



**First Session — Thirty-Fourth Legislature**  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

**DEBATES**  
and  
**PROCEEDINGS**  
**(HANSARD)**

37 Elizabeth II

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable Denis C. Rocan  
Speaker*



**VOL. XXXVII No. 63B - 8 p.m., MONDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1988.**



**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Fourth Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
<b>ALCOCK, Reg</b>	Osborne	LIBERAL
<b>ANGUS, John</b>	St. Norbert	LIBERAL
<b>ASHTON, Steve</b>	Thompson	NDP
<b>BURRELL, Parker</b>	Swan River	PC
<b>CARR, James</b>	Fort Rouge	LIBERAL
<b>CARSTAIRS, Sharon</b>	River Heights	LIBERAL
<b>CHARLES, Gwen</b>	Selkirk	LIBERAL
<b>CHEEMA, Gulzar</b>	Kildonan	LIBERAL
<b>CHORNOPYSKI, William</b>	Burrows	LIBERAL
<b>CONNERY, Edward Hon.</b>	Portage la Prairie	PC
<b>COWAN, Jay</b>	Churchill	NDP
<b>CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.</b>	Ste. Rose du Lac	PC
<b>DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.</b>	Roblin-Russell	PC
<b>DOER, Gary</b>	Concordia	NDP
<b>DOWNEY, James Hon.</b>	Arthur	PC
<b>DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.</b>	Emerson	PC
<b>DRIEDGER, Herold, L.</b>	Niakwa	LIBERAL
<b>DUCHARME, Gerald, Hon.</b>	Riel	PC
<b>EDWARDS, Paul</b>	St. James	LIBERAL
<b>ENNS, Harry</b>	Lakeside	PC
<b>ERNST, Jim, Hon.</b>	Charleswood	PC
<b>EVANS, Laurie</b>	Fort Garry	LIBERAL
<b>EVANS, Leonard</b>	Brandon East	NDP
<b>FILMON, Gary, Hon.</b>	Tuxedo	PC
<b>FINDLAY, Glen Hon.</b>	Virten	PC
<b>GAUDRY, Neil</b>	St. Boniface	LIBERAL
<b>GILLESHAMMER, Harold</b>	Minnedosa	PC
<b>GRAY, Avis</b>	Ellice	LIBERAL
<b>HAMMOND, Gerrie</b>	Kirkfield Park	PC
<b>HARAPIAK, Harry</b>	The Pas	NDP
<b>HARPER, Elijah</b>	Rupertstand	NDP
<b>HELWER, Edward R.</b>	Gimli	PC
<b>HEMPHILL, Maureen</b>	Logan	NDP
<b>KOZAK, Richard, J.</b>	Transcona	LIBERAL
<b>LAMOUREUX, Kevin, M.</b>	Inkster	LIBERAL
<b>MALOWAY, Jim</b>	Elmwood	NDP
<b>MANDRAKE, Ed</b>	Assiniboia	LIBERAL
<b>MANNES, Clayton, Hon.</b>	Morris	PC
<b>MCCRAE, James Hon.</b>	Brandon West	PC
<b>MINENKO, Mark</b>	Seven Oaks	LIBERAL
<b>MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.</b>	River East	PC
<b>NEUFELD, Harold, Hon.</b>	Rossmere	PC
<b>OLESON, Charlotte Hon.</b>	Gladstone	PC
<b>ORCHARD, Donald Hon.</b>	Pembina	PC
<b>PANKRATZ, Helmut</b>	La Verendrye	PC
<b>PATTERSON, Allan</b>	Radisson	LIBERAL
<b>PENNER, Jack, Hon.</b>	Rhineland	PC
<b>PLOHMAN, John</b>	Dauphin	NDP
<b>PRAZNIK, Darren</b>	Lac du Bonnet	PC
<b>ROCAN, Denis, Hon.</b>	Turtle Mountain	PC
<b>ROCH, Gilles</b>	Springfield	LIBERAL
<b>ROSE, Bob</b>	St. Vital	LIBERAL
<b>STORIE, Jerry</b>	Flin Flon	NDP
<b>TAYLOR, Harold</b>	Wolseley	LIBERAL
<b>URUSKI, Bill</b>	Interlake	NDP
<b>WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy</b>	St. Johns	NDP
<b>YEO, Iva</b>	Sturgeon Creek	LIBERAL

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, October 24, 1988.

The House met at 8 p.m.

### CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY—EDUCATION

**Mr. Chairman, Harold Gilleshammer:** I would like to call the committee to order on the Estimates for Education.

Item 1.(c) Research and Planning: (1) Salaries—\$385,300—shall the item pass? The Member for Flin Flon.

**Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon):** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I would dearly love to see this item pass but there are a number of questions that we are going to have the Minister address, given some of the remarks that he made earlier.

I would like to start with identifying, I guess, what this Minister expects from this task force. Perhaps we can begin even on a more fundamental level by asking him to identify the target groups for literacy programming in the province generally. It seems to me that the Minister has lumped in some \$9 million—\$9.2 million is being spent on literacy training—and I would like to try and identify who is receiving that training and what is this Minister calling “literacy training,” because he has included English as a Second Language and obviously there are a number of other programming components that go to make this up.

I would just like to know from the Minister what exactly is included in the amount of funding that he has identified as being directed to literacy training.

\* (2005)

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education):** With regard to the amount of money and how it is broken down, that question was asked earlier this afternoon and I had indicated that I would come back, and I guess the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), in his anxiety to know, has repeated the question in some sense.

First of all, at the present time in this province, we are spending some \$5.2 million on Adult Basic Education; we are spending some \$2.3 million on English as a Second Language—

**Mr. Storie:** \$2.3 million?

**Mr. Derkach:** Yes. We are spending \$1.5 million in the literacy, Kindergarten to Grade 5, area, or thereabouts; we are spending \$120,000 of the provincial part that I was talking about on community-based literacy programs; and \$100,000 on the community-based programs from the federal department.

**Mr. Storie:** If you could back up to the \$1.5 million that went towards the Kindergarten to Grade 5, perhaps

the Minister could explain the \$1.5 million in Kindergarten to Grade 5. How does that fit into a literacy program? What is it specifically?

**Mr. Derkach:** I am not sure; I cannot answer that question specifically in terms of—

**Mr. Storie:** So you have been lumping these all in and you do not know what they are? This is interesting.

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Chairman, if I might?

**Mr. Chairman:** The Honourable Minister.

**Mr. Derkach:** Instead of the jibber-jabber we are hearing from the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), if he wants specific programs that are developed, we can get that for him. I do not have it at my fingertips right now and certainly we can get that information.

**Mr. Storie:** I was not the one quoting the \$9.2 million being directed at literacy programming; the Minister was. I am assuming, given his assurances that this amount of money is being spent on literacy training, that he knew what he was talking about; and now he says, well, we are doing something K to 5. It strikes me as somewhat odd that this would be included in the literacy programming. The K to 5 is clearly within the mandate of the public school. I would like to know what specific programs/projects are being included in this \$1.5 million.

**Mr. Derkach:** As I indicated to the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), I can get those specifics for him and get back to him tomorrow on the specifics for each area, if he likes, the types of programs that are delivered in each area.

\* (2010)

**Mr. Storie:** Mr. Chairperson, following up on that, he mentioned that \$2.3 million was being spent on the English as a Second Language training. Is that \$2.3 million from the province or is that \$2.3 million including the federal contributions from Secretary of State and others?

**Mr. Derkach:** In the Adult Basic Education Program, it is basically our own monies that are in there to a large extent. The English as a Second Language is 50 percent dollars—50 percent from the federal Government and 50 percent from the province.

**Mr. Storie:** The Minister is saying we have 50-50 funding on ESL, and basically the \$5.2 million is ours in Adult Basic Education. I am wondering; could we have from the Minister a breakdown of where that program is taking place? I know that some of the AB program is offered through community colleges, some of it is through the Winnipeg Adult Education services

Monday, October 24, 1988

and some of it is being offered through various school divisions in the province. Could we have that broken down? Is that figure direct support from the Department of Education or does some of it come from other programming, federal programming, or monies from school divisions themselves?

**Mr. Derkach:** I am wondering if this whole area perhaps can be deferred to the appropriate time when we are talking about Post-secondary, Adult and Continuing Education, because at that time we will have staff here to be able to answer some of those technical questions. This certainly is not the appropriation that we would be talking about those programs under.

**Mr. Storie:** I am not adverse to holding off the specifics. What I think I was trying to do was to point out that this Minister has used figures to justify the Literacy Task Force which do not necessarily reflect just provincial dollars but reflect a whole series of programming, some of which occurs in the public schools, some of which does not directly address the literacy question. Basically, we have a hodgepodge of programs and dollar figures attached to them used to support the Minister's objective in establishing a task force, and I really do not think it holds water.

I guess the question that one still has to ask is given that there are at least four different areas now where the province, in conjunction sometimes with the federal Government, is addressing this broader literacy question, what is the provincial position? What programs are we looking at requesting support for? How are we developing our package that we are going to the federal Government to in search for some of that \$12 million that may be available for programming this year? Are we not looking for federal support now in any of these areas or in some of these areas? How are they being defined if we are preparing proposals? Who is doing it, in conjunction with whom?

**Mr. Derkach:** I think the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) just makes the point for the necessity of the task force. He alludes to the fact that it is a hodgepodge. Certainly, the hodgepodge was not created by this Government. It was his Government that created the hodgepodge if there is one. Certainly, the Literacy Task Force is going to help us sort this hodgepodge, as he refers to it, out.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that if we want to answer detailed questions with regard to Post-secondary, Adult and Continuing Education, which this falls under, I would be more prepared to answer the detailed questions when we have staff in that particular appropriation here.

\* (2015)

**Mr. Chairman:** Shall the item pass? The Member for Flin Flon.

**Mr. Storie:** Mr. Chairperson, we are talking about Research and Planning. I guess the obvious question is, given the Minister's uncertainty about what they are going to be asking for, is Research and Planning playing

any role in preparing proposals to take to the Secretary of State, the federal Government, with respect to the federal initiative on literacy?

**Mr. Derkach:** As I indicated in my last answer, this is an area which is not being handled by Research and Planning; rather, the negotiations for funds are going to be handled through the Post-secondary, Adult and Continuing Education.

**Mr. Chairman:** Shall the item pass? The Member for St. Vital.

**Mr. Bob Rose (St. Vital):** Mr. Chairman, if I touch on areas that have already been touched upon, I apologize for that. I glanced through this report earlier and I would like to study it in more detail, but I want to, before I do that, place it in the context that puts its relative importance to me or to anybody else.

First of all, I would like to know, is this type of report something that your department—it seems to be quite elaborate and very thorough and probably rather costly and time consuming—is this the type of report that is regularly made on a continuing basis within the department?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Chairman, I have to reiterate that it is certainly not a report that I commissioned. It was not commissioned by the former Government. It was an internal document that people within our department undertook to do. Obviously, there has been some time commitment to it. It is not a costly kind of production. It certainly was not my intention to have numerous copies of this thing made. It was, as I understood it, a copy for me as the Minister for the department, and also for my Deputy Minister, to analyze and to take from it those kinds of things which are important.

I think it also shows what the department is doing, which is fine—I accept those things—and that is why we are forwarding it over to the task force so that they do not have to do a lot of redundant work and hopefully we can save some time that way.

I have to reiterate again; I did not commission this particular report.

**Mr. Rose:** Mr. Chairman, a follow-up to that. Is it normal for this type of report to be made within your department or indeed any department without the specific direction of the Minister, to use this many staff hours on a report that does not have the Minister's input to it?

**Mr. Derkach:** From time to time, there are requests made from other jurisdictions with regard to what is being done within a province with regard to certain areas. In this particular case, this being literacy, there have been requests from some groups with regard to what we are doing in literacy.

To illustrate what is happening within the department, this internal working document was prepared. However, it was submitted to me as an internal working document and I took it as such. It does not have my name on it in terms of redistribution for the media or for other jurisdictions.

Monday, October 24, 1988

Whether it is a regular thing that happens, I think from time to time the department does try to keep the Minister informed with regard to what is happening in those particular areas. In the Adult and Continuing Education Branch, I guess this was a means of the branch allowing me to know what is happening within the department and what they are doing with regard to the literacy programs.

\* (2020)

**Mr. Rose:** I thank you for that, but in this particular report, the brief look I have had at it, it seems to have no reason. There is no heading that says what the reason for the report of it is, why it was commissioned. It does not come to any sort of conclusion, nor does it appear to give any specific recommendations to broaden the present scope of whatever programs we have. That seems unusual for me.

If I were the Minister, I would question just what was this report made for. What was its specific purpose? Who was it targeted for? It was obviously not targeted for the exclusive use of the Minister. Who was it for?

**Mr. Derkach:** My impressions of the report were that it was specifically designed as an internal working document for the Minister, and that is the way I treated it. I have had staff analyze the report so that we could take from that report and understand from that report what is happening in the area of ACE or the Adult Continuing Education, so that it would give me a better working knowledge of what I could discuss when I am talking to the Literacy Task Force and the kinds of programs we have got available to us.

Understand that I did have to discuss literacy with the chairperson of the Literacy Task Force and give that individual some kind of indication of what is happening within the department so that the task force itself has a better understanding of where they are going and what is happening.

In terms of having it distributed, in terms of my commissioning it and asking for an objective or determining an objective of what I wanted done, that was not the case. Therefore, when you see a document like this make its way into other hands, there are certainly questions, and legitimately so, about the purpose and the outcome and what is intended. So it is not a complete report.

I must also indicate that the report does not cover the broad spectrum of literacy areas. So, therefore, it is somewhat misleading to say that all of a sudden the answers for our literacy programs are all contained within this report because they are not.

**Mr. Rose:** To the Minister through you, Mr. Chairman, if I understood you earlier, this report was started some several months ago, perhaps during the election campaign. I might have heard you incorrectly, but I gathered that your first knowledge that you had of the report was some time in late August or September. Is that correct?

**Mr. Derkach:** I received the report in August, either late August or early September. I cannot tell you exactly

what date I received it but it was in and around that area. When I received the report, I received it as information. I did not receive it as you indicated. It does not have specific recommendations about this is what the department is doing or this is the way we are moving. I think it was meant for information. I received it as information with the anticipation that when we get down to talking about the implementation of programs, when the task force does make its report to me, and in the report it will take this into consideration, that we will combine all the information that we have of provincial programs, both in the area of Adult and Continuing Education and the broader spectrum, and be able to implement programs which in fact will be effective.

**Mr. Rose:** I would understand that probably under The Freedom of Information Act that this document would be available to anybody in the public if they had asked for it or if it was known it was available. There does not seem to be any secrets or confidentiality about it. I was just wondering, in that regard, that previously today had the Minister got any requests from anybody, either in the public or from the Legislature, to produce copies of this document for public distribution?

**Mr. Derkach:** Up until this document was made public, I guess, or given to some people within the education area last week, I had no requests from anyone to see this document because, as you know, it is an internal working document. As Ministers, we do receive internal working documents to give us information that we request or maybe that the department sees that we need.

I think, if you take a look at the surveys, the area that we just went through, I get a quarterly report of the progress that is being done with regard to those surveys, the research that is being done. That is sort of to keep the Minister informed as to what is going on. If I came into the House, into the Legislature and into Question Period and were asked questions but could not provide the answers, certainly you would be wondering why I do not have the information. So for that reason, we do get documents of this kind meant for the Minister and not really meant for public consumption, not necessarily commissioned by the Minister in each and every case. This is one of those documents. I think it gives us information as to what things are being done, but certainly it does not cover the whole broad spectrum.

\* (2025)

**Mr. Rose:** Like my grandmother used to say, fools and wise guys should not see a job half done, and I think it is probably unwise to have documents released which are not the complete story or what have you.

Would it not be normal in your department that before an internal working document was released to the public or whatever, that there would be some clearance either from yourself as Minister or at least your Deputy Minister?

**Mr. Derkach:** Yes, of course. That is why I did not release this document in terms of making it a public

document. The document was presented to me as information for the Minister. I did not go to the public and say here is the document that I have received from one area of the Department of Education and this is the way we shall proceed. Certainly, that was not the intent at all.

**Mr. Rose:** It appears to be, and stop me if I am wrong, that this document became public without the knowledge of yourself or probably the senior members of your department. Is this correct?

**Mr. Derkach:** Yes.

**Mr. Rose:** How can that happen if that is so?

**Mr. Derkach:** I guess the Members from the New Democratic Party would know how these things happen. Certainly—

**Mr. Rose:** Should I ask them?

**Mr. Derkach:** Yes. Certainly, I did not make it public. It is obvious that somebody who has a copy of the document has given it to the media and has given it to other people within the education sphere. As I say, it was not intended for that purpose. I do not know who provided the information, but nevertheless, it is not something I am ashamed of. It is just information that I received. As you have seen, it is not something that makes specific recommendations as to policy changes. It is simply information and we take it for what it is worth, really.

**Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas):** There are several bands in northern Manitoba who have identified the need for basic adult education because the band members are not able to take job training or further education without having basic skills. There are some discussions about demonstration projects and there is some money from the Secretary of State for these projects.

Has the Department of Education had any input into these programs, or is this something that the Department of State is conducting strictly on their own?

**Mr. Derkach:** Again, we are sort of straying away from the area. This really should be covered under the appropriation when I have staff here but, in a general sense, I could answer that question. Within the next two or three weeks, I have indicated that we will be negotiating with federal officials for programs to address the illiteracy rate. Indeed, some of those programs could entail some of the area that you raise.

Once again, if I could ask Members, perhaps, if you have technical questions about this particular area, if we could raise them at the appropriate time when we do have the appropriate staff here.

**Mr. Harapiak:** Mr. Chairman, I have no technical questions. It is just that I was in the constituency over the last several days. There is some information out there that there are going to be adult administrative programs being delivered. I would urge you to support delivering those programs in the communities rather

than having them delivered in institutions where there would be great difficulty for some of the bands to have access to them.

So if there are discussions between the Secretary of State and the Minister, I would suggest that—or support that you deliver them within the communities rather than having them delivered by some of the institutions that are presently delivering some of the programs to those areas.

\* (2030)

**Mr. Derkach:** I think the Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak) certainly does raise an important issue. That is also one of the areas that the task force needs to take a very careful look at; that is, how do we best deliver programs to those people who live in remote constituencies—small, small communities in the northern and rural areas? Because, as the Member knows very well and he probably knows this area better than I do, it is very difficult for some of those people who not only live in remote communities, but cannot get easy access to the larger institutions to get there to take these literacy programs.

So we have to identify what is the best means of delivering, and what is the most efficient means of delivering those programs to those very small and remote communities so that those people can get the basic skills required to take further training programs or to gain some kind of employment. Because we know that the unemployment rates in these communities is very high, the standard of living is very low and our objective is to try and get both up. So, yes, the Member does raise a valid point that way.

**Mr. Harapiak:** I have several questions dealing with BUNTER, but I guess it would be a more appropriate area for approach later on.

**Mr. Derkach:** Sure. Okay.

**Mrs. Iva Yeo (Sturgeon Creek):** Just one last question that was presented to me to ask with regard to the Manitoba—whatever it is called—Progress in Literacy. Is there any idea of the cost of that particular internal report that was done? Is there any idea of how much that would have cost?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Chairman, the document, as such, was an internal working document, so therefore there is no specific cost associated to that. It is just a staff document that staff would prepare as a normal course of their workload. It is not something that we commissioned, or the department commissioned, outside of that particular branch. So I am sorry, I cannot give you a definitive cost as to this particular document. I guess we could analyze the cost of the paper or whatever, but otherwise I am sorry.

**Mrs. Yeo:** If I could then ask a question on the managerial position that is listed here in 1987-88. The salary is listed in '89; the salary is less. Is this a new position, a new individual in an old position, or can you tell me why there is a lesser figure?

**Mr. Derkach:** This is a new incumbent into this particular position and therefore the incumbent has got a lower classification and is paid less. Lower on the scale.

**Mrs. Yeo:** Yes, I understand that. I assumed that was likely what it was.

I have a question, too, with regard to Research and Planning. I am wondering if there has been any attempt made or is there any idea of attempting to evaluate the possible potential on education should the Free Trade Agreement be implemented?

**Mr. Derkach:** There has been very little done in that regard. However, it was the former Government that had made the analysis that there would be very little or no impact on the public school system. However, I might indicate that when you talk about students moving back and forth, it would appear that it would be easier for students to move back and forth under a freer trading arrangement between the two countries.

In specific terms, there has been nothing substantial arrived at in terms of the impact. It seems that there will not be very much at all.

**Mrs. Yeo:** I assume the Minister, when he is saying "moving back and forth," this means someone moving from Texas to Winnipeg, back to Minneapolis, etc., that there might be some greater ease there.

**Mr. Derkach:** That is right.

**Mrs. Yeo:** What about the market for materials? We, in Canada, and I think I have heard all my life about the greater need for Canadian studies, and they are constantly talking about Canadian studies curriculum and Canadian textbooks, etc., I have some concerns about the material aspect should the Free Trade Agreement go forward. Again, I am wondering if there has been any attempt to research this particular aspect.

**Mr. Derkach:** I do not think there is any specific restriction on educational materials travelling back and forth at the present time that I know of. If there are specific incidents, certainly, those have not been brought to our attention at this time, but in educational materials, there is free trade in that area now. I am hopeful that under a freer trading arrangement, more of our materials may be accessed by the people from the United States. Certainly, that would be a positive kind of move. For example, I met with the publishers in this city and I think that we are certainly competitive, although we are small. Certainly, we put out some excellent materials and I think that we can do a lot for Canada in marketing these not just in the United States but also in other parts of the world.

**Mrs. Yeo:** But that is, I think, one of the biggest fears with this particular Free Trade Agreement is that it is not a universal type of trade agreement in nature. It is more of a we/They thing with the big "They" being the U.S. Government and the little tiny "we" being the Canadian group.

I do have some concerns as far as the free trade aspect goes, being that a few years ago I attended a

National School Board Association Convention in Dallas, Texas, and in my ride from the airport to the hotel, the gentleman who was driving the cab was a schoolteacher who was making \$17,000 a year and was trying to support his wife and numerous children and therefore was working at his second job which happened to be that of being a cab driver.

I have some concerns that we are going to have difficulty in this country if we put this agreement through, and I was sort of hoping that there might be some research that might have been done to this effect.

I have also read that in 40 states a garbage collector—and I think there is a beautiful term for garbage collector, but at this time of night I cannot think what it is—

**An Honourable Member:** Sanitary engineers.

**Mrs. Yeo:** —makes more than a beginning teacher makes in 40 of the multi-states. I am wondering then—this brings me to teacher and teacher classification/certification—if there has been any research done on the potential of this particular agreement as it stands now, impacting the teacher and teacher classification or certification aspect.

**Mr. Derkach:** I cannot tell you how the salaries of teachers in Dallas, Texas, relate to salaries in Canada, for that matter. Our teachers are certainly governed by different laws and will continue to be. We have a Teachers' Society in Manitoba that certainly will ensure that our teachers are being treated fairly. I do not think there is any intent under the Free Trade Agreement to have garbage collectors earn more money than teachers, or at least I am not aware of that; but in terms of the textbooks, which we were talking about before, we do have free trade in that area.

I hope that kind of attitude will continue where we can share information back and forth freely, because I think that is not only good for Canada, it is also good for the United States and all our neighbours.

**Mrs. Yeo:** I can assure the Minister that there was no attempt at having his assurance that the Free Trade Agreement was not going to lump the teachers in with the garbage collectors as far as salaries are concerned. I was merely asking if there had been any thought to some research done to see whether there would be an impact. When the Minister did answer the first question he said "at the present time." At the present time, I think we are happy with what is going on, but we just have some concerns with down the line, will it be down the tube for we in Canada, and more along the lines of things such as teacher negotiations, the curriculum materials, the market for materials, etc., and I assume the Minister has answered that.

\* (2040)

**Mr. Chairman:** Shall the item pass? The Member for Niakwa.

**Mr. Herold Driedger (Niakwa):** Just a couple of questions to pick up on what the Minister said about the trade and textual materials across the border now.

It is my understanding that American materials are easy to produce because the system does permit teachers to do some research. They are paid to do research. They are paid to produce materials in summers and in sabbaticals and these materials are essentially American materials for the American culture and milieu. These materials are not for the Canadian milieu.

I think if we are interested in trying to do some sort of preservation of Canadian culture, I think it would be more imperative for us to start looking at trying to reduce potential trade in textual materials back and forth across the border and perhaps do a little more local content or local research to actually inculcate the values that we wish our children to have within our curriculum and our system.

Can you respond to that, please?

**Mr. Derkach:** Our students will never be able to compete in the world if we build walls around us and try to keep the rest of the world out. If we are really interested in having our students compete in the marketplace, in the job markets, and compete in the high technology areas with the rest of the world, we have to make sure that the information flows back and forth freely.

We have free trade in educational materials now. I do not think that we want to move into a protectionist or a restrictive kind of mode with regard to that kind of information, because this is educational information and I think the term "educational" is key.

Of course, we are not going to reduce Canadian content. I do not think there has been any indication to do that. As a matter of fact, if we are prudent, we will in fact enhance Canadian content to make sure that our students and our children know more about Canada than they presently do to understand our country, understand the principles that it was founded on, and preserve the democracy and the heritage that we have.

I think that we can get into a whole debate on free trade right from square one, but I have to tell you that I favour a free exchange of educational materials back and forth because I think we gain from that kind of an arrangement. Certainly, I would not favour us closing off our borders to educational materials. I think we have very key people coming into our country and into our province from various parts of the world.

I only mentioned to you the contribution that is made to our culture by foreign students, and foreign students do mean students from the United States. At the present time, we do not even have differential tuition fees because we feel and it has been felt over the years that these people contribute to our culture, our society and our economy. Therefore, that is just an extension of the kind of attitude that exists in terms of education, not only with our neighbours to the south but also with our countries around the world.

**Mr. Herold Driedger:** I do not know exactly how to take that answer. The first part of the answer actually rested upon the free exchange of ideas, which is

commendable, and a free exchange of materials when they are in technical fields, a free exchange so you understand each other which is something that I think we are not trying to argue against. But then in the second part of the answer, the Minister started focusing on teaching Canadian content, teaching the Canadian value system, which is essentially what I was trying to get him to say.

The question I asked originally dealt actually with the concept of bias in materials. If I can recall correctly, before 1982, any class I ever taught in history, I had no difficulty getting the concept of unconstitutional from my kids, and yet there was nothing unconstitutional in our Constitution. We did not have the American Constitution. Yet, that was the value system and that was the value that the students were able to understand. It is just simply to try and make certain that when you do teach the different cultural values, when you do enrich the system, you would like to have Canadian materials produced by Canadian people, produced with a Canadian bias so that we actually can retain the cultural values that we feel are worth retaining.

That is, I think, something that should be perhaps going back to the kind of literary research that you were alluding to earlier, where you are taking a look at the situation with literacy in Manitoba, in Canada, specifically, to our case. I think the second stage you want to do with that is to address that with Canadian people, Canadian authors, Canadian publishers so that actually the biases that we want our children to have, as opposed to the American biases, are the ones that they actually will end up with.

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Chairman, I have no difficulty with us teaching our Canadian facts and history as it should be taught in its pure and true sense. You can extend what the Member for Niakwa (Mr. Herold Driedger) opposite has just said to even our provincial aspect in the way that history has portrayed some of the issues of history in terms of the Native people, in terms around our province and in our country for that matter. Whether it is the Natives or the Metis, we find that even they have some questions about the way history is portrayed and the biases that have been put in within our own country.

The best way to describe it is, yes, we want to ensure that Canadian history or Canadian content is there and promoted by Canadian writers and Canadian publishers. We can even get down to the local level and say we want Manitoba publishers to be predominant in our province. However, let us not start creating walls and fences around our country and then around our provinces. Let us have a free exchange of educational materials. As long as our curriculum within our own province ensures Canadian content, teaches Canadian culture, Canadian history, I think it does not mean that we shut out the rest of the world. We learn about the rest of the world as well, because that part of history is important too.

**Mr. Herold Driedger:** I do not wish to imply that I would like to build walls around this country and keep everything Canadian inside and keep all the rest of the world out. That is not at all the intent here, but I think



Monday, October 24, 1988

the Minister did reference the fact that the Native people, the Native history, has not necessarily been well portrayed in Canadian histories, largely because we tend to have access to other cultural systems and other cultural-produced books a lot more easily than perhaps we would like. So perhaps the argument that he is actually advancing is one that we could use to actually counter some of the free trade rhetoric, because here we have a situation where we might actually want to have a little bit more protectionism for the Canadian system.

**Mr. Derkach:** The only response I would like to make to that is that we do not approach it in a negative fashion and say, because we have not done our homework in our country, free trade is bad. I think what we should say is let us get our act together and let us make sure that Canadian content is enhanced in our educational programs in our province and in our country, but let us also keep our eyes and minds open to what goes on in the rest of the world. I do not think that just because we have not done our homework here that we should close out the rest of the world.

I accept the argument that, yes, we need more Canadian content, that we need to perhaps put more programs into our school system which emphasize the importance of Canada and how it came about to be the nation that it is. I have no difficulty with that at all. Certainly, I would be one to promote that kind of an idea.

\* (2050)

**Mr. Chairman:** Shall the item pass? The Member for Flin Flon.

**Mr. Storie:** Just a couple of questions before we leave the area of research in terms of literacy programming anyway, the Minister had taken actually a number of questions as notice, and I understand that the Minister or staff are going to get back to the committee on the breakdown of the \$9 million that is spent on literacy training, including the \$5.2 million that is spent in Adult Basic Education. I would like to know specifically whether that addresses spaces in our community colleges or in our school divisions or in Winnipeg Adult Education Centre.

The other thing that I would like from the Minister is he has referenced the fact that not much was done by the previous Government in the area of literacy. I would certainly like a historic review of this, say, from 1980. I would like to see whether in fact the previous Government spent any money in the area of English as a Second Language, Adult Basic Education. I am sure we will find a manifold increase. I predict that quite confidently. So I hope that the Minister will be able to accommodate us with providing that information as soon as possible.

I have a couple of other questions, but I would like to just follow up on the questions that have been asked by my colleagues from Niakwa (Mr. Herold Driedger) and Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo). The Minister, I guess, was suggesting that other than the area of books in

education materials that there is no other, as far as the Minister can tell, potential impact of the trade agreement? It does not impact, for example, on the province's Department of Education's ability to encourage new Canadian material being developed in the province.

Could the Department of Education now say, yes, we are going to join with one of the publishers, small publishers in Manitoba, and produce a series, jointly sponsored, underwritten by the provincial Government, as has been done incidentally in provinces like Alberta? Could we go ahead and support directly the production of educational materials, given that free trade "already exists in educational material"?

**Mr. Derkach:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess the former Government did not see fit to take this kind of initiative. I would take his recommendation under advisement and we will investigate it to see its feasibility and see whether or not we can somehow embark on something whereby we could promote more Canadian and Manitoba content in our schools and use Canadian and Manitoba publishers to advance our programs.

**Mr. Storie:** I appreciate that and I look forward to it.

I think, just along a similar vein, my colleague from Niakwa (Mr. Herold Driedger) talks about it would have been nice if we would have—and I have to include all Governments in the past—attempted to Canadianize our curriculum, the instruction material used in our curriculum a long time ago. I know that the Minister has met with Manitoba publishers. He knows that there is a desire out there to build on our strength locally and include or develop materials for the school system.

I guess if one wanted to look historically at what happened, for example, in the music industry when Canada decided to impose some restrictions and require some Canadian content in the production of music and the use of air time on our radio stations and so forth, what we saw was the development of Canadian industry. We did not have the foresight to do that in the educational materials field. As a consequence, many of our students are using textbooks that have a United States orientation, and I guess it is important.—(Interjection)—The texts. I am referring to math books that have—

**Mr. Derkach:** Which ones?

**Mr. Storie:** Which math books? I do not know. I cannot remember the series, but a Grade 6 math book that—

**Mr. Derkach:** Grade 6?

**Mr. Storie:** Grade 6 math book that I know that I have seen with American coins in them; perhaps other materials that have reference—

**Mr. Rose:** Heaven forbid!

**Mr. Storie:** The Member for St. Vital (Mr. Rose) says "heaven forbid!" I am not suggesting that you cannot learn mathematics or something else. The fact of the

matter is that there are references to the height of the Empire State Building and all kinds of references that have an American orientation. I am not saying that you cannot learn using that material, but my point was more broadly that if we had taken the initiative or if a Government in the future decided that they wanted to Canadianize the curriculum that they could not use the tools of Government to do that. They could not interfere, and I wondered if that causes the Minister any concern at all.

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Chairman, obviously, the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) could not give me any concrete examples except the height of the Empire State Building. I really do not know whether it matters whether it is the Empire State Building or the CN Tower in Toronto, but that is so irrelevant. He is asking us to throw away educational materials being used in our schools and to revise or to throw out anything that suggests that it may have come from another source than Canadian. That, Mr. Chairman, I cannot accept.

Certainly, I think we are going to encourage, and maybe the former Government did not see fit to encourage, but we are going to encourage the use of Canadian materials and Canadian content inasmuch as possible. However, as I indicated before, we are not going to shut out the rest of the world. We want our students to learn about the United States. We want our students to learn about Japan, Germany and all the rest of the countries, and certainly to know something about those countries, because today the Member knows very well we do not live in a very enclosed society. We do not live in a vacuum. We live in a world society where students and people travel extensively around the world.

**Mr. Storie:** I certainly have not suggested we throw out any educational material. I was trying to raise the point that if, at some time in the future, a Government now wanted to Canadianize the curriculum—and the Minister is trying to pretend that I am the only Manitoban and Canadian that has ever suggested that. I think he will find perhaps to his surprise that there are a good number of teachers, a good number of parents out there who believe that the Canadianization of our curriculum should be made a priority for a Government at some time. Perhaps you can criticize the previous Government for not doing enough, but that begs the question: if a Government decided to do something in the future, could it go ahead and do it? I do not think that it is clear that it could. The example, I think, exists to show that we can develop not only an industry—and I am referring now to the music industry—but can, after we have developed an industry, then very successfully market it. We did not take the initiative in some other areas, and educational materials may be one of them. Perhaps it would be nice if we could in the future.

I do not have any more questions in the area of Free Trade Agreement.

\* (2100)

**Mr. Chairman:** Shall the item pass?

**Mr. Storie:** No, Mr. Chairperson, it will not pass.

**Mr. Derkach:** I would just like to say that he asked the question whether or not, if at any time we chose, we could change. The answer, of course, is yes, because education is excluded from the terms of the Free Trade Agreement.

**Mr. Storie:** I recognize that education is excluded. My question was whether the publishing industry is excluded—is the publishing industry excluded from the agreement?—and I think the answer is no.

**Mr. Derkach:** As I indicated in, I think, my first answer to a question, there is a free trade arrangement right now in the exchange of educational materials. Therefore, a freer trading arrangement between Canada and the United States will not impact on those areas.

**Mr. Storie:** I hazard to guess that unfortunately we may find out whether in fact the wording of the agreement is such that it would—

**Mr. Derkach:** You just admitted that it was excluded yourself.

**Mr. Storie:** No, I did not say that.

**Mr. Derkach:** Yes, you did. You said that you acknowledged that it is excluded.

**Mr. Storie:** Education. I asked whether publishing was, specifically. I am not sure that it is.

**Mr. Derkach:** Educational materials are excluded. You acknowledged that.

**Mr. Storie:** The publishing industry is broader than that. The issue of free trade has, I think, more ramifications than just the publishing industry. I had asked the Minister previously whether he had any other areas of concern expressed to him by teachers, the Teachers' Society, MAST, any other groups in Manitoba. Is he aware of any additional concerns raised by other groups?

**Mr. Derkach:** No.

**Mr. Chairman:** Shall the item pass?

**Ms. Gray:** In your Research and Planning, every once in a while the subject of health promotion and disease prevention comes under discussion in the Department of Education and in the Department of Health; oftentimes the subject of public health nurses and whether in fact public health nurses should be in the school system as employees of schools so that nurses can work on a full-time basis in schools and actually be an integral part of the delivery of health promotion and disease prevention activities. This subject comes up and there seems to have been much discussion as well. Oftentimes, in meetings with superintendents within the Department of Education, the subject comes up of what would appear to be less than adequate

Monday, October 24, 1988

resources of the provincial public health program versus what the City of Winnipeg program can provide.

My question would be, in Research and Planning, in regard to the Department of Education, I am wondering if Research and Planning has ever conducted any review or studies either on their own or in conjunction with the Department of Health in regard to the effectiveness of public health nursing programs provided in the schools and whether there has been any comparison done of the effectiveness of the City of Winnipeg public health programs versus the provincial public health programs in relation to how they provide services within the school system.

**Mr. Derkach:** In both instances, the answer is no.

**Ms. Gray:** Could the Minister indicate to me—have his senior staff ever received or been presented with any concerns from superintendents in regard to what they would perceive as lack of adequate public health staff in the province versus what the City of Winnipeg can provide?

**Mr. Derkach:** Yes, there has been some concern raised that the number of public health nurses in the city is more on a per capita basis than it is in the rural areas.

**Ms. Gray:** I think the Minister would find that it is also more per capita not only in rural areas but also in the other areas of the City of Winnipeg as well.

**Mr. Derkach:** That is correct.

**Ms. Gray:** Does the Minister feel that the public health nursing program—and when I say public health nursing, I am specifically referring to health promotion and disease prevention programs—does he feel that there would be any benefit of school divisions hiring their own public health staff as you do sometimes see in the private school system?

**Mr. Derkach:** It is a very unusual kind of question. At the present time, current methods of funding do not provide for that. Whether I have considered it, I would have to honestly say no, to this present date, I have not considered it. Will I look into it? I can certainly ask staff to give me a briefing as to the status of public health nursing in the province and then discuss it with the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), depending on what kind of information I receive.

**Ms. Gray:** The Minister has indicated that there have been concerns expressed in regard to the variations in public health staff per capita because of the differences between city jurisdiction and provincial jurisdiction. Would the Minister consider it part of his role or would he consider it part of the Research and Planning role to further review this area and to advocate, on behalf of his department and the schools, with the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), to ensure that the public health nurse ratio per capita would be equalled more in line with the City of Winnipeg?

**Mr. Derkach:** I suppose I would be happy to undertake something of that nature and have Planning and

Research take a look at it. I do not know what the outcome of that kind of research or that kind of investigation will be, but certainly it might be interesting to see the results. I am not opposed to doing something of that nature.

**Ms. Gray:** I thank the Minister for his consideration of that. Another question, Mr. Chairperson.

Could the Minister tell us—Research and Planning Branch, would they review and study the effectiveness of ongoing curriculums or ongoing subject areas in the school system? Is that an area that Research and Planning would look at?

**Mr. Derkach:** That is an area that is usually undertaken by the Curriculum Branch. If there were a specific project or something, it will refer to Planning and Research—I suppose they could do it—but largely that is done through the Curriculum Branch and would be covered under that appropriation. I would be happy to answer any questions with regard to that when staff are here.

**Ms. Gray:** In regard to curriculum, then, in regard to the ongoing home economics program within elementary and high schools, is the Minister indicating that that discussion as to policy surrounding home economics programs would be covered under that particular appropriation?

**Mr. Derkach:** Yes, that would be covered under the curriculum area.

**Ms. Gray:** Thank you.

**Mr. Storie:** The Minister listed a number of other areas that were being researched, or had been researched, in the last year. Just to spend a couple of minutes in a couple of areas. One of them was the High School Final Examination Program, a review somehow of high school examinations. I had asked for a brief synopsis of each of those areas, but I would just like to explore for a minute what this particular study was intended to do.

**Mr. Derkach:** The purpose of this particular overview, if you like, or research, was to obtain some indication as to the practices of the school divisions in the province and their existing trends and divergencies and so forth with regard to final examinations; basically, what their approach was to final examinations.

**Mr. Storie:** Is it possible for us to get a copy of the results of that analysis?

**Mr. Derkach:** I cannot provide the analysis right at this moment, but certainly we can get it for you, if you wish.

\* (2110)

**Mr. Storie:** Mr. Chairperson, I was pleased to see the Minister's conversion—as my colleague, the Member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard), would say, the “immaculate”

conversion of the Minister—on the issue of tuition fees for foreign students. I think he waxed quite eloquently this evening about the support, the benefit that accrued to the system because of the attendance of foreign students in our universities and our post-secondary education institutions. I note that there has been—

**An Honourable Member:** Conversion?

**Mr. Storie:** Pardon me?

**An Honourable Member:** Conversion?

**Mr. Storie:** Yes, I do recall the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) introducing a resolution which would not be viewed as that supportive when he was on the other side.

Mr. Chairperson, my question, though, more specifically, was international students was mentioned as one of the areas that was being investigated not directly by Planning and Research but with some involvement by Planning and Research, and I am wondering if we can have an explanation of the investigation that is under way.

**Mr. Derkach:** First of all, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the contribution that foreign students make, never did I ever indicate that foreign students, international students, did not make a contribution to this country, both culturally, economically and in other ways. That was never a statement the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) heard from me. I think they make an invaluable contribution and I have always said that.

With regard to providing the information, Mr. Chairman, we would be happy to provide that information, but once again, we will provide that tomorrow if we can.

**Mr. Storie:** I remember the valuable contribution that the Minister alluded to in his speeches requesting that we introduce a differential fee for foreign students. I will leave that aside. I am sure we will have chance to discuss that when we discuss post-secondary education.

A follow-up question in the same area. The Minister indicated that AIDS curriculum policy was being investigated by the Planning and Research Branch. I am wondering whether, first of all, the Manitoba Education Council on AIDS has met subsequent to the last time that issue was raised with the Minister.

**Mr. Derkach:** Could you repeat the question?

**Mr. Storie:** The Manitoba Education Council on AIDS.

**Mr. Derkach:** I am not aware of whether they have met since whenever it was the Member raised it. I am not in the habit of monitoring when these particular groups meet, whether it is the post secondary group or the MECA group. Certainly, we have meetings scheduled for the Manitoba Education Council on AIDS and myself as Minister, but I cannot give you the exact date when that is.

**Mr. Storie:** Then could the Minister perhaps indicate what new research is being done in the area of AIDS education policy?

**Mr. Derkach:** The only area that we have really done anything in is in the adoption of the policy to deal with AIDS, but with regard to the curriculum itself, the curriculum has not been altered to date. The same curriculum is being provided. In-services are being planned for the teachers who are going to be delivering the program per se, but since we have taken Government, we have not incorporated any new information into the AIDS curriculum. That is something that certainly will be considered in the future as new information is being made available. Certainly, we want to keep current with whatever information is provided to students.

**Mr. Storie:** A couple of other questions. Just if I can paraphrase what the Minister said, I gather that the AIDS policy that is referenced was with respect to the treatment of students with AIDS in the classroom, I understood.

A follow-up on another issue that was mentioned as being under study, and that was the transportation issue, if I recall correctly, there was some work done on the relative costs of transporting students particularly within Winnipeg divisions to existing schools, old schools, schools that had been closed, as opposed to the cost of building new schools. I am wondering if the Minister can indicate what happened to that review?

**Mr. Derkach:** We are not aware of any study that was done in that regard, unless it was done under your administration, but certainly not in ours.

**Mrs. Yeo:** Just a couple of questions with regard to Research and Planning. I very quickly glanced through the document that the Minister provided and did not see anything with regard to research for children with learning and emotional disorders, the special needs kids. There was a mention of the mainstreaming aspect, but I am thinking more along research with regard to children with challenging needs. Is there anything in the offing?

**Mr. Derkach:** No, there has been nothing done specifically with regard to that kind of research, to date.

**Mrs. Yeo:** Is there any thought towards some research into this very important group of young people?

**Mr. Derkach:** Certainly, we recognize the need to do some innovative and perhaps different things with regard to special needs, the way we treat special needs students and the way we deliver programs to special needs students. We have explored, in the very short time that we have been in office, or examined some other approaches to this particular way of delivering programs, but with regard to specific research that has been done, there has not been anything done. I would anticipate that in the future we will be taking a very close look at special needs and how we can improve the way that we deliver programs and better the programs that we are delivering to those students.

Monday, October 24, 1988

**Mrs. Yeo:** I am wondering how much time is spent consulting with various branches of school boards, external organizations, with regard to research methodology. Are there other organizations that come into play when methodology is looked at?

**Mr. Derkach:** I guess the approach varies, depending on the particular situation on a particular topic. The information comes usually from within, or the demands come from within, to get the research done. When a topic is approached and information is required, the Planning and Research Branch would implement a variety of ways, depending on the particular issue.

**Mrs. Yeo:** With regard to sort of substantial types of educational research fairly broadly, would more discussion be more properly centred when we begin talking with universities? I am thinking of more in-depth types of research that would be done in conjunction with the universities, or would it come under this particular department?

\* (2120)

**Mr. Derkach:** The kind of research that is done is short-term research within the department. Any long-term foundation research is not carried out specifically by the Planning and Research Branch. I might say that, for example, the mainstreaming research that was done was done at the request of the Manitoba Association of School Trustees and also the Manitoba Teachers' Society. That is kind of a special project, but other than that we do not embark into any long-term kind of research.

**Mr. Chairman:** I wonder, if Honourable Members would like to carry on a private conversation, would move to the back. The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**Mrs. Yeo:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Is there any cost-sharing type of funding through things like the National Research Council or the Canada Council or other shared research relative to our children in school?

**Mr. Derkach:** The Planning and Research Branch make their data available to the universities and perhaps StatsCan, but in terms of joint projects, I am not aware of any that are being done right now or have been done.

**Mr. Chairman:** Shall the item pass? The Member for Flin Flon.

**Mr. Storie:** We have a list of the studies that have been undertaken. I am wondering if the Minister could indicate whether, in the last number of weeks, months, the Minister has directed staff to research any additional issues. Are there some new directions in terms of research? Do we have a list of the new projects that have been identified by the Minister for investigation?

**Mr. Derkach:** One of the areas that perhaps is still in the process stage is the student-aid research that will be undertaken. That is sort of in the initial process stage at the present time.

If I might add, there has also been research undertaken in the past few months, because I was involved as the chairman of the Canadian Council of Education Ministers, and my Deputy was also the chairman of the Canadian Deputy Ministers' Association; so there were some joint ventures done that way for information being provided to the Council of Ministers. As you know, the Council of Ministers is embarking on the National Indicators Program which will certainly be of tremendous benefit, I think, to all the provinces.

**Mr. Storie:** Mr. Chairperson, I am surprised that somewhere in this list there is not a mention of home schooling. Over the last year, year and a half, there have been a number of divisions, superintendents, who have raised the concern about the increase in home schooling in some divisions. I do know that some policy work had been undertaken prior to the election. I am wondering where the policy is at this point.

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Chairman, certainly, the home schooling issue is well-known. It is not something that needs a lot of specific research in terms of the numbers of students that are out there. There has been a joint committee of MTS and MAST who have studied the situation. We are in the process of taking a very close look at trying to come up with some policy with regard to how home schooling is conducted in the province so that we can ensure that students who are not in school today will, in fact, receive some kind of educational programs and not be lost out there without getting any education whatsoever.

**Mr. Storie:** I am pleased that the Minister feels that he has a handle on the incidence of home schooling. I am certainly anxious to see a policy with respect to the department's role in monitoring home schooling. Where is the appropriate place, or can the Minister answer now, how many staff are assigned to monitoring, dealing with requests from parents, when it comes to home schooling?

**Mr. Derkach:** Once again, Mr. Chairman, we are straying away from the area of Planning and Research.

To accommodate the Member, I could indicate to him that probably when he was the Minister of Education, he, too, had one staff person assigned to monitor home schooling, and that is basically what is in place at the present time. We have a person from the department who monitors the home schooling to ensure that students who are being home schooled do get some sort of programming so that they are not lost.

**Mr. Storie:** As a follow-up to that, I am wondering whether the department has done any analysis of the number of private schools that are not receiving funds and whether the Minister has the same kind of certainty when it comes to the number of private schools.

**Mr. Derkach:** Planning and Research has not initiated any kind of research project in that area, and the other aspect of that question could probably be answered in the appropriate appropriation.

Monday, October 24, 1988

**Mr. Chairman:** Shall the item pass? 1.(c)(1) Salaries—pass.

Under 1.(c)(2) Other Expenditures \$94,900—shall the item pass? The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**Mrs. Yeo:** I am looking at the Other Operating and seeing the same amount from the last time until this time. However, when I looked at the front of the book and I saw what was listed under Other Operating, I found this seemed like a fairly substantial amount.

I have talked to various people, various libraries about the cost of publications, etc., and I know that some of the university libraries do not spend that amount for their publications and I am wondering, the list in the front of the book, is that really what is listed there, or are there some surprises under that particular appropriation?

**Mr. Derkach:** No, there are no surprises under that particular appropriation. That is the regular operating budget which covers the areas which were mentioned—computer related charges, paper, publications, hotels, meals, relocation and transfer costs, basic operating costs.

**Mrs. Yeo:** That is it.

**Mr. Chairman:** 1.(c)(2) Other Expenditures—pass.

1.(d) Personnel Services: (1) Salaries, \$270,800—shall the item pass? The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**Mrs. Yeo:** I am just trying to get organized here. Manager—I believe if one were to calculate a percentage increase, it is something like 7.5 percent, or whatever. I suppose it is the same response that was alluded to before that—(Interjection)—No? Okay.

**Mr. Derkach:** This is the regular GSI plus the reclassification of this particular individual, so you combine the two and that is what you come up with, reclassification in this instance.

\* (2130)

**Mrs. Yeo:** Can you tell me, please, Mr. Minister, how many staff are seconded from school divisions in this particular year?

**Mr. Derkach:** I am sorry?

**Mrs. Yeo:** How many staff do you have seconded from various school divisions, if any, this year?

**Mr. Derkach:** No, there are none that are seconded from school divisions in this particular area.

**Mrs. Yeo:** I am wondering, too, Mr. Chairperson, if there have been any changes to various affirmative actions programs that might be in place?

**Mr. Derkach:** No, there have been no changes.

**Mrs. Yeo:** Are there any changes anticipated this particular year?

**Mr. Derkach:** Could I ask the Member for Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo) to clarify specifically her question? I am afraid I am not understanding it.

**Mrs. Yeo:** I am just wondering if there are any particular target groups or any priority groups that might be considered specifically with any new hiring that might occur within the department.

**Mr. Derkach:** No, there are no specific target groups except that we will follow the affirmative action as set down by Government policy.

**Mrs. Yeo:** Can you tell me, in the Administrative Support group, what the ratio of male to female positions might be?

**Mr. Derkach:** In the Administrative Support they are all female.

**Mrs. Yeo:** Thank you.

**Mr. Storie:** The Minister indicated that there had been no changes in staffing, staff responsibilities when it comes to affirmative action. I am wondering whether the CAMEO Program is still operational? Is there someone still assigned in the department who has responsibility for that program?

**Mr. Derkach:** Yes, it is still operative.

**Mr. Storie:** Could the Minister indicate how many positions have been held by participants in the CAMEO Program this year, in 1988?

**Mr. Derkach:** How many positions have been held? Competitions?

**Mr. Storie:** No, positions. How many people are involved in this program this year?

**Mr. Derkach:** I do not have the stats at my fingertips but we can get that information for the Member.

**Mr. Storie:** Can we have an indication of whether we are moving forward? Are there more people involved?

**Mr. Derkach:** We are always going forward.

**Mr. Storie:** Could we have an indication? If we are moving forward significantly, I think the Minister would have an answer at the tip of his tongue.

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Chairman, we provide informational sessions, training sessions. We have had people who have been promoted, but if the Member is asking for the specifics, I indicated to him that we will have to get those stats. We do not have them here right now.

**Mr. Storie:** The Minister indicated that the Department of Education was no different than any other department, that he was following Government policy. Just to refresh our memories, could we have the Minister enunciate Government policy? Can he tell us what that is? What does that mean?

Monday, October 24, 1988

**Mr. Derkach:** I can get a copy of the Government policy and provide it for the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) tomorrow.

**Mr. Storie:** Is the Minister sufficiently familiar with Government policy to be able to tell the committee whether a policy includes identification of positions, positions which will be filled with affirmative action candidates? Is there a target within the department in terms of a global number of positions that will be filled in the next six months, in the next year with affirmative action candidates? Does it include that kind of specific agenda?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Chairman, specific targets have not been established. We have, as you know, a very varied and large component of staff in the department, but certainly any position, for that matter, is open to affirmative action in terms of our willingness to get as much affirmative action incorporated into the department as possible. I would think it would be wrong to say we are just going to do this much. Our goal is to do as much as we possibly and humanly can.

**Mr. Chairman:** Shall the item pass?

**Mr. Storie:** Then we are going to have to get more specific for information of the committee members and certainly for my own information.

Can the Minister tell us how many positions might be open in a year in the Department of Education, how many positions are open at the current time, and whether any of those positions are beyond the Minister's vague hope that affirmative candidates will apply and that they might be actually appointed? Can the Minister indicate which positions are targeted for affirmative action and are so designated in the advertising?

**Mr. Derkach:** As a former Minister of Education, the Member probably knows a lot of this information. However, for his edification, I will tell him that we have 45 positions that are vacant at the present time. It is up to the selection committee to determine what weighting they will give to each position in terms of affirmative action, but I would say that I cannot see why there should be any specific reason or any concrete reason not to have these positions open to affirmative action.

**Mr. Storie:** Every time we talk about affirmative action with any Member of this Government, it raises a whole bunch of concerns. The Minister has just said that he cannot see why any position should not be open to an affirmative action candidate. My God, no one in the world would believe that any position should not be open. The question is, does the Government have the willpower or the initiative to request or require or designate a position, a number of positions—a number, 4 out of these next 45—to designate them as affirmative action, indicate in the advertisements and in the bulletin that they are affirmative action positions?

The Minister is saying anybody can apply. The question is, is the Government going to move to the next step and indicate that affirmative action candidates

will receive preference? Has the Minister taken any steps to do that? Are any of these 45 in the category of affirmative action targeted?

\* (2140)

**Mr. Derkach:** I do not know what the Member is suggesting by that insinuation in that question, but I have to tell you if any Government is going to move on affirmative action, this Government is going to. It is our intention to put in as many positions using the affirmative action policy as we humanly and physically can.

I might indicate, Mr. Chairman, that affirmative action is not the only criteria when one considers a position, and that I think is understandable, but certainly it is a factor when you hire somebody. We are going to ensure that within this department and within Government that we follow affirmative action policies as were set down by Government.

**Mr. Storie:** We certainly need clarification from the Minister as to what Government policy is then, because if Government policy is the way the Minister interprets it and that is that it means that anybody can apply, I would assume that was the kind of position that has been adopted by governments across the country since the abolition of slavery.

My question was: does the Minister have an affirmative action policy which designates specific positions, administrative, management, middle management for affirmative action candidates? Is the Minister prepared to say that, all other things being equal, if two people apply and one is from an affirmative action category, that person will have preference? Is the Minister prepared to do that? If the Minister is not, then he does not have an affirmative action policy. He is telling me he is a hell of a good guy but that is all.

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Chairman, if the Member is suggesting that we only designate certain positions within Government for affirmative action, that is certainly not the way my department intends to move and it certainly is not the attitude of this department. Affirmative action is a factor but it is not the only factor that is considered when you hire people. The Member shakes his head. Well, maybe it is late in the night and that is why he is shaking it. He should give it a shake once in a while. Mr. Chairman, I should indicate to him that affirmative action is a factor in the filling of all positions but it is not the only factor.

**Mr. Storie:** I am going to let my colleague go at him and see if we can get his head straightened around here.

**Ms. Gray:** Mr. Chairperson, the Minister has indicated that his department will not designate certain positions as affirmative action. Could he elaborate on that answer?

**Mr. Derkach:** We recognize in the department that we are underrepresented in terms of affirmative action in probably every area; therefore, affirmative action is a

Monday, October 24, 1988

factor in filling positions. However, I have to indicate that along with affirmative action you must consider merit. The two go together. The Member is kind of dismayed at the answer. Certainly affirmative action is followed and when we advertise positions or when seeking employees to fill positions, affirmative action is a factor that is considered.

**Ms. Gray:** Mr. Chairperson, I am dismayed by his answer because the Minister is indicating that as well as affirmative action, merit should be considered. Now to me the Minister is saying that merit is exclusive of affirmative action.

My understanding is that any good affirmative action program always goes on the basis that merit is to be considered, and that is one of the integral parts of the Affirmative Action Program. Is the Minister now indicating that merit is separate and apart from the Affirmative Action Program?

**Mr. Derkach:** Absolutely not, Mr. Chairman.

**Ms. Gray:** The Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) had asked the Minister to give us the Government policy surrounding affirmative action and the Minister had indicated that he did not have the specific details here. Although we would want perhaps the Minister to be able to indicate to us the specific objectives of the Affirmative Action Program, as indicated by his particular Government, perhaps because that is not available the Minister could then give us his understanding in general terms of what affirmative action means to him as a Minister of this Government?

**Mr. Derkach:** I do not know whether the Member means more than whether she is asking just for the groups that are included in the affirmative action policy. Is that what you are asking?

**Ms. Gray:** What I am really asking for is a statement from the Minister. If I say "affirmative action program," what is the Minister's understanding of the Affirmative Action Program, particularly in light of the Minister of Labour's (Mr. Connery) comments this afternoon in the House?

**Mr. Derkach:** If the Member is asking for a general statement in terms of what affirmative action, or my understanding of affirmative action is, I suppose I could in the general sense without reading the specific policy, which I will have for her in a moment, is that we have to reaffirm that when job opportunities arise that we will make sure that those opportunities will be offered to such groups as women, Natives, visible minorities, handicapped and so forth.

**Ms. Gray:** Could the Minister indicate to us—in the Personnel Branch, is there an affirmative action coordinator?

**Mr. Derkach:** Yes, there is.

**Ms. Gray:** Could the Minister tell us who that affirmative action coordinator reports to in a line capacity, and

also what liaison relationship or staff or line relationship that person would have with Mr. Terry Edgeworth?

**Mr. Derkach:** The affirmative action personnel would report directly to the manager or the director of personnel within the department.

**Ms. Gray:** Could the Minister tell us what the relationship is with the affirmative action coordinator and the central responsibilities for affirmative action in the Civil Service Commission?

\* (2150)

**Mr. Derkach:** There is a statistical report that goes to Mr. Edgeworth on a monthly basis, and based on that information that is received, there would be direction given to the department with regard to affirmative action; also, I suppose, an indication of where we have to focus.

**Ms. Gray:** Could the Minister tell us what the nature of that statistical reporting is? Are there positions that are indicated as to where we are underrepresented in the Department of Education in regard to certain target populations?

**Mr. Derkach:** The statistical report will include the hirings as they exist in each of the categories and also would include the number of people in affirmative action or that are from affirmative action for each of those categories that have been hired.

**Ms. Gray:** Could the Minister tell us—is there any system or mechanism within his department in regard to affirmative action that indicates to his coordinator the number of positions where there would be underrepresentation of various target populations? Would that data be available to his department or staff?

**Mr. Derkach:** Yes, that would be available.

**Ms. Gray:** If that data is available, then am I assuming correctly that when a vacancy comes up and a position is bulletined, would there not be data available to say this particular position is underrepresented in the area of women and visible minorities? Again, would that have been a correct assumption?

**Mr. Derkach:** That would be a correct assumption.

**Mr. Chairman:** Shall the item pass?

**Ms. Gray:** No. When these positions are indicated that there may be an underrepresentation with the particular target population, then what is the process to determine if that position then will be designated that, yes, women and visible minorities, as an example, should be considered for this position? Is that something that is done automatically with all positions or who would make that decision?

**Mr. Derkach:** It is the expectation that in each situation affirmative action be considered and be weighted in the selection of the candidate.



Monday, October 24, 1988

**Ms. Gray:** When a selection board occurs and where two people, let us say, are considered for the job in the final analysis, one is an affirmative action candidate and the other is not, who has the final say as to who will be hired? Or is it the policy of this department and the Affirmative Action Program that, all things being equal, the affirmative action candidate will be hired?

**Mr. Derkach:** Given all things being equal, and I guess if we consider seniority being equal and all of those areas, if there were two candidates who were identical—if that is what the Member is asking for—and there was one who was not affirmative action and one was an affirmative action candidate, clearly the affirmative action candidate would be the one who would be selected.

**Ms. Gray:** Can individual supervisors or managers overrule that decision? I am asking the same question I asked in Community Services because in my experiences with individuals applying for affirmative action that oftentimes what happened was an individual supervisor or manager on the selection committee would still choose, for whatever reasons, if they wanted to hire the candidate, all things being equal, who was not an affirmative action candidate and there seemed to be some questions as to who had the final say. It presented difficult situations since that person would be reporting to that particular manager or supervisor. So that is why I am asking, who does have the final say on the selection boards?

**Mr. Derkach:** No, Mr. Chairman. In all instances, all things being equal and if the affirmative action candidate were selected by the selection committee, that would hold. All employment competitions are scrutinized by the Civil Services Commission so therefore there should not be that kind of a situation ever arising where the preference of a manager would overrule an affirmative action candidate if all things were equal. I would not foresee that, nor would I support that.

**Ms. Gray:** The Minister mentioned seniority. Does seniority come into play in selection boards? In other words, can seniority be a criteria that could outweigh or be a determining factor versus affirmative action candidates applying?

**Mr. Derkach:** In the Civil Service Commission, the affirmative action is now considered in the categories of merit, affirmative action and seniority. In normal situations, affirmative action would outweigh seniority.

**Mr. Storie:** We do not have a lot of time, but there are a number of questions that I would like addressed, perhaps as notice to the Minister, so they can provide information. He indicated earlier that there were 45 vacant positions in the department. I am wondering if he could tell us tomorrow, how many of those positions have affirmative action as one of the criteria for hiring? Is it identified? How many of those positions where they have been bulletined or advertised have that as part of the criteria? Could the Minister also indicate how many positions have been opened since May 1 of this year to the present time? How many positions

have been filled? How many positions have been filled by affirmative action candidates, and provide us with that background.

**Mr. Derkach:** For that kind of detail, we would have to take that as notice and provide you with the information at another time.

**Mr. Storie:** I appreciate that and that is why I was asking the question at this late date. I recognize that you are unlikely to have that information at your fingertips.

The other information that I had requested with respect to CAMEO, I think. The Minister indicated that there were people involved in the program, there were individuals. Could the Minister indicate, who is responsible for support to the CAMEO Program (a); and (b), who is the coordinator of the Affirmative Action Program in the department?

**Mr. Derkach:** I can indicate that Louise Ulrich is responsible for that program.

**Mr. Storie:** Who is the affirmative action coordinator?

**Mr. Derkach:** The area comes under the responsibility of the director or the manager. Maybe I should clarify something for the Member. At the present time, we have had a resignation in this particular position, and so in the interim it is vacant. But certainly that position is there and will be filled. There was a resignation where the candidate moved away.

**Mr. Storie:** Just shifting gears a bit. I wonder if the Minister could indicate—how many people have voluntarily resigned from the department in the last six months? How many voluntarily resigned? The follow-up to that is: have there been any dismissals in the department in the last six months?

**Mr. Derkach:** I can indicate that all resignations were voluntary. There were no forced resignations per se and we have had no dismissals to date.

**Mr. Storie:** Just as a matter of curiosity, could the Minister provide us with a copy, in a brown envelope, of the people who have retired or voluntarily left the department?

**Mr. Derkach:** We will provide the positions of those people who have retired, but I am not sure that we want to start divulging names of people who have decided to retire or resign. I do not think that is appropriate at all. I think the Member knows that as a former Minister.

\* (2200)

**Mr. Chairman:** The hour being ten o'clock, what is the will of the committee?

**Some Honourable Members:** Committee rise.

**Mr. Chairman:** Committee rise.

**SUPPLY—AGRICULTURE**

**Mr. Chairman, Mark Minenko:** I call this section of the Committee of Supply to order. We are continuing to consider the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture. We are presently considering appropriation No. 10. Education Tax Reduction Program for Farmers. Is it the will of the committee to pass this item?

\* (2005)

**Mr. Bill Uruski (Interlake):** I see that the Minister really is, by his lack of response, admitting that this program in effect is taking away money from and support from Manitoba farm families who can be considered as small and medium, and medium to large farmers.

There is nothing that the Minister has been able to tell us this evening how this program is in fact bringing more benefits to, I would say, a significant number of Manitoba farm families. In fact, the reverse is true. It is providing benefits for individuals who really have bought farm land for speculation or have bought farm land for investment purposes. They will be the major beneficiaries under the program. Under the previous program, these individuals were excluded because they basically did not meet the definition of a family farm corporation which was the criteria that we used. Now, that criteria has in fact been discontinued for what the Conservatives say, for the benefits of husbands and wives and widows. The Minister will not be able to produce enough widows to cover off \$2 million worth of tax benefits.

The fact of the matter is, you need a lot of widows to take into account the benefit of the Manitoba lawyer here who went out and bought 25,000 acres of Manitoba farm land valued at just under \$11 million in the late Seventies, early Eighties. That individual will receive a benefit of between \$25,000 and \$30,000 under this program, under the program that he says is there designed to help Manitoba farm families—\$30,000 to a Winnipeg lawyer.

Can the Minister tell me; is this lawyer going to provide his tenants with an equal rebate or a reduction in their land rental rates during a period of time when land values have dropped? I venture to say that lawyer will be laughing all the way to the bank under this Minister's program. He says Manitoba farmers are in fact going to be helped. Mr. Chairman, two million acres, even at \$1 an acre benefit, that is what I have calculated as a benefit going to non-farming interests. That is \$2 million out of the \$12 million in the program is going to individuals who have no interest in farming.

Let the Member for Swan River (Mr. Burrell), sitting there listening to this debate, ask his farmers in Swan River, who operate in Mafeking and all the cattle ranchers on Crown land who we know whose land assessment who maybe paid between \$150 and \$300 total taxes, last year they could have got \$500 had they accumulated all of their land. This year, take 25 percent and I venture to say that those farmers may get \$250, \$300 at best from his program. They are going to be losing \$200 or \$300 and you are not going to be able to justify a payment of \$27,000 to the

Winnipeg lawyer. How are you going to explain it to your constituents? Even the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay)—is the R.M. of Rosburn in your constituency? No, it is not. Or Birtle? R.M. of Birtle is, m'huh.

\* (2010)

One of my examples was a farmer who has land in the R.M. of Birtle, or the R.M. of Rosburn, and here is what could be considered a fairly small-time farmer, owns half a section, 1988 school taxes, \$548.70. He owns a one-third share of another half section and the school taxes on that other half section are \$571.90, so a third of that is \$190.44. Total taxes paid by this farmer \$739.14. That are school taxes in 1988. Under the old program he received \$500 benefit which made his net tax payable \$239.14, based on this year's payments. Under his program, your Minister's program of 25 percent of \$739.14, he receives a benefit of \$184.79. He has just reduced his benefit, maybe his constituent, by over \$300, and had our commitment of doubling that benefit to \$1,000 per year come into play, he would have paid no school taxes this year.

Here we have this Minister saying this program is welcomed by the municipalities, by the major farm groups. I looked at the clipping and I find astounding how the general manager of Keystone Agricultural Producers—and it is not the organization—I venture to say I am going to be speaking with the president of that organization and asking him whether this gentleman who speaks for that organization and says is happy with the new rebate program. "In the long run the new benefit will benefit full-time farmers who need the tax break the most," Douglas said.

Is he saying that to those farmers who are beginning farming, and who the Minister himself has said that between 40 percent and 50 percent of our farmers lease a portion of their operations? They lose out totally under this program. They get nothing because it is the widow who owns the land. Is the widow going to collect \$27,000 under this program?

He could have made an exception, could have made some changes, but, no, their philosophical bent is really to say those who have most will get even more. That is essentially the nature of this program. That is the Conservative philosophy here. Those who have wealth, possess wealth, why not let us heap it on them some more and say to the rest of the taxpayers in this province—there is 7,000 more unemployed—these farmers need more help, so we will give them an additional \$2 million even though no one can show that they will pass on those benefits to those farmers who are actually leasing from them.

It is really a program, I guess you could put it—I think Tommy Douglas said this is welfare for the rich and free enterprise for the poor. That is essentially what this tax giveaway is all about. This Minister has not been able to give us one shred of information, one shred of evidence to show that the vast majority of farmers are going to benefit by this program. He has not been able to show us where the cutoff line is. Where is the break-even point? By even my guesstimates, you have to have at least six quarters of good agricultural

land before you break even between the old program and the new. If you have more than six quarters of good agricultural land, then there may be some benefits, but if you lease a portion of that six quarters and you own maybe two quarters, you are a loser. You are a net loser in this program.

\* (2015)

The \$12 million will go. He will pay out the \$12 million under this program but he will not be able to tell Manitoba farmers that it is going into their pockets to assist them through these hard times. It is going to go into the coffers of Winnipeg lawyers and doctors, into the land dealers outside this province, into whichever individuals who own farm land in this province for investment purposes. They will be the beneficiaries. He is saying to young and beginning farmers, those who actually operate the land, he is saying to them, tough.

We think this program is much more simple because some of our municipal administrators and councillors said it was quite a bit of work and it was tough filling out these forms on behalf of farmers, so we wanted to simplify the system. Simplifying the system is costing Manitoba farmers 20 percent at least of this budget. That is where it is headed. It is headed out of the farm community and into the hands of people who do not need it. It is a program for the wealthy and the non-farming interests. That is what this tax credit program should be saying, Mr. Chairman. Here is a program for you, and at least their notices are honest in the sense it says, if you own farm land, whether you farm it or not, the 25 percent will be deducted from your tax account and paid by Manitoba Agriculture.

-(Interjection)- The Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst), I do not know what he said, but if he wants to get into the debate, he is welcome to get in on this debate because I am sure there are some individuals who are speculating on farm land within the boundaries of Winnipeg who are the beneficiaries of this. There is no doubt in my mind. I am sure some of the real estate people in the boundaries of Winnipeg and the farm community are saying, holy moly, our tax rate in the urban setting of Winnipeg is skyrocketing and here the real estate agents who are buying up the farm land are going to get a 25 percent rebate on their taxes. That is the way to invest in farm land. I would like to hear what this Minister has to say about his farm tax program.

**Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Chairman, the Member for Interlake (Mr. Uruski) does a complete disservice to all those people who own land but do not actually farm it. He says 1.8 million acres are owned by non-resident landowners. That may well be but they are not all lawyers and doctors in the City of Winnipeg. They are people who live in their rural communities. They may be retired and their son is farming it. They may be relatives that are farming land and renting it from their relatives. I just do not accept the fact that because we are giving a tax rebate on a uniform basis to all landowners where land is farmed, it is giving money away.

He gave out \$9 million on a program where \$12 million was budgeted. We will be giving out between \$11 million

and \$12 million in a program that is designed to support the principle that education taxes on bare farm land are unfair and need to be addressed in the future years. Our objective from here on in the future is further removal of taxes from farm land. If we followed his principle of we are going to direct it to specific kinds of landowners and not give it to others, when you eventually come to have to remove it in a greater portion from all farm land, are you saying that you are not going to ever give rebates to that land that is owned by people who are not farming it specifically?

We are trying to address the position of removing it steadily and progressively at the same percentage for all landowners, where the land is actually farmed. I know there are many family units where the land is rented from some relative, and I am pretty confident that benefit will be passed through to that relative who is actually farming it.

\* (2020)

We have, through this process, addressed the problem with wives and widows, a real problem that existed in the previous program, and we are putting into existence some \$12 million of rebate. He mentioned the figure of six quarter sections, as anything over six quarter sections would be net benefactors. That is the average farm size, six quarter sections. So the Member for Interlake (Mr. Uruski) is himself saying that half—anybody with average farm size in the province is a net benefactor from the program. That is clearly what he says because the average farm size is six quarter sections.

So, Mr. Chairman, the program has been designed to give a uniform rebate on land that is farmed, and the progress in the future will be to continue to remove more and more of the education tax off of bare farm land because it is deemed by the farm community to be a relatively unfair tax because the burden has become quite heavy in the recent years. You will say, five or six years when farm incomes were fairly good, farmers paid their taxes and did not really notice the impact because incomes were good and they needed some expenses.

But in more recent years, as incomes become tighter and farmers started to watch the expense side of the ledger much more carefully, they noticed the impact of education taxes. They started through their organizations asking, well, who else is paying education tax or how are they paying it? They looked further and further into the situation with people living in towns and cities, and they started to realize that the total of education tax bill they were paying on their enterprise was deemed in their mind to be very high relative to their ability to earn an income.

So it is fairly straightforward. The program is designed to reflect a rebate to the person who is actually paying the tax. In our mind, that is the person who should get the rebate.

**Mr. Uruski:** I think the Minister is contradicting himself in what he has just said. I certainly accept the Minister's statement that he said that the benefit should go where

Monday, October 24, 1988

the land is actually farmed. But, Mr. Chairman, their notices in their program does not say that. Their notices say, if you own farm land, whether you farm it or not—(Interjection)—that is what your notices say. That is in your ads in the paper.

So, who really should receive the benefit?

**Mr. Harry Enns (Lakeside):** You are missing the point. The tax should not be on farm lands.

**Mr. Uruski:** The Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) now wants to add a diversion into this whole debate. The Member for Lakeside says the tax should not be on farm land. So is the Member for Lakeside saying that it is okay for the lawyer from Winnipeg to get this \$27,000 in benefits? Is he saying that the eastern land dealer, who is getting \$10,000 in benefits, should he get that benefit? If he is agreeing with that, then he is essentially saying what the Minister is saying, let us give it. But the Minister at least got up here now and he contradicted himself. His ad says one thing and he is saying, let us give the benefit where the land is actually farmed. In their ads, they are saying we will give you the benefit whether you farm the land or not. That is essentially what the program is saying.

So, Mr. Chairman, I challenge the Minister to tell me, to say to me that the average farm size in Manitoba is 960 acres. Is that the average farm size in Manitoba? Six quarters is 700 acres? Six times 160—(Interjection)—pardon me?—(Interjection)—No, no. The average farm size in Manitoba is about, in statistics that were provided, between 600 and 700 acres, and six quarters is between 900 and 1,000 acres—six quarter sections.

**Mr. Findlay:** Count the cultivated acres. You take six quarters in a lot of this province—

**Mr. Uruski:** Yes, but the acreage is not cultivated acreage in terms of farm size. It is total acreage in terms of the—this Minister has not been able to say why was he not prepared to amend the regulations to assist the wives and husbands that he talks about that the previous program supposedly discriminated against. Why did he not add just another benefit, allow another \$500.00? Those families would have gotten \$1,000 benefit under one simple amendment, double the benefit for husbands or wives, give a double benefit as if they were a family farm corporation, double the benefit from 500 to 1,000.00. Then you would have had \$1,000.00. Now on \$1,000 of benefit, Mr. Chairman, that husband and wife would had to pay school taxes, 25 percent, \$4,000.00. They would have had to pay \$4,000 worth of school taxes. All he had to do was double the benefit for husbands and wives, move it from 500 to 1,000.00. Do it like the family farm corporation if that was a difficulty. That is all he had to do. No, he has now left out, and he has never answered the question, what is he going to say to all those beginning farmers who lease a portion of their farm land, who lease—in his other Estimates, he said it was closer to 50 percent of farmers who leased their farm land.

\* (2025)

How is he going to deal with them because they are totally excluded under his new rules? No privately leased farm land is included in this rebate. They have to go on bended knee to the landlord to say, will you pass on some of this benefit? We have recognized a long time ago in this province that the Property Tax Credit Program is payable to tenants. When you lease an apartment, 20 percent of your rent up to the maximum of \$325 is eligible as a property tax credit or rebate on your income tax. That has been long acknowledged as part of a fair taxation system in this province in terms of trying to assist homeowners and tenants in dealing with higher school costs and shifting some of that burden. There is no one in this Legislature, and I do not want the Minister to get up and say that somehow we are not in favour of removing school taxes from farm land. We took the first step in this area.

**Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation):** We forced you.

**Mr. Uruski:** The Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger) says, "We forced you." Your force is just giving these people who have no direct involvement in agriculture a \$2 million windfall. You tell it to the farmers in Emerson, those in the Vita district and in Emerson district who farm on marginal farm land, how much they are gaining under your program, how you are going to justify this eastern Canadian lawyer who bought 8,928 acres for 5.2 million, how he can get a \$10,000 benefit under your new rules and your farmers are going to lose money. How do you explain that one because that is, in essence, what this program is? The fact of the matter is we all are in favour of moving the burden from the school tax off farm land, but the criteria should be those who are actively engaged in agriculture. I do not believe the vast majority of Manitobans agree with the policy to give windfall benefits to those who are not involved in agriculture.

There is a simple way of dealing with it. Raise the benefit \$1,000 or \$2,000 to those who are farming and give them the full benefit. Then you know that every farmer has the full benefit whether he leases the land or not. Then he or she gets all the benefit because they are actively farming the land. He appears, Mr. Chairman, to have said though, "where the land is actually farmed."

But, Mr. Chairman, his benefit is not going to those who are actually farming the land. Whether you farm it or not, you get the benefit. So, Mr. Chairman, this Minister really is in fact taking over \$2 million from the farm community at a time when over 400 farm families are before the Debt Review Board, many of whom—and there are hundreds of others because these are only the provincial ones and I am only using those in the provincial Review Board—many of whom, I am sure, have leased land, could have used an additional \$200 or \$300.00. Mr. Chairman, I said that the break-even point, if you are six quarters or less, you are losing money. You have to own more than six quarters of land before there may be some gain. If the land is marginal, then in fact you have to be like this family farm corporation in Fisher. They own nine-and-a-half quarters and they still lose almost \$300 under this program.

Monday, October 24, 1988

\* (2030)

**Mr. Enns:** I will bet you I lost.

**Mr. Uruski:** The Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns), sitting beside me, says: "I will bet you I lost." Mr. Chairman, his taxes in his municipality are probably due at the end of this month. He will have an opportunity to see what his benefits are under the program. The Crown land benefits will come directly to him because I am sure he, being in the Shoal Lake area, leases a fair bit of Crown land, so he will get his 25 percent there. But I venture to say that the school taxes payable on that Crown land compared to Class 1 or Class 2 land would be a fair bit lower.

So, Mr. Chairman, this Minister has to come clean and say how he intends to correct not only the anomaly but really the leakage of \$2 million from the farm community to outside interests.

**Mr. Findlay:** I wish the Member would just produce some evidence to show a \$2 million leakage. He just uses a figure he plucks out of the air. It has no relevance in fact whatsoever.

He stood up here a few minutes ago and said, landlords who own land serve no benefit to agriculture. He talks about young farmers not being able to get started. How do young farmers get started? If they cannot afford land, they can rent it, and rent it at a rate that is a much better investment for them than sticking their neck out and taking the risk of a mortgage. They do serve a very valuable service to those who do not want the risk of owning land, and that is incredible that Member would stand up and make that kind of statement, that landlords are all bad, that they are all bad. It does not matter who they are, your father and uncle, a relative who is living in the province or out of the province. He calls them all bad, they are terrible people. For young farmers wanting to be able to get into farming, the ability to lease land is certainly a very attractive option.

In terms of being able to assist those young farmers in paying a lower rent, this is a process for which they can negotiate a lower rent with their landlord knowing that the landlord paid less costs in terms of taxes and, if he is saying that the rentals are too high, if that is what he is really saying, and we are going to fix the landlords by passing the money, instead of through their hands, straight to the renter, if the problem is you think the rent is too high, then address that head-on. Do not try to address rents by passing taxes directly to the land lessee, and that is really what your program last year, I think, was directed at.

You were saying landlords should not be able to charge rent, so we are going to fix you by passing the monies directly to the renter.

This program, as I said earlier, has been relatively well-received. It is understood that it is addressing the problem of taxes being too high in terms of education tax on land.

I find it astounding that the Member would not support the principle of removing taxes, the education

tax from farm land, in a reasonable and progressive fashion. It is our attempt, and it will be our future direction, to continue to remove a greater and greater portion so we get the producer into a position where he is paying a reasonable load of the education tax on his ability to earn an income on his farm property in comparison to other businesses of similar size across the Province of Manitoba.

**Mr. Uruski:** Mr. Chairman, I find this Minister's comments astounding, and I say "astounding," for a Party which only several years ago—you remember the 1967 election? Mr. Chairman, you were a young lad then. This Party, the Conservative Party, was opposed to the province assisting farm families who could not retire, and was buying farm land and bringing in young people to lease with an option to buy. They said the state was going to own all the land and all farmers would be tenants. Now we have a Conservative Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) get up in this House and say the landlords are good for tenants; landlords are a great benefit to agriculture.

I am not knocking and I have never knocked landlords. The question comes into being: who do you want to provide tax benefits to? That is really at issue. Do you want to provide tax benefits to farmers who are actually farming the land or do you want to provide tax benefits to those who may have no interest other than investment into farm land as an investment tool? Do you want to give them the tax benefit? I say, and our Party says, let us give it to farmers. That is where we stand apart from the Conservative Party, that any tax benefits go to those who are actually farming that land. We provided a program that in fact does it, and it is not an issue that somehow we now do not support the removal of school tax on farm land.

The fact of the matter is his program is costing many hundreds and thousands—it will actually be thousands of Manitoba farm families' money this year. They will be losing benefits under their program because what will occur is that all those who own farm land and do not farm it—and one of the reasons we brought in The Farm Lands Protection Act was in fact one of those reasons because it was deemed—let us just look at what the issues were at the time so that this Minister, who has forgotten that debate, remembers that the need to bring in some restrictions on the ownership of farm land is because there was, in a number of municipalities, more than 20 percent of the farm land owned by non-farming interests. They outbid local farmers.

Farmers, some of whom bid with them and in fact overpaid, those same farmers are now being assisted under either The Family Farm Protection Act or the new Mediation Board legislation, MACC Interest Rate Relief Programs, all those myriad of programs, because there were thousands of farm families in Manitoba who competed against those outside interests.

What happened in those municipalities? As soon as those land prices were bid up, the assessor walks in and says, well, since land sales are going up and above the norm, let us raise the assessment so that everybody's taxes go up, because here is the new

Monday, October 24, 1988

market price of farm land. That is who this Minister says should get the benefit, those people who, through their speculation in farm land over the last decade, caused many farm families to be in financial difficulty. I am sure there will be a large number who will go bankrupt as an indirect result of overpaying on farm land that they had to compete against these outside interests.

Here we have this Minister saying we will give you a couple of million dollars. We are nice guys; you do not have to farm the land. As long as you own it, we are going to give you the benefits. All you landlords, you are such nice people, we know that you will provide those benefits; we know that you will turn those benefits over.

Those who lease the land did not have to go, cap in hand, to the landlord and say, will you please pass on that benefit? They knew that they could receive the \$500 benefit from this program because they operated the land. Our Party says that those who operate the land should be the beneficiaries.

This Minister should acknowledge the siphoning off in excess of \$2 million to outside interests. All he had to do—and why does he not admit it?—was double the benefits. You will still pay out the \$12 million; you will satisfy the majority of smaller and mid-size farmers. You will wipe out their entire education tax, and is that not the basic criteria, the basic principle that all of us here are espousing, to remove school tax, for the Member for Gimli (Mr. Helwer)?

\* (2040)

Sure, that is what we are all about. The R.M. of Gimli and the R.M. of Bifrost in my area said, yes, more people will get the benefit but less of it will go to farmers because there will be others.

This Minister before made statements to the media and said hobby farmers were getting it under your program. Somehow hobby farmers were the ones that you were helping and you were not helping full-time farmers.

I want him to tell me where his program is not helping hobby farmers. Your program does not distinguish against anybody. All it says, farm it or not; as long as it is assessed as farm land, it is yours, you get your 25 percent. This Minister has been on the border line of deceiving the public in terms of how his program is operating. Let him come clean and say no to those who operate the farm land; this is the way it should go.

Mr. Chairman, I will continue to get up and ask him to amend the program, to bring in the doubling of the benefits that we proposed. All he had to do was bring it up to \$1,000 per farm family. The vast majority of farm families would have had the majority of the school tax removed from their farm land. What he is doing now, he is making sure that those who are not directly involved in farming and those who have very large tracts of farm land are the biggest beneficiaries in this program. It is really, no doubt, in my mind, and I am sure over the next number of weeks the Minister and

I will—because I have asked Manitoba farm families to continue writing me and indicate how much they are paying more this year because there is no doubt, there are thousands who are paying more.

**Mr. Findlay:** We have taken a very balanced approach and said if you own land that is farmed in the Province of Manitoba and are paying education tax on it, you qualify for a 25 percent rebate in 1988.

In 1987, the former Government sat in their little rooms and the former Minister of Agriculture decided that you should get 100 percent rebate of your education tax, you should get 80 percent, you should get 70 percent; and you, I do not like you, you should get 10 percent rebate on your education tax. That is what you decided in your room.

You decided to discriminate against anybody who was too big, in your mind, in terms of a farmer. And anybody who was a hobby farmer, a part-time farmer, a small farmer—oh, you are a great guy; we will give you 100 percent rebate of your education. That is what you decided. You did it by the \$500 rebate to every producer regardless of the size of his farm. And you said to the wives of farmers: you do not qualify if you own any land. If you are a widow who has to rent your land out, you do not qualify because we do not like you. If you are a landlord of any nature, we do not like you, so you do not get any money. You pay the tax and we will pass it onto somebody else because we like the guy who is paying too high a rent.

But they decided that there was somebody, because they liked them, should get 100 percent rebate; and those over there, because they do not like them, should get 10 percent. That is what they decided. No fairness in the system at all.

We brought equality and fairness back to the method of rebate of education tax on farm land. If you are paying tax, you get a rebate. If you are not paying tax, you get no rebate.

**Mr. Uruski:** The Minister talks about fairness? How is he going to tell his constituent who owns land in the R.M. of Birtle and the R.M. of Rossburn—I do not know where he lives, whether it is in Birtle or Rossburn—one of those municipalities is in his area—and tell him or her that they are losing \$315, they are getting \$315 less this year on a half section, basically a three-quarter section farm? He is getting \$300 less under your program while the lawyer in Winnipeg is going to get a \$27,500 benefit. Is that fair? Is that the kind of fairness that he is talking about?

Or the middle-size farm in the R.M. of Grandview? Seven quarters of farm land, seven quarter sections, 1,095.7 acres—right from his tax bill: 1988 school taxes, \$1,773; 1987 NDP tax program, \$500; net tax payable, \$1,273; the 1988 Conservative reduction, \$443.00. Even he is a loser by \$57.00. All he had to do was double the program to \$1,000 as we had proposed. This individual would have had a net tax payable of \$773.00. Instead, he is paying this year, under the Conservative program, \$1,329.00.

What about the Wells Land and Cattle Company? Address now? Where?

Monday, October 24, 1988

**An Honourable Member:** In Texas.

**Mr. Uruski:** No, they are not in Texas. They are now in Manitoba. They are in Carberry. They own 20 quarters of land in the R.M. of Hillsburg and another six quarters in the R.M. of Shell River. Twenty-six quarters owned by the Wells Land and Cattle Company getting benefits of between \$1,000 and \$1,500 on fairly marginal land. Should they get \$1,500 in benefits while the farmer in Grandview loses \$65 under this program?

**An Honourable Member:** They are paying tax?

**Mr. Uruski:** Sure, they are paying tax. Of course, they are paying tax. So, Mr. Chairman, the Conservative philosophy is equality means that if you own half of Manitoba, we will give you 25 percent of your school taxes. If you own a quarter section, we will give you 25 percent of \$100 if that is what your taxes are; but if your taxes are a quarter of a million, we will give you 25 percent as well whether you farm it or not.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** But we will not give it to you if you are a hobby lawyer owning a farm. We will not give it to you for that.

**Mr. Uruski:** The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) says we will not give it to you if are a hobby lawyer. Mr. Chairman, that is not true. The fact of the matter is the Minister of Finance is paying all the hobby lawyers now. He is paying every hobby lawyer that has bought farmland in Manitoba—(Interjection)—Oh, not at \$500.00. Well, he is paying but not at \$500.00. If he does not like \$500, how about \$27,500 for the hobby lawyer who bought 25,000 acres for \$10.8 million? Does he like that hobby farmer? What kind of hobby has he got? Mr. Chairman, 25,000 acres, who is he fronting to? What kind of hobby has he got? Pretty good hobby, I would say, when he is getting the benefit of \$27,500 in school taxes. That is the kind of friends that you are dealing with.

**Mr. Manness:** What did you do to the widows?

\* (2050)

**Mr. Uruski:** Here is another one, the 7,000 acre lawyer. Mr. Chairman, there are other examples.

**Mr. Manness:** What did you do to the widows?

**Mr. Uruski:** This program—

**Mr. Manness:** Answer me.

**Mr. Uruski:** I have said that if you wanted to change the regulations, change them.

**Mr. Manness:** Why did you not? We asked you to.

**Mr. Uruski:** Well, you are now Government. We were going to double the benefits. We pledged that individual benefits for farm families would go from \$500 to \$1,000.00. The majority of farm families, middle and smaller size farm families are losing under your program.

You do not like it. There are others. Here is another land dealer who has a Quebec address; 5,000 acres—5,060 acres, \$3.1 million, \$600 an acre farm land. You are going to give him a benefit, \$5,000.00? That is a nice hobby. That is a nice hobby to own farm land in Manitoba. Or here is the B.C. lawyer who resides in Europe now, acquired 3,027 acres at \$2.5 million through his Manitoba Corporation. They are all eligible now; all 3,000 acres. Here is a \$3,000 benefit for your hobby. That is the Conservative program. That is the kind of benefits that the Conservatives are providing to Manitoba farmers.

As Manitoba farmers start paying their tax bills, they will know that they are the net losers under this program.—(Interjection)—Pardon me? So, this Minister is saying that it is fair to own a lot of farm land and we will give you the benefits whether you farm it or not, and for those poor individuals who are struggling to begin farming, who are leasing a portion of their land, or those who happen to be mid-size farmers who are in the Conservative books, are saying, no, you are getting too much; \$500 was too much for you—because that is in essence what he is saying—\$500 was too much for you. We are not going to give you \$500; we are going to give you 25 percent, which in most of those cases will be less, far less than what they received previously. Those who have family farm corporations, they got \$1,000 last year. Many of them will get less this year. That is the description of fairness under the Conservative model. Those who have more, we will give you. We will give you lots more in farm land. Those who happen to be leasing and are smaller and are beginning: Well, boys and women, forget it, we will only give you what you own, and you go on bended knee to those who own the land. That is in essence what you are saying. You are not dealing with those who farm the farm land and those who should be getting the benefits.

That is, in essence, what this program—and who should be getting the benefits of school tax? Not the beneficiaries who have no interest in farm land but to invest in it, and they are not contributors to the community. Those who farm the farm land are the contributors to the local community. It is not those who lease the land out.

**Mr. Findlay:** I find it most interesting that the Member is standing up and saying lawyer A, lawyer B and lawyer C are undesirable owners of farm land, but yet in his program he said that lawyer 10 and 20 and 30 and 40, if they owned a quarter section, if they owned a half section, and were hobby farmers and puttered around on the weekend with their \$100,000 salary in their hip pocket, he says: We love you. You do not have to pay any education tax. We will rebate all your education tax. Do not pay any of it. We will give you \$500.00. Here, have a good time, have a good party, have a good evening out with your wife. That is what you said to them. We are saying, no, you shall pay at least 75 percent of your education tax if you are that size of an operator and that kind of an operator. We went it after it in that direction, on uniformity across the landowners in the Province of Manitoba.

We did not go around and say, we like you and you get 100 percent rebate, we do not like you so you get

Monday, October 24, 1988

a 10 percent rebate on your education tax. We did not take that discriminatory approach. We recognized that the people who were paying the tax should get the rebate whether you are a farmer in the Interlake or a farmer in southwest Manitoba or you are widows, and there are many of them living in the communities of the Province of Manitoba who cannot physically farm the land. You should not be discriminated against, should not and will not under our program.

**An Honourable Member:** Right on.

**Mr. Uruski:** Mr. Chairman, if the Conservatives are so intent on paying benefits to those who own the property, and I am assuming the Minister of Finance will be bringing in amendments to the Property Tax Credit Program to take it away from all tenants.

**Mr. Manness:** Do not confuse the issue.

**Mr. Uruski:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance now says, "Do not confuse the issue." The issue is not confusing. Why on the one hand are you prepared to continue providing benefits to tenants and recognizing that a portion of the tenant's rent is equatable to school tax, a portion of it?

**Mr. Manness:** Maybe it has nothing to do with school. Maybe it is municipal. It has never been identified.

**Mr. Uruski:** Mr. Chairman, now the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is playing games with words. Yes, it has been identified. The Minister of Finance is going to be worried. He has something to worry about because the tenants of the City of Winnipeg, the tenants who are renting, who have received benefits over the years will now have to question themselves, to keep these people in office, are we going to lose our benefits under the Property Tax Credit Program, which was a recognition of school tax payable. Now they are arguing and saying, no, it should be only those who pay the taxes. Well, landlords do pay the taxes, who own apartment blocks and all the apartments the tenants rent from. Is the Member saying that they are the ones that should get the full property tax credit? Well, change the program. If it is good on one side of the ledger, why is it not good on the other? Why are farmers who are actively farming the land and leasing the land somehow not legitimately contributing to the benefits of the community and the community around them? It has been shown—

**Mr. Manness:** Decter was the only guy that ever looked at them. Your guy.

**Mr. Uruski:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) can baffle and throw little curves all he wants. The fact of the matter is he is prepared to have his Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) argue that it is unfair to provide tenants who farm the farm land, who actually physically do the work on the land, with benefits, but on the other hand, we will continue to provide benefits to tenants in apartment blocks. Maybe he had better clear this up, or is he saying to tenants who live in apartment blocks, we are going to cut your benefits

because we really do not believe that tenants contribute to school taxes in the Province of Manitoba, that your rent really does not contribute towards the payment of school taxes.

If that is what he is saying, because obviously that is the argument that he is putting on the table, he has to be saying that because he cannot on one hand argue it this way, and on the other hand in the same program argue exactly the opposite. It will be very interesting. They say, who is getting benefits? All you have to do if you are so concerned about the hobby farmers that have small tracts of land, there is an easy solution for the Minister. All you have to say is that acreages, 40 acres or less, or 100 acres or less, are excluded. We provide no benefits to those people. That is all he has to do.

**Mr. Manness:** Some of them are legitimate farmers.

**Mr. Uruski:** Mr. Chairman, some of them are legitimate farmers. Is not that an interesting revelation, but just two minutes ago we had the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) saying those are not legitimate farmers. Those with small acreages, they are getting benefits when they should not have gotten benefits.

Here we have Conservative logic. On the one hand, you are saying they are not legitimate, exclude them, you gave them benefits for nothing; on the other hand, you are saying some of them are legitimate farmers. Is that not real Conservative logic in terms of this program? This Minister will have a lot of explaining to do in rural Manitoba on this program as farmers pay their taxes.

**Mr. Chairman:** Order, please.

Resolution No. 16: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$12,000,000, for Agriculture, Education Tax Reduction Program for Farmers, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1989—pass.

I would like to draw attention to Members that we are now considering item No. 11., Resolution No. 17, Emergency Interest Rate Relief Program. Is it the will of this section to pass this item? The Honourable Member for Interlake.

\* (2100)

**Mr. Uruski:** Can the Minister indicate, is this a provision for payment under that repayment on that program or write-off?

**Mr. Findlay:** Yes, the \$2.232 million is made up of \$44.6 thousand for administration, \$1.5 million for allowance for doubtful accounts and \$650,000 as the interest on the capital advances from the province.

**Mr. Manness:** I am not going to rise to debate of a former Minister of Agriculture, the Member for Interlake (Mr. Uruski), with respect to education taxes. I just want to revisit this Interest Rate Relief Program just for 30 seconds. I will point out to some new Members of the House how is it politicians at times fall out of esteem with the electorate.



In the election of 1981 there was a promise made to Manitobans that because of ManOil, that new Crown corporation, that farmers and small businessmen and indeed owners of homes that were troubled those times because of high interest rates would not lose either their farms, their homes or their small businesses. What we are discussing under this item is a small remnant, still a very costly one of that program, which even though the intention was well-founded and I do not question the intention, was going to be financed by the profits associated with ManOil. This was one of the major items of the 1981 election campaign.

Mr. Chairman, and indeed Members of the House, I point out the fact that ManOil has lost millions of dollars since and still we have the liability associated with the very good intention of offsetting subsidizing to some degree the high interest rates of the early Eighties. I think that this program will ultimately be completed in two or three years, but it takes sometimes 10 years to finally wind down completely a promise that is made during an election, which is not funded by us.

**Mr. Chairman:** Is it the will of this section to pass this item?

Resolution No. 17: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,232,900 for Agriculture, Emergency Interest Rate Relief Program, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1989—pass.

I would like to now draw the Members' attention to Resolution No. 7, item No. 1.(a) Minister's Salary—the Member for Fort Garry.

**Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry):** This has been an interesting experience for me and certainly one where I felt that I have gained a lot of information. I am certainly not going to spend a great deal of time tonight but I think there are a few areas within the agricultural budget that I would like to highlight as the ones that I think created the most concern, perhaps also the most interest.

The one that I think distinguishes this particular budget from the previous one, of course, is the assistance that was provided for the drought aid. While I certainly have commended the Minister on taking quick action on this, I think that it does indicate that there is one area of deficiency that has not been addressed, and that certainly is the fact that the federal Government has been slower than I think is necessary in making some sort of an announcement as far as the aid to the grain farmers are concerned in the drought area, because the provincial program certainly has covered only two areas, and that is the feed and the herd retention programs for livestock producers. I know, in talking to producers in the drought area, there certainly is concern regarding the lack of any announcement on the assistance from the federal Government.

I am very concerned that this is being used as a political gimmick and I suspect that the announcement will be made probably two or three days before the federal election. The timing may be fine as far as the

political sense is concerned, but my guess would be that this will be a serious backlash to the Conservative Party when it is announced at that late date after farmers have been waiting a significant period of time.

The Prime Minister, a person who already lacks credibility, I would suspect that his credibility would go lower, but that is very difficult for that to occur because it is already as low as it can possibly go. Time will tell what happens after that federal election, and I think that there will be some serious surprises. We will find out how far "Long Chin" gets at that time.

The other areas that I think should be touched upon, and of course that is the whole business of the drought assistance and the fact that I think there is necessity of further drought proofing. The Minister has agreed to this and I think that the areas that we need to be looking at are the whole business of water services. There has been some serious difficulties there and I am sure the Minister will realize and knows that there is that tendency. As soon as the rain starts and the drought seems to be relieved, for the short term at least, there is a tendency to forget about the necessity of further drought proofing. I think that is something that is essential, because regardless of the Government that happens to be in power, if we are faced with another serious drought in a decade or so I do not think any of us can really come up with a valid excuse for not having attempted to do everything within the realm of possibility to make sure that the next drought does not create as serious a problem as it has these past few months.

While one does not want to be accused of being an alarmist, I think we have to take into consideration the possibility that maybe we are on the beginning stages of the greenhouse effect. I think many reputable scientists have already indicated that there is a possibility of more variability from year to year and that we may be looking at more extreme weather conditions, some years faced with excess moisture, other years with excess drought. The fact that we have had the five hottest years on record all occurring in the current decade I think is fair warning that something has to be done.

Another area that considerable concern has been expressed and that is the fact that we have approximately one-half of our farmers utilizing the Crop Insurance Program and something just in excess of half of the acreage being covered. There again this is a program that I think all of us agree is the best program currently available for income stability in terms of drought proofing and that there has to be a mechanism put in place that is going to find out why farmers are not utilizing the program, and what had to be done in order to change it so that it is more attractive to them. I think most farmers agree that it has merit but obviously are shying away from it because there are some areas that they are not totally satisfied with.

Another area that we have spent considerable time on was the whole question of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. Here again I think we are looking at an institution that has provided good service to Manitoba farmers over the years.

Here again, I think that there needs to be some review done with a view to making sure that it is providing

the best possible service that it can to farmers in Manitoba, and that it can be relied upon to continue to be a source of assistance to farmers who are just getting into the business. I think that we have to be somewhat alarmed when we look at the average age picture of Manitoba farmers, realizing that the average age is getting up into the vicinity of what we would regard as approaching normal retirement, and that we are not getting the number of young people into the industry that we require. I do not think we can rely on the traditional lending agencies to be the ones that provide that assistance. So MACC certainly has to be looked upon as a tool in that regard.

\* (2110)

Looking at some of the more specific areas, I was pleased to see that the Minister is looking at providing greater assistance to the weed control districts. I think that the change in farming over the years with the move to continuous cropping has certainly changed the whole weed spectrum in Manitoba and we have to be looking at greater surveillance, greater assistance, in terms of extension to the producers.

Because even as a scientist myself, in the area of plant science, I certainly do not pretend to have a thorough understanding of all the herbicides that are currently available, what they are expected to do, what they can do and so on. I do not think it is realistic to assume that any farmer is keeping up to date with all of these new herbicides and can be expected to get along without a lot of assistance from outside sources, whether it be the Extension Branch or whether it be weed supervisors. Certainly that type of support is necessary and is critical. I think there is a tendency for all of us to underestimate the impact that weeds have on crop production in this country. They are one of the most serious causes of losses to crop production.

I think the other questions that we have to address are, should there not be greater use being made of our soil testing facilities. Probably the question is even more relevant when we look at the utilization of our feed testing facilities, an area where I would anticipate that there is considerable saving to be made by producers if they were to utilize that facility more extensively, and of course it is not one that is being used to its capacity at the present time.

We have also discussed in considerable detail the various aspects of income stabilization, looking at the specific commodities, and in this province we spent our time looking primarily at the beef, hogs and the two small ones that we spoke of earlier today, the sugar beets and the beans. But I think that it is time that we started to give serious consideration to moving to income stability as opposed to the stabilization of individual commodities. The Minister has indicated a willingness to certainly investigate this, but I think the time frame that he was talking about may be a little too slow. I would like to see that investigation of the various proposed income stability programs looked at very quickly with a view to trying to move in that direction very soon.

Finally, Mr. Chairperson, we spent quite a bit of time this evening with this whole business of the school tax

reduction program. I certainly am not going to get embroiled in that discussion tonight, but I do feel that it is time that we look at the removal of the education support from realty taxes and from farm property. I do not think that it is equitable the present way that it is set up. I do not think that it is a fair way of coming up with the financing that is necessary for the education system.

While I certainly appreciate the comments that were made by my colleague from the Interlake (Mr. Uruski), I, at this time, have to indicate that my view would be that the tax rebate should go to the person who owns the land. I cannot see any mechanism where you can pay the tax rebate and call it that if it is turned over to the renter. If the intent is to provide additional support for farmers who are renting land, then there has to be a mechanism whereby that can be done. But I have to agree with the Minister that there is no logical way of making a rebate on taxes if it is not going to the person who pays the tax.

The assumption has to be made that if you are renting land, you are operating on a supply-demand basis for the rental of that land. I rent accommodation here in the city. If I know that the owner of that property is getting a tax rebate, then I am going to be pushing very hard when I go to get my rental agreement within the next time that I get my share of that. I am sure that farmers in this province are astute enough to know exactly who is paying the taxes and, if the owner is getting a rebate, they are going to go to that owner and try to negotiate a better deal for the rental. I guess what I am saying is that what I have heard from the Member for Interlake today has convinced me, if I ever needed convincing, that I will never be a socialist.

**Some Honourable Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Laurie Evans:** And so while some of this—and obviously they are quite happy knowing that I will never cross the floor. The Member for Interlake certainly accomplished one thing by further convincing me that I was on the right track. I think that the way it is being done now, I certainly have some sympathy with the concept that if you have got major speculators out there, there should be some way of curtailment that. But at the same time, I think one also has to appreciate the need for venture capital in this country without somebody who is willing to go out and invest some money and take some chances here. That is what drives this economy.

Therefore, I appreciate that there may be some necessity for fine-tuning of the program. There have been some changes made in that this year. The concept that maybe the upper limit should be increased to \$1,000 or whatever, or change the percentage, these are all things that I am sure can be looked at. But I think that it is a step in the right direction to start to remove this education tax from farm property but, at the same time, I do not think we should be ever in a situation where those who owe taxes have it relieved entirely while others get only a percentage.

So with that, Mr. Chairperson, I think it would be appropriate at this time to thank the Minister for his

Monday, October 24, 1988

efforts and to thank the Minister's staff. I felt that the Minister had given us very open answers and I appreciated his willingness to do that. Once again, I appreciate the fact that the Minister had patience because, being in office in this House, there are probably questions that he thought under his breath, "surely to God, he knows that sort of thing," but he never let it out or at least his facial expression never belied the fact that he was being somewhat critical of the type of questions I asked.

So with that, Mr. Chairperson, I think it would be very frivolous on my part to move any such amendment that would reduce the Minister's Salary. I think that in this case and the little time I have spent in here, I am satisfied that everybody is underpaid for the type of work they are doing. Certainly, I am quite anxious to see the Minister get back on the job and get ready for the next Budget.

**Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill):** When I rose in this particular set of Estimates, almost a month ago, September 29, to seek some further assistance from the Minister respecting the use of the Port of Churchill for the shipping season, I did not think that I would be standing here still speaking in these Estimates after it appears as if the Port of Churchill's shipping season is over.

Unfortunately, from the Minister's perspective, I am sure, the Estimates went on longer than we had anticipated, and certainly unfortunately from everyone else's perspective it appears as if the shipping season for the Port of Churchill may well be over.

I have had some conversation with the (Interjection)- I am sorry, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Penner) says it went on longer than we expected. I am trying to determine whether that was the Estimates or the Port of Churchill shipping season, because the shipping season should have gone on longer than it has. I am assuming and perhaps it is an incorrect assumption, and I hope it is, but I am assuming from the information that has been given to me that we have seen the end of this year's shipping season with a total of two ships. I am told that the last ship took all the grain from the elevator, that there is no more grain at Churchill. So there would have to be shipping to get it up to Churchill. The Minister knows that when we had conversations earlier with CN and the Wheat Board as to how long that would take, it would take at least 10 days and more than likely a couple of weeks in order to get grain up there from the announcement that there would be a ship. That was at the beginning of the season. I assume it would be the same at the end of the season.

Given that we are now in late October, given that the Russian ship that came in has taken all the grain out and it appears as if they are starting the shutdown operations for the port, I think the assumption can be made that it is the end of the season and a very bad season for the Port of Churchill. So I would ask the Minister first if he has had any information to the contrary with respect to future contracts or with respect to extending that season or with respect to the operations which appear to have been started to close down the port facility for this shipping season.

\* (2120)

**Mr. Findlay:** If it turns out that two ships are it, it is indeed an unfortunate season for the Port of Churchill. But I have no more information about the Wheat Board, where they are at in terms of negotiations for any more for this year or anything else. We have heard nothing more, I have had no more reports. Maybe the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger) might have some additional information but I do not.

**Mr. Cowan:** I have asked the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger) almost daily or on every occasion that I had the opportunity to speak to him as he passes by this seat on his way in and out of the House as to whether or not he has heard any more news on another ship. Each time, I believe he does so sincerely and with regret, but he tells me that no, they have not had any more information. So I can only assume that there are not any more ships forthcoming, which I think is regrettable. I thought we had an opportunity to try and put in place the icebreakers that could extend the season this year. There was every reason to do so. I do not want to be overly pessimistic and I certainly do not want to give up hope. I would hope that the Government is, as are Members of the Opposition, still pressuring the federal Government to get icebreakers in place and pressuring the Canadian Wheat Board to the extent that we can get contracts which would enable us to turn at least a bit of the crisis into at least a bit of an opportunity this year. I am not certain that can be done.

I would ask the Minister if he has had an opportunity to write to the Western Canadian Wheat Growers' Association, as he indicated he would do or he would have the committee do on September 29, to assure them that the Port of Churchill had the full support of the Government and the Legislature and that if there was any misconception that could arise from their comments in their article of two months ago now with respect to the viability and the cost effectiveness of the Port of Churchill, we would lay those to rest and put on the record very clearly that the Port of Churchill does provide significant cost benefits to farmers in the Churchill catchment area for shipments of grain to many eastern European and many other ports from the Churchill catchment area.

**Mr. Findlay:** After our discussion on September 29, as you indicated, I have directed staff to take those estimates and put together a letter that summed up the opinion that we wanted to present about our support for the Port of Churchill. I think that letter also needs to be extended beyond just the support that we see for it this year but the support that we want to see in place for coming years, for the keeping an eye open to getting shipments through that port looked at much earlier in the year than what we have seen this particular year. I think movement to stimulate action for that port needs to occur some number of months earlier than what we got into this year. If we are going to see a viable shipping season for '89 and '90, there has to be earlier action.

I can just mention to the Member that I have inquired at the odd elevator here most recently, and elevators

Monday, October 24, 1988

are very short on grain right now. What grain was there has moved east and west very rapidly. Certainly, certain parts of the province have very little grain left on the farms. Other than maybe the area of northeastern Saskatchewan and northwestern Saskatchewan and the north of the Riding Mountain area of Manitoba, which did receive some rain this year, those are the only areas that are going to have much grain left come next spring because there has been such a movement out already, amazingly fast. I have never seen grain elevators empty in October in this province for years. I cannot ever remember when you would go to the elevator in October and see them empty and know that you do not have much grain left on the farm to haul. It is almost a scary situation from the farmers' perspective.

**Mr. Cowan:** Mr. Chairperson, it is certainly scary for the farmers. It is also quite scary for the community of Churchill, the employees at the Port of Churchill and the managers at the Port of Churchill and, as the Minister indicates, everyone in the business. What we did see happen this year I think is unfortunate and regrettable. We may differ as to where we place the blame and how we apportion the blame in this House. I happen to think that the Canadian Wheat Board could be more aggressive in promoting the Port of Churchill. I happen to think that the federal Government could have been more aggressive in sharing that. We did take advantage of the chance to send shipments out late in this year by the station of icebreakers there. I think they could be more aggressive in a lot of other areas.

I think perhaps the provincial Government, although I appreciate what they have done, could have been more aggressive in respect to promoting the Port of Churchill and getting on board earlier. I think that perhaps the Liberals could have supported our initial resolution, which would have given us a two-week head start instead of voting against that resolution for an emergency debate. While we have worked together in large part on the Port of Churchill, there are still some significant differences in approach and the extent to which we see the issues a bit differently.

As MLA for the area, I am going into the debate with a particular strong bias for the Port of Churchill, as would any MLA who had a similar sort of crisis in their own constituency come about the way that one did. I think we have done as a caucus all that we can do now. We were not as successful as we would have liked to have been. We know that there should have been more done, but we cannot let some sense of failure stand in the way of looking at next year, which is going to be even more difficult if I am hearing the Minister right in his answer.

That is something that we have said all along that, given the circumstances and the way in which the Port of Churchill is structured and its shipments are structured, the excuse for a drought being in place did not really apply as much this year as it will next year. So now we have a situation where we had an extremely bad year. Although we are thankful for two ships, it was not nearly enough nor was it nearly what it could have been, and we know that next year could be worse. One can say, how can it be any worse than this year, but it could be worse unless we as a Government and

a Legislature and Opposition Parties work very hard together, starting now to make certain that we do not let the same sort of circumstances happen again next year.

We know that there are very powerful lobbying forces out there against the Port of Churchill. We have seen it in the Western Canadian Wheat Growers' Association magazine. We have seen it in the newspapers. We have seen it in statements from different organizations. There are those groups that are aligned against the Port of Churchill. Our concern has always been that, if you had no ships this year or just two ships or three ships this year and you have no ships next year or just one, two or three ships next year, that you have turned around the precedent. What you have is a port that is not being used instead of a port that is being used, although we always said it was being underused and only marginally used.

You have an entirely different set of circumstances, and you start to have tremendous impacts on the community with respect to morale, pride, a sense of the future, optimism. The whole community starts to be torn asunder because of those doubts, because of insecurity and uncertainty over the future. You have people who start to leave the community who can leave because they become pessimistic. Then you have a snowball that begins incrementally with one bad year and then two bad years that takes away from the Port of Churchill and the community of Churchill all that we have been able to accomplish over the past 10 years or 20 years. It starts to turn around the whole mentality about the port. We can lose the Port of Churchill. That is what really concerns me, we can lose the Port of Churchill. That is what is at stake here.

I hope the Minister will write that letter now because, as he says, we are going to have to start earlier this year than last year. Well there is no time like the present to start when it comes to the Port of Churchill. As I have in the past, I will again offer any assistance which I can give to the Minister or the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger), or to my colleagues in the Liberal caucus or to any group or organization that wants to promote the Port of Churchill and wants to ensure its greater use.

\* (2130)

I just want to make one other point. Last time, when we discussed this issue in the Estimates, I had about anywhere from 2,500 to 3,000 cards which I brought forward in support of the Port of Churchill. I want you to know that we have not brought those cards to the attention of the Minister responsible at Canadian Wheat Board yet because we do not know who the Minister responsible is going to be in the next instance but, secondly, because the cards are still coming in at a rate of 20 to 50 a day on average. It is simply amazing how much support there is for the Port of Churchill, and more recently, because we have sent the cards out of province more recently, most of the cards are from Saskatchewan and Alberta, although we are still getting a large number of cards back from Manitoba. That means we have probably received, I am guessing, anywhere from 350 to 550 or 600 cards since we last talked about this issue.

Monday, October 24, 1988

I have a letter here today which I just received today. It is dated the 17th but it just came in today's mail. I want to read it because I think it shows just how much support there is out in the province and outside of the province for the Port of Churchill, and if it gives us any encouragement and any motivation and any further commitment and enhances that commitment or helps us work harder on the Port of Churchill, I think it will be of value.

It is from the Rural Municipality of Paddockwood No. 520 in Saskatchewan. I am not familiar with it. To put the letter in the proper context, when we sent out the cards—again, the cards ask people to show support. They were addressed to Charlie Mayer, Minister responsible for the Wheat Board and asked them to indicate support for the Port of Churchill and to ask that the Canadian Wheat Board ensure that the Port of Churchill get its fair share of shipments. We asked the people to sign and put their name and address. We sent five to each of the municipalities in the Hudson Bay Route Association area. They are not municipalities that are directly affiliated with the Hudson Bay Route Association specifically, they are just municipalities in the catchment area and the Municipality of Paddockwood is one of those.

We just received this letter today. It is addressed to myself. It says, "Dear Sir: Would you please send us some more of the support cards for supporting the Port of Churchill. Members of council signed the five that were sent and we can use some more for council, and I also have some other very interested ratepayers. Thank you for giving us an opportunity to express our desires. Yours truly, Carole Moritz, Administrator for the Rural Municipality of Paddockwood."

We received other returns from municipalities where they did not ask for more cards but they took the cards we had given them and xeroxed them, so we have the xeroxed copies of the cards and then they had each of the councillors fill them in. The reason we only sent out five was because we were running out of cards at that time. We wanted to get the cards out into the mail.

We have, as I indicated earlier, received widespread indications of support through Manitoba, through Saskatchewan and Alberta particularly. Out of all the cards we sent out, and we sent out about 10,000, we received two returns that were not supportive of the Port of Churchill. One, and I do not have it with me, was a municipality in Alberta and the other was a non-indication of either support or lack of support.

It was from the mayor of Winnipeg. I have to tell you that it was our error when we sent out the cards because we were doing it quickly. We addressed it to Reeve Norrie instead of Mayor Mr. Norrie and we got a letter back from Mayor Norrie saying that he was a mayor and not a reeve and he was concerned that we would make that mistake and certainly we knew better. He did not mention a thing about the Port of Churchill, which can only tell me that his priorities are more with his title than with the Port of Churchill. I do not want to be unfair to him. It has been a few weeks since we received that letter and we have not received any further indication from him. We thought he would have at least said oh, by the way, I support the Port of Churchill or something to that effect.

Those are the only two letters we received that were either negative or noncommittal. The rest have been very strong in support of the Port of Churchill. That feeling is out there. We had to argue pretty hard at the beginning that farmers who shipped the grain, municipalities who depend upon those farmers for a lot of their tax base and their existence are in large part in support of the continued and enhanced use of the Port of Churchill.

When we sent those letters out in the first instance we were not certain of what sort of return we would receive, but I have never seen that sort of return in any other mailing I have done in 11 years in this House, and I have done a lot of mailings.

I think it shows that this is an issue that transcends political boundaries. I think we have showed that in the House to the extent that we can, and I have tried to approach this from as non-partisan a basis as I can, although from time to time, as the Minister says, it was difficult. I think I did a fairly credible job, although I did slip from time to time, because I think this does transcend political boundaries. I think this is too important to let it be sidetracked by partisanship and political battles, although I enjoy partisanship and political battles most of the time. But I think this issue is one that the crisis was just too imminent and the results of not being able to deal with it positively were too devastating to take any chances whatsoever.

We may have to resort to partisanship over time, but I hope not. I hope we can learn from the lessons we had this year about getting started as soon as we can, keeping that ball rolling and working as hard as we can. I look forward to being able to discuss next year how successful we have been between now and the next set of Estimates in making certain that the Port of Churchill gets its fair share of grain shipments which is 3 percent. It is unfortunate that we were not more successful this year. I know the workers in the community are depressed right now, despondent, but I think we can help a bit by renewing our commitment to the fight, and renewing our energies and moving ahead from this point in time.

So I hope that letter goes forth very soon. I hope the committee continues to meet and I hope that we are able to build on the widespread support, probably over 3,000 cards now that are out there, that has been indicated to us for the Port of Churchill and ensure a better future starting next year for the Port.

**Mr. Chairman:** Is it the will of the section to pass this item? The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**Mr. Findlay:** I would just make a few brief comments on the Port of Churchill. Certainly, with the ability of the Legislature to approach the issue in a non-partisan way when the three Parties got together, I know that we had an impact on the Canadian Wheat Board. We had an impact on letting them know of the will that existed here, and I will congratulate the Members over there for initiating the cards to the municipalities in the catchment area to solicit their support. I think maybe they are even surprised at the number of cards that came back, which is a strong indication that there is

a good feeling out there that the Port should be maintained.

I will also tell the Members that the feeling, I think, in the farm community has grown somewhat in the last two or three years because of two issues that are on farmers' minds with regard to shipping grain East.

One is the two stoppages that occurred on the St. Lawrence Seaway, each for about three weeks without any ability to get around those stoppages. It was just blocked and ships were locked in or locked out and the farmers could not ship their grain. So there is concern about the long-term ability of that seaway to move grain consistently when we get back to high export years and, secondly, is the cost of shipping grain out that way. There is concern that cost is going to skyrocket in coming years and be uncontrollable. The Port of Churchill—we have well documented that the cost under normal—everything else being equal, can be beneficial to the producers of western Canada. Since it is going straight into the ocean from the Port of Churchill, there is no way there could be blockages other than ice. That, I think, probably can be addressed. I think most people looking at the technology we have on icebreakers, know that we can address that problem with a month on either end of the shipping season to improve our ability to export more than 3 percent of our total export volume.

So I think there is certainly a will out there. There is a desire among us in this Legislature and we have had an impact on the Wheat Board. I think we also have to keep in mind that the Port of Churchill's ability to survive does not depend completely on or totally on grain. I think the idea of a national park up there, and improving the tourism activity at the Port will also help the Port of Churchill as a community to survive. It is our commitment on this side—I cannot speak for the particular Minister responsible—but I know that the commitment is here in a general sense, that we want to see initiatives that will be in overall, stimulating and supportive to the Port of Churchill and beyond just the grain sector.

There is no question that the letter will get sent and we, together with the Minister of Transport and through the committee, the all-legislative committee, will do what we need to do to maximize our opportunities for a shipping season in 1989.

**Mr. Chairman:** Is it the will of the section to pass item 1.(a) Minister's Salary? The Honourable Member for Interlake.

**Mr. Uruski:** Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a few comments and indicate to the Minister that I have certainly enjoyed participating in the debate on his Estimates. There is no doubt in my mind that he does have a good cadre of staff who are very supportive of the Minister, whoever it is, and I am sure as he is, very proud of the support that he receives.

I want to restate just a number of brief points during these Estimates that bring me and I am sure many in rural Manitoba concern, and that is the one issue that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) became involved

in. That is the issue of the statement that there was an increase of 50 percent in the agricultural budget which, Mr. Chairman, was not accurate. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) actually confirmed that was the case when he raised the point, or brought forward the point of the write-offs under MACC. When one compares budget-over-budget, which is the accurate way of comparing, one looks at an increase in the 20 percent range, year-over-year, if one was to compare budgets-over-budgets of similar amounts.

\* (2140)

So it is really unfortunate that this Minister got caught up in the political agenda of his Minister of Finance, to try and show that they were doing something that they were not. Notwithstanding that, I want to say and I said it before, that the aid within the budget, the drought aid for cattle producers, both the Greenfeed and the Cow Retention Programs will be responded to positively, I am sure, by most in the farm community. I am sure most are appreciative of that support, as well as I am, on behalf of the constituents that I represent.

One other area that I would like to make comment on is this Government's, what I would call "blind faith" in the whole area of trade. There has not been at least a critical analysis in the sense of this Government taking its own course on the question of this agreement. It is not a question that somehow those who are in opposition to this deal are somehow timid as far as trade goes. That really is not the issue. In the agriculture community the majority of goods now move without barriers. They have in the main over the last 20 years. The enhancement of trade by all the initiatives that the Minister is continuing, that were begun by myself and Ministers before us, both of Conservative stripe and NDP stripe, those initiatives on trade enhancement continue. That is not the issue in this debate. It is an issue that I believe this Minister should be an advocate for the farm community and should be taking some of the concerns that have been raised both on the marketing board side. I know that the marketing boards are very cautious in this one. They are not certain, they are not sure but there are concerns about the trade.

Just as of today, Mr. Chairman, the latest move on the U.S. side about the question of the U.S. taking action against the Canadian Wheat Board. Several months ago, in fact, at the beginning of August the Canadian Wheat Board Advisory Committee basically raised its concerns about the free trade deal. They are in a very difficult position because they work under the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, who is an advocate for this deal, but they raised very serious concerns of this trade deal on the Wheat Board. The rumblings are coming out fairly loud and clear as to what the intentions of the U.S. side are in this whole area. Their laws for at least the foreseeable future will apply vis-a-vis any countervailing actions and any other actions that they may wish to take. Farmers need the protection of a Minister of Agriculture to become a strong spokesman on their behalf, and it should not be just said, well, our farmers can compete with the best. I am sure they can compete, but the circumstances of what occurs in the United States is far different than

Monday, October 24, 1988

what occurs here in this country. We have to recognize that, so that this Minister should really, rather than being what I would consider a puppy dog on behalf of farmers, should become a loud spokesperson. I guess one could almost call him a pitbull terrier on behalf of farmers, that he fights and fights hard on behalf of the farm community. That is what he will be known as, a good representative for the farmers of this province.

The question of the appointment of boards—only one board I raise and that was the firing of the Family Farm Protection Board which I view as being very partisan on behalf of the Minister when that board was in fact established by having representatives and recommendations from all Parties in the Legislature. I have never argued against it and I have said that the Minister has the right, as the Minister responsible, to make appointment changes. It is only this board that I believe the Minister went too far on his changes.

Second lastly, Mr. Chairman, the drought aid—we need the Minister to speak out and push his federal colleagues into making an announcement as soon as possible in terms of what might be expected. It may not have the total number in terms of global amount but certainly an announcement can be made that here are the parameters of the program, because they know generally what data in the worst hit areas are already by virtue of the claims that have been filed against the Crop Insurance Corporation.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, the changes in the Farm School Tax Program are ones that really separate us from the Conservative Party in terms of their program providing benefits to those who are either not directly involved in farming and in fact are there as investment purposes. We believe that any tax benefits under this program, if they are going to be paid to individuals, should be paid to those who are actually farming.

I also thank the Minister for his candidness in most of the Estimates with the exception of this one area because he has clearly, clearly left out, and left thousands of farm families losing benefits under his changes to the program.

There is one specific question I have yet. I ask the Minister, we did not discuss the question of the Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute. Nowhere could I see any reference made to it in the Supplementary Review. I ask the Minister whether PAMI and Manitoba's contribution to PAMI is continuing. The Minister confirms that. I would have assumed that in the Supplementary Information, it would have been within the Technical Services or that area there. But the Minister assured me that area continues as it has in the past. I want to thank him for listening to my comments in this debate.

**Mr. Findlay:** I will get the last word in yet.

I would like to thank both my critics for the constructive nature of the discussion throughout the last four weeks and now tonight starts the fifth week. As I recall, we started on a Monday night four weeks ago tonight. It has been a long process. I would like to publicly congratulate my staff on the support they gave me. Throughout the process of Estimates, it has

been a learning process for me. I appreciate the discussion throughout even though we might have got a little carried away on the education tax but that is the way things are.

I will just mention to the last Member who spoke about the trade deal. I will tell him that as recently as this morning, myself, plus the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst), met with about 30 producers representing a complete cross section of farmers, farm organizations in the Province of Manitoba. If I was to put numbers down, I would say out of the 30 that were there probably 20 to 25 support the deal and the other five would be neutral. If there were any concerns about trade, it was with interprovincial trade barriers, not with the trade going north and south. There are certain problems in the country between provinces particularly that the processing sector is having. Those are issues that have to be dealt with also in the process of getting freer access to markets in North America for Manitoba producers.

It has been a good constructive debate and I appreciate your comments. You have opened up a few areas of concern that we will be able to address in the coming months before we get back into this process again. I thank you.

\* (2150)

**Mr. Chairman:** Is it the will of the committee section to pass item 1.(a) Minister's Salary—pass.

Resolution No. 7: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,015,900 for Agriculture, Administration and Finance, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1989—pass.

We will now recess this section of the Committee of Supply until ten o'clock.

## RECESS

\* (2200)

**Mr. Chairman:** The hour being 10 p.m., committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

## IN SESSION HOUSE BUSINESS

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, prior to adjourning for the evening, there is a duty I must perform and that is to announce to Honourable Members that the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources will sit tomorrow morning at 10 a.m. in Room 255. This is, I understand, agreeable to the House Leaders for both Opposition Parties.

## COMMITTEE CHANGE

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have a committee change to make. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema), that the composition of the Standing Committee on

**Monday, October 24, 1988**

---

Public Utilities and Natural Resources be amended as follows: the Honourable Member for Niakwa (Mr. Herold Driedger) for the Honourable Member for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor).

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The hour being 10 p.m., this House is now adjourned until tomorrow at 1:30 p.m. (Tuesday).