This has not happened before.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps the Minister then can tell us how many teachers were involved in this investigation for permanent certification in the last fiscal year, or calendar year if that's any easier?

While the Minister is looking that up, I wonder if he could be a little more specific on what sort of investigation was carried on. Was it a matter of interviewing the particular teachers, or checking with their schools, looking at their credentials — just what is involved in the investigation of teachers?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, of course, along with this particular function of ascertaining the certification of the staff in these particular schools, and discussing this matter with them, the field representatives also were discussing the curriculum being offered in these schools at this time as well.

Going back to the question of the Member for St. Vital, there are some 498 teachers in private schools as follows: 383 hold Manitoba Teacher Certificates, 115 are uncertified, for a total of 498. Now these are figures as of February 15, 1979.

For those private schools where there are agreements with the local school division for shared-services funding, these schools had 359 certified teachers. Some 53 teachers did not have certificates, and certain actions have been taken by these individuals to procure teaching certificates at this time. It may be necessary in some cases to issue permits to some individuals on an interim basis.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I realize that the next item in the Estimates has to do with Teacher Certification, and I don't want to be out of order or drift onto something else.

Can the Minister then just confirm to me briefly that personnel in this particular support unit are only investigative personnel, that they don't actually grant the certification as such?

Can the Minister tell me whether this figure of 498 is the total number of teachers in private and parochial schools in the province, and have all of them been contacted by members of this unit?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the legislation was passed last July. We have some 16 members in the field unit, and they have many other duties besides this particular duty. The last figures I have are as of April 12, 1979, which is reasonably current. This type of investigation, although that is rather a strong word I would suggest, but it's the word that's used here, is ongoing, and I would suggest is not completed as yet. There are probably other schools that they will have to visit before the term is up, so I would suggest to the Member for St. Vital that this is not a complete figure of all the teachers in private schools in Manitoba. They will, of course, as a priority visit those schools that have shared-service agreements with their local school divisions first, because this certification is a requirement for the funding process to take place.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. No. 3 on this same page mentions that work continued on the draft revision of the Acts relating to the public school system and I would like to ask the Minister whether any of the personnel in this unit were involved in the drafting of the so-called professional bill for Manitoba teachers?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the answer to that is very simply no, but I don't think that is really what the Member for St. Vital is asking. The reference here is to the revision of The Public Schools Act. The bill has had first reading in this House, and I would hope to have in for second reading very shortly.

MR. WALDING: I accept the Minister's assurance that this sentence referred only to one Act. I would remind him, however, that it is written in the plural, and the word is "Acts", relating to the public school system, which would seem to be much wider than . . . just the one Act that he referred to.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, there are two Acts, as I think the member is aware. There is The Education Administration Act as well as The Public Schools Act, so in fact the plural is applicable here.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I accept the Minister's answer, which was the thing I was most interested in.

Item 5 on the same page mentions the implementation of the Teacher Induction Project. Can I ask the Minister what the Teacher Induction Project was?

MR. COSENS: The two projects referred to here are projects that are under way in regard to the . . . I suppose we could best describe it as the induction of new teachers in the field. These were projects that were ongoing with first year teachers in certain divisions in the province, both the TERM and TIP project are referred to here, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WALDING: I didn't want to confuse myself, Mr. Chairman, by referring to both of them at the same time, and that's why I referred just to one of them at the beginning.

This speaks of the implementation of the Teacher Induction Project. Can the Minister tell me in how many school divisions this project is in operation?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I'm informed that the first project was a pilot, the project carried on in about 6 school divisions in rural and northern Manitoba. The project has now been completed, but it was a pilot project to test out procedures that would be of assistance to new teachers going into the school system for the first time.

MR. WALDING: I see, Mr. Chairman. I understood from the Minister's first remarks that it was a province-wide program that was in fact in place. Can the Minister tell me what assessment was done on that pilot project, whether it was considered to be a success, or whether further work is indicated as necessary?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I don't have that particular assessment with me. I can attempt to get that for the Member for St. Vital. As far as the induction of new teachers is concerned, in regard to their first year in the school system, we have had discussions with the Teacher Training Institutions, and they are attempting to devise new ways of making this transition from the theoretical to the practical aspect of teaching a little easier. This has always been a problem for people going into the teaching profession to make that transition to the classroom where they are the teacher, from the classroom where they were the student in the Faculty of Education. There have been different strategies used over the years to try to smooth that transition. The two that are mentioned here

were just two of those strategies that have been attempted — in some cases some have been more successful than others — some have been more expensive than others, and of course we also have the consideration that this transition is something that, in many cases, we have felt should be the responsibility of local people in educational administration offices of the local school division, whether they be the superintendent, the school principal, senior teachers on staff — in other words, the professionals that the new teacher is working with.

MR. WALDING: Yes, I would like to ask the Minister if he would inform the Committee whether he thinks that such a Teacher Induction Project or program, if it was provincially wide, would be beneficial for education in the province?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, without having the assessment in front of me, in regards to the particular TIP project, if I remember correctly, the assessment was not positive in that particular project, but I don't have the details with me as to why it was not positive, nor do I have the details of the dollars that were involved or the number of people. I know it was restricted to a very small area, and to a small number of teachers. No doubt some benefits accrued, they always do, but I suppose if we're looking at it on the number of dollars involved, there was some question. Once again, I don't have the assessment with me, I can't give it to the member at this time; I'll endeavour to get it.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister whether any similar pilot project has been carried out in the province by any school division?

MR. COSENS: Well, the second project mentioned by the Member for St. Vital, the TERM project, is carrying on, and is doing much the same type of thing as we've been referring to, again dealing with the induction of new teachers into the classroom.

MR. WALDING: Still to attempt to avoid confusing me, Mr. Chairman, I would now like to ask the Minister about the second-named program, Teacher Education in Rural Manitoba project — maybe he has answered me already as to what this is, but I would like to ask him again, what is this program and how is it different from the Teacher Induction Project?

MR. COSENS: Actually, Mr. Chairman, I may have misled the Member for St. Vital with my last answer. The TERM project is actually more of a teacher training project than a teacher induction, although that hopefully would be the spinoff from the program. It was an attempt to get young people, probably more than likely from the urban area who were in teacher training out into the rural areas of the province; have them do a certain amount of their practical training out in the classrooms in rural schools; hopefully, as a result of this, we would be able to convince them or they would decide that they would like to teach in those particular areas. We have had some problem, as the Member for St. Vital is no doubt aware, over the last number of years, in getting many of our teacher graduates to go beyond the Perimeter Highway

If they couldn't find a teaching job in the urban area, they did not feel that they wanted to go out into the rural or the northern area of the province, and as a result we've had to often bring in 200 or more teachers from outside the province to teach in northern schools and in rural schools. At the same time we would find ourselves with some 200 or so Manitoba graduates, who were not employed, but who, through choice, had decided not to go beyond the Perimeter Highway.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, I don't think I fully understand the details of what the Minister is telling me. Is he saying that there was some inducement or incentive given to newly graduating teachers to move to a position outside of the city? If so, is this on a year's contract basis or is it a matter of a teaching day here and there outside of the city?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, what we are talking about is part of the teacher training program for these particular student teachers, taking place in rural schools under this program, where the student teachers went out to the rural schools and spent a certain portion of time practise teaching, if you wish to call it that, in these rural classrooms. So that they would get some appreciation of the rural school system, the rural communities, and as I say, hopefully would then decide, once they had graduated, to teach in those particular types of situations. Which I might say, Mr. Chairman, today are very modern and well-equipped and are the equal of the schools we have in our urban areas.

MR. WALDING: Still for clarification, Mr. Chairman. Can the Minister tell me whether these projects

came into effect after the teacher had graduated from his university course or were they during that course and a part of it?

MR. COSENS: The TIP project, as I mentioned earlier, was a teacher induction type of project for those who had graduated, their first year in the classroom to help them in that transition. We had discussed that earlier, of course, Mr. Chairman. The TERM project applies to student teachers, those who have not graduated but who spend their practise teaching time in rural schools over an extended period of time, so that they become accustomed to that particular type of situation.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, since this says that it is a project, can the Minister confirm that it was done on a pilot basis, and whether it is an on-going program and does he have an assessment of this program similar to the TIP program previously mentioned?

MR. COSENS: The Member for St. Vital is quite correct, it is a pilot project and we have an assessment being made of the TERM project at this time. It will be completed, I would expect, in the next month or two.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I didn't want to interrupt my colleague from St. Vital, but I want to assure the House Leader — I won't repeat the arguments of TIP and TERM under the next item, under which the appropriation falls, under teachers' certification, because as I understand it, the funds for that are under certification, not under the unit that we're talking about at the moment, but nevertheless, if we could — on the item before us the external administrative support staff type of thing. The Minister had mentioned earlier about deploying field staff to help school divisions and my question comes out of the apparent conflict of engineering reports relative to George V School, but in conversations of deploying field staff to help people as far as bus safety is concerned, I remember during the discussion in the House, there was some concern about deploying people in the province to help divisions in their training of safety procedures relative to bus — does the Minister envisage deploying that kind of assistance in the field staff under this external administrative support staff unit?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, that is not one of the particular functions that was envisaged for the field representatives; most school divisions, in fact practically all now have school bus co-ordinators in their division, and these people provide a great deal of the particular function that I think the Member for Winnipeg Centre is referring to as far as bus safety is concerned. It is an area of course that we are looking very closely at, even though we have the best record in Canada. Mr. Chairman, I'm not prepared to sit on the laurels of the best record and not take further precautions or instigate further programs that can enhance even the best record in Canada, because the only record that we should be satisfied with is a perfect record. No accidents, I suppose. But I can assure the Member for Winnipeg Centre that that is not a function of the field representatives. That has not been envisaged as such.

MR. BOYCE: I realize that hasn't been a function, Mr. Chairman. I just asked the Minister whether it should be, because the question was raised by some of the school trustees, that in this time of restraint, perhaps the deployment of someone who could serve two or three divisions might help them, but I guess my concern in this area is prompted by this problem of, albeit the best architectural advice that we had and the engineering advice, I guess we're still paying for the stabilization of Red River Community College, and when it comes down to, you know, the resolution of differences of professional opinions in the engineering field and traffic safety and the rest of it, I don't want to dump any more of a load on the Minister's shoulders than he has at the moment; nevertheless, some of these questions, you know, judgments have to be made and by deploying the staff who can help in a conciliatory manner with the professional expertise, perhaps this is something that could be considered by the Minister under this particular item.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, just going back to the previous question of the Member for Winnipeg Centre, I am informed that we have added an additional member to our transportation complement, our staff under transportation, and that one of the functions of that person, that's back under 1.(b) that we have just passed, one of the functions and the main function of that person will be to work in the area of bus safety.

Tuesday, April 17, 1979

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d) (1) —pass. (d) (2) —pass; (d)—pass. (e) — pass; (e) (1) — the Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: I was going to suggest, Mr. Chairman, now that we've got to another appropriation that might be a rather long one, it might be an appropriate time for the committee to rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.