

TIME: 8:00 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY
ESTIMATES - EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN: We broke at the Private Members' Hour. We were on Resolution 51(f)(1) Special Programs and Projects: Salaries \$181,800. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister intended, over the supper hour, to provide some answers in this area of special projects and special programs. I had asked him for an explanation of the additional programs that involved an increase of over 100 percent in the appropriations that he's requesting now as compared with the appropriation that he requested last year for the same department and the Minister asked for some time in which to obtain this information.

The second question was relating to the career education project and it was pointed out, Mr. Chairman, that this project began in 1973 with a \$13,000 allocation of funds, and then in 1974 the expenditure was \$16,000. There was a further expenditure in 1975 and 1976 and the Minister was unable to tell us exactly how much those amounts were. I wonder if he has that information now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Brandon West asked some questions about special programs and projects and I did undertake to provide him with the explanation. His questions, as I understood them, are primarily of an accounting nature and I have a reconciliation of the figures between last year's printed estimates for 1976-77 and this year's printed estimates for the year ending March 31, 1978.

Last year's estimates book showed under the column details of appropriation \$125,000, and the figure that the member wants us to provide information about is how we get from \$125,000 shown last year to the \$287,400 shown in the comparable column for this year's estimates.

The reconciliation provided by my staff is as follows: there were transfers in of total staff cost of \$84,100; there were transfers in of other expenditures of \$27,300; and in addition to that there was an increase, for a new program, of \$51,000.00. If you take those three figures it totals to \$162,400.00. If you take the printed figure of \$125,000 for last year and total \$162,400 and \$125,000 you come to \$287,400 as indicated in this year's estimates book.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentioned a new program. What was the new program, specifically, \$51,000.00?

MR. TURNBULL: There was an increase in Canadian studies of \$26,500 and an increase for the implementation of the co-operative education project of \$24,500 making the total of \$51,000 that I mentioned. How's that, Jim, is that brief enough?

MR. MCGILL: The Canadian studies program is not really a new program, that is an addition to that ongoing program in that respect and the co-operative studies program is interpreted by the Minister to be a new study undertaken by the department. I think, Mr. Chairman, the Minister got the first part of that. The second figure given to me was for co-operative studies program. Is that a new program being undertaken by the department?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, this program is not a new program. It has been developing primarily in co-op development services and this amount of money, \$24,500 is the amount of money we have in our budget for the implementation of that program. That is the piloting and, I guess, feedback of that program as it is implemented in the schools.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the career education project. There was a question put to the Minister, how much money went to this project in 1975 and in the year 1976.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, the funds in 1973 were \$13,000 and the funds in 1974 were \$16,000.00. In 1975 and 1976 the department provided a half SMY for this project and the intention of that person working on it half-time was to review and supplement the program. This person's work will continue on that basis for this fiscal year of 1976-77. He is involved in direct consultative process with the teachers.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I understand it's a half SMY. I presume that's the co-ordinator of the project. What was the amount of money involved in 1975 and in 1976?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, the point I was making was that there was money provided in 1973 and in 1974 but in 1975 and in 1976 we were provided with personnel resources. In other words, what would be the equivalent would be the half of that person's salary. And it's a professional person so it would be likely, the half amount would likely be equivalent to the average of the two amounts provided in 1973 and 1974.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, my curiosity is being aroused. If I understand the Minister in his remarks I believe he said that the input of staff would require a further \$81,000.00. How many of his staff does this cover, and what does that staff do?

MR. TURNBULL: I am going over in my mind, Mr. Chairman, all the remarks that I have made in the last week of my estimates and I don't recall the figure that the Member for Swan River now attaches to what we are discussing: namely career education. Let me repeat in 1973 the figure, I understand, was \$13,000, in 1974 it was \$16,000 . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. TURNBULL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In 1975 it was half of a staff person, and in 1976 it was the same thing, and in 1976-77 it will be the same thing, so I don't understand where we get the dollar figure that he mentioned.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, I may have misunderstood the Minister a few moments ago when he was replying to the question put by the Honourable Member for Brandon West. And I made a note here and he said at one point the new program was \$51,000, and the input of new staff, or the input of staff, would require \$81,000, and I'm simply asking how many of a staff and what is that staff doing for \$81,000.00?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I see the problem that the Member for Swan River has, now. He rose to make his contribution during the time that the Member for Brandon West and I were . . . discussing career education and I was giving information about career education.

The figures that the Member for Swan River is talking about, I believe, relate to the reconciliation and addition in program that I was providing for the vote that we are now discussing which is vote 51(f) and I was explaining to the Member for Brandon West how we got from last year's Estimates, a printed figure of \$125,000, to the total of \$287,400 which is shown in this year's Estimates Book. And I gave him the figures and I said, "Well, the reason for the increase from \$125,000 to \$287,400 was that we transferred in staff and their salary positions accumulated to \$84,000, other expenditures \$27,000 and then there was an increase in new program of \$51,000." The Member for Brandon West then asked me for detail on the \$51,000 and I said, "Well that was as a result of \$26,500 for an increase in Canadian studies and \$24,500 for the implementation of the Co-op Education project." Does that explain to the member? —(Interjection)— It does. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(f)(1). The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I just have one brief question for the Minister. The special projects are Consumer Education, what was it, Classroom Arts, Canadian Studies, Youth and the Law, Labour Education, REAP is involved I think —(Interjection)— no, it's not eh, Outdoor Education or something like that. How do they arrive at these special projects? Does the directive come from the department or the research people feel that these are the fields that should come under the item of Special Projects?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, the question answered by the Member for Roblin predates, of course, my arrival on the scene as Minister of Education. The information I have, however, is that some of these projects were generated in the old curriculum branch and in the research and planning branch of years gone by. It was generated there and you know they've been carried forward. Many of them are, I think, of considerable value to young people.

MR. McKENZIE: Then of those that I listed the REAP Program is out. We can stroke that one out and the . . . Are there any others of those that were in the annual report that are now obsolete?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Roblin is correct, I believe the REAP Program is no longer. I do not think it ever was in this appropriation although I would have to check that. that but I think that's the case. And there was one other that you mentioned, Outdoor Education. I don't think that is in here. It's not in my House Book as a program that is described here. The others that you mentioned, though, are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the Minister whether this area of Special Programs and Projects includes anything in the way of instruction in Canadian political institutions and the political system of the country, or whether that is covered in another area more directly related to the formal curriculum, or whether it is covered at all?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I think any educated, trained, experienced, competent teacher teaching Canadian history or Canadian geography would teach what used to be called and what he and I are familiar with, civics. I believe it is still in the various curricula for the teaching of Canadian history.

The Special Projects, of course, that we have here relate to the increase in the use of Canadian materials and I had earlier today and I think I still have it, a book which I think the team should be particularly proud of; it's called "In Search of Canadian Material." It's a bibliography. It lists materials developed in Canada, printed in Canada I believe, that are available for use in our schools and material that is at the level of the children in the schools. So this is the kind of thing that this Project group does. Does that answer your question?

MR. SHERMAN: Just so long as I'm assured, Mr. Speaker, that there is not a gap in the system where the Canadian political system and the institutions of the country are ignored. If the Minister is

assuring me that that is covered in a course that we used to refer to as civics and that was usually taught with a maximum of boredom and dullness and with a minimum of imagination — (Interjection)— Well, that's part of political life, that's true, and certainly that aspect of political life should not be overlooked but nonetheless that's probably part of all walks of life. As long as I have some assurance that that area has not been dropped completely — I'm not aware that civics as such, under that name at any rate, is still taught in our schools but I may be under a mistaken impression there.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I was saying that what the Member for Fort Garry and I used to know as a civics course, for which there used to be a green-covered 200-page book — I don't think the book is used any more, it may still be on the authorized reading list, I can't recall offhand — but the material in it, I think, is taught and is in various curricula. The politics themselves, if that's what you are talking about, are something that I believe likely should be introduced in the school in one form or another but I'm sure the Member for Fort Garry knows that this is a very contentious issue for reasons that have always eluded me. I think that our citizens, our young people growing up to be adults and citizens, likely should become familiar with their civic rights, with their civil rights, and with the political system while they are in school. I think that would be desirable because I think it would result, for example, hopefully, in higher turn-outs for school board elections, something which I think would be very desirable.

I have not asked staff or even questioned anyone on my staff about politics per se in the school curriculum or whether or not we should undertake a special project, but if the Member for Fort Garry and his party would like to make a speech to that end, I can assure you that I will attempt to do what I can as Minister of Education to have the study of politics, in its broad and non-partisan sense, introduced in the school system. I think it would be very useful.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I don't know that I'm prepared to accept the Minister's invitation to make a speech on it at this moment, although I have in the past made reference to what I feel is an important area of education that is too often overlooked and as the Member for Fort Rouge suggests, that it may be because — or suggests by implication — the subject has a tendency to be somewhat dull and tedious in its presentation. That's probably due to the fact that we have a shortage or a paucity of teachers who are equipped to teach that subject with imagination and with excitement, with the excitement that it deserves. I would simply leave the thought with the Minister that I think there are people on both sides of this House who are interested in ensuring that that very important aspect of education and life is not completely overlooked. I recognize the difficulties and the tightrope that must be walked to avoid partisan politicking, but I think that there are certain fundamentals about the evolution of our system that are important and that should be conveyed. I fear that there are far too many young people who don't really appreciate the evolution of the system and the evolution of our institutions and I would like to leave the thought with the Minister that when he's considering special projects and programs for the future, that that is one area that is deserving of consideration. It need not necessarily be handled specifically within the strict sense of the school-day curriculum. I could foresee its being accommodated through the medium of a special project or program. So I just leave that thought with him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, the previous comments of the Member from Fort Garry bring to mind my own experience when I was first teaching and having to do freshman political science from that fine book called Government of Canada by McGregor Dawson and someone said to me the only way you could make it interesting is if you stripped naked and colored your nose red, that was the only way you could keep people awake more than five minutes in a classroom and I suspect that may be one of the particular problems. There is just no way you can make the BNA Act I suppose sound like a pulp novel but that was not the reason I rose to my feet.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to raise with the Minister a concern of mine that I think may appear in later references when we talk about financing but I think also deserves some examination under this topic of Special Projects and that is the apparent unwillingness up to this stage of the Department of Education to support in any tangible way the promotion of the community school concept in the City of Winnipeg. As we all have come to understand, I would hope, there is a number of pretty dramatic changes going on in the nature of education in the city, that there is just a number of pressures and conditions which were probably not apparent many years back and one of the responses that have been initiated, oftentimes by local community organizations and sometimes by school board members, has been the introduction of community school projects.

I think in, if my memory holds me correct, there is a community school program going at William Whyte, one at Shaughnessy Heights, Shaughnessy Park School and just in this last year I was involved in initiating one in the Fort Rouge School which is an elementary school in my own riding. The reason for initiating such activities, Mr. Chairman, are that it is one way of trying to regenerate a degree of commitment on the part of the surrounding community to a school in the activities of

education in the broad sense of the word, but many of these schools have children in them who come from a variety of different cultural backgrounds, oftentimes are transient in their own housing location. I think that the kind of statistics that appear in about some 25 to 30 inner city schools is that the mobility rate of children is anywhere from 30 to 70 or 80, sometimes close to 100 percent and these create special problems for the school and one of the answers that have been tried has been to develop a community school concept which is in some fundamental respects quite different from that of the traditional school setting primarily by introducing people into the school system whose main function it is to help organize in the outside community, both amongst parents, amongst children and amongst adults in the area, a variety of educational options that not just utilize a school building but also try to introduce a variety of educational programs that are particularly relevant to that community.

So I can indicate to the Minister that in the case of the Fort Rouge School where a community school program has just been initiated, programs such as a noon-hour program to look after children because a large number of the parents are single working mothers, in its first month of operation had something like 45 to 50 children per noon-hour of a total school population of 120 which indicates a very strong demand for that kind of service which wasn't provided before and, in fact, tracing that particular problem back a little bit we found out that many parents, because they were working, were forced to find babysitters at noon hours and to make all kinds of ad hoc arrangements which have now been covered in the school.

Now the range of programs goes much wider than simply providing that kind of noon-hour, after four, weekend program but the question that concerns me is that generally these programs have to be supported by a series of make work projects, LIP grants, Manpower grants, sometimes special grants from the school board and the Department of Education has been extremely reluctant to provide any endorsement of this kind of position.

MR. TURNBULL: I truly hesitate to rise on a point of order but I know the Member for Fort Rouge was otherwise occupied when we looked over the appropriation or vote rather, Resolution 49(2) Evaluation, Research and Policy Analysis. I believe it was on Friday. We did discuss this matter of community involvement in schools, community use of schools then. It is not a topic really fitting for discussion under Resolution 51(f) which is what we are now discussing. However, for the members benefit there is money provided under 53, the major amount there for grants for schools and we could discuss it then. I leave it to you, Mr. Chairman, as to whether or not you wish to abide by what I think is really a speech being made by the Member for Fort Rouge which is not in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member would raise that item that he is raising now under the School Grants, under Resolution 50(a).

MR. AXWORTHY: . . . point of order raised by the Minister that I read over the Hansard of the discussion that took place on Friday and I think it's quite different from what I was intimating. We're not talking about community use of school, we're talking about a community school project which is quite a different matter and if the Minister would prefer to deal with it under grants, it certainly is amenable to me and I'll just make the same speech. I certainly have done so in the past and prepared to do so again, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(f)(1). The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to pursue the matter of the career education project in some greater depth and I think we got from the Minister the information that there had been 50 kits developed, 50 kits of material developed under this program and that approximately 20 had been released. I think that is my recollection of the information the Minister gave. Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister could tell us who was in charge of this project and have there been any copyright difficulties in respect to the material contained in these kits? Have there been any copyright difficulties in respect to the material that's contained in the kits produced by this Career Education project?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that sometime in 1975 a particular staff person was assigned to this to review, as I said earlier, this project. My understanding is that and this is going back sometime in history, of course, my understanding is that that staff person of the Department of Education was assigned to review the project because there were some peripheral problems with copyrights and what he has been doing is drafting or re-working the program, in conjunction with others, I assume, to avoid any incipient problems in that regard.

MR. MCGILL: Well, I asked the Minister who the person was who was in charge, I presume the co-ordinator of the project. Could he tell us whether this person was one who would be fully familiar with career conditions in Canada?

MR. TURNBULL: I hope the member is not adding this information and name to the dossier that the Conservative Party is collecting in the eventuality that they might be able to do something with it. The individual concerned is called Dennis Lucas. His academic training and professional training, I understand, is in this whole area of career education, that's.. what he's trained in, that's his specialty. As a guidance counsellor is trained in techniques related to guidance, this man is trained in the area

of career education.

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder then could the Minister tell us if this co-ordinator of the project during one phase was engaged at the same time in his Ph.D. work at the University of Manitoba and also in co-ordinating this project?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that that's not the case.

MR. MCGILL: There's no mention of this project in the Department of Education's Annual Reports for June 30, 1975 and June 30, 1976. Apparently it seems to have dropped out. So it leads us to wonder, Mr. Chairman, what is the present status of this Career Education Project and why would it be dropped from the Annual Report of the Department of Education?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I have no explanation why it's not in the Annual Report. I don't think that there's any law that says the Annual Report has to mention every specific activity of the department. I suppose that's the only reason. Clearly we have discussed it, I have given him all the information that is available, going back four years and it is a matter of public record, the development of the Career Education material, as I understand it, and as I said earlier today, is being worked out in conjunction with the members of the Chamber of Commerce, you know, it's an open record, an open book.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I don't understand by what yardstick the Minister decides which programs will be included for reference in the Department of Education's report and which will be consigned to more inaccessible files, but it would seem to me that there is something less than total enthusiasm about this project and I wonder if that's the reason why there isn't any resumé or indication of the progress of the project contained in the Annual Reports, particularly when earlier reports, I believe, did carry some reference to it. Mr. Chairman, just to allay our fears about this project, I wonder if he could tell the House whether the project does indeed have the full support of senior officers of his department, especially the Deputy Minister and the Assistant Deputy Minister. Is there general concurrence in the matter of this project?

MR. TURNBULL: I am checking with the chaps in front of me, Mr. Chairman, and they say indeed they support the program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(f)(1) —pass; (f)(2) Other Expenditures \$105,600—pass; Resolution 51(g) Computer Services (1) Salaries \$16,000. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I notice there is some reduction in the amount of the appropriation that's asked for for this department, this branch. I would ask the Minister if there is any significance to the staff changes that have occurred in computer services in relation to the importance of the service itself in the Department of Education? Has there been any reduction in the activity or in the importance of this service with respect to the Department of Education's operations? We notice that there have been some staff changes during the year under consideration.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, the staff that was on board for the program, I understand, has been cut back and the main reasons for this, I am advised, is because when the program was getting off the ground it did need more personnel input. Now that the program is more in the nature of an ongoing program, there isn't the same need for the same number of staff. My understanding is that the program is delivering service to the schools that are on contract and, indeed, we have plans for some expansion of the delivery of the service.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentioned that they cut back on services and I'm now referring to the statement of Public Accounts as of March 31, 1976 and it shows some five on staff, at least were on the payroll and the total payroll comes to well over \$80,000.00. I wonder why there's only \$30,200 shown in the Estimates and yet the Public Accounts shows five on staff and the total salaries are over \$80,000.00?

MR. TURNBULL: I gather, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for Roblin is asking for a reconciliation of the figures and I'll get that for him.

May I make this announcement to the House, if I may, this is a draft of a letter that I will be sending to school divisions: "I am pleased to announce that the Manitoba Schools Computer Network, a pilot project launched in 1972, will be extended during 1977-78 to all schools in Manitoba who want to participate in the program. This decision is based on the success of the current network and the increasing acceptance of the computer as a valuable, instructional and administrative aid in the school. Final details of the planned expansion are now being developed and I shall forward them to you in the near future. By participating in the expanded computer network, more Manitoba schools will be able to provide computer-related credit courses and will have access to computer programs related to current secondary school curriculum. At present, the network also provides access to administrative programs such as time-tabling. This project thus represents a significant step in the equalization of educational opportunity for all Manitoba students. The continuation and expansion of the network should reduce and perhaps eliminate the need for individual schools or school

divisions to embark on the development and support of high overhead mini computer systems to meet the growing demand for educational use of computers. I look forward to welcoming your school as a member of the network."

That letter, as I say, is in draft form. I expect that it will be sent to schools within the province in the very near future.

I in am advised, Roblin, answer to the question of the Member for that the staff that supports the Computer Services Operation are in Consultant Services, there is one consultant and a secretary retained in Consultant Services, that would explain the change in the salaries line for Computer Services.

In 1977-78, the Estimates that we are considering, the \$16,000 in Salaries is provided for contracted services to update the School Computer Program, to update the School Computer Program. I think that answers the member's questions.

MR. MCKENZIE: I have one more question. I'll list the names in the Statement of Public Accounts and the Minister could advise me if these people are still employed in Computer Services. The first name is a Mrs. Carol Alexander, George Dorward, James Kelsall, Peter M. Luba and Duncan McCaig, are they still employed in Computer Services.

MR. TURNBULL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know from memory that Duncan McCaig is retained on the computer network program and that Mr. Luba, Peter Luba, was transferred to the consultant section as a mathematics consultant. The other three individuals apparently went back to the schools divisions from whence they came — I assume that means that they were seconded from those three divisions to work on this program.

As I indicated when I introduced the item there was need for a larger number of staff in the start-up stages of the program and I assume that these three people were in that category.

By the way, seeing I am talking about seconded staff, I think that that is a useful technique that the department has. It brings people into the department from the school divisions to work, and I believe it also has departmental people going into the schools to work and I think that kind of interchange is very useful for both the schools and the department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(g)(1) — The Honourable Member from Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, just to refer briefly to the draft letter that the Minister has brought to our attention, perhaps many of the schools will receive that intimation with some enthusiasm, that they will be able to take part in the services that are provided by the computer network. I wonder if the Minister can indicate what proportion of the schools in Manitoba are now presently making use of the network program?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. TURNBULL: The member asked for the percent of schools enrolled, I have a figure in terms of percent enrolled in credit courses, which I believe refers to the number of students, 8.2 percent of the students are enrolled. The number of schools with terminals, number 27.

MR. MCGILL: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(g)(1)—pass; (g)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. GEORGE MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the Honourable Minister if the expenditures shown here, the \$360,000, what portion of that goes to the cost of running the computer, and would the Honourable Minister advise which computer is utilized by the department? Is it the Manitoba Telephone System's computer or is it their own central computer at the Norquay Building or is it Cybershare?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, this program was started, this School Network Computer Program was started before the Manitoba Data Services got under way, and consequently the Manitoba Schools Computer Network Program was put on the Cybershare Company's machine. Of the \$360,000, Other Expenditures shown in this year's Estimates, \$255,000 is for the Cybershare contract and \$100,000 is to be paid to the Manitoba Telephone System for transmission costs along the System's lines and for data sets. That is, I believe, some of the terminal devices that MTS provides.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Honourable Minister. advise, Could the Honourable Minister are there competitive quotes requested for this type of service?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I can't recall whether back in 1972 this contract was tendered or not, but my staff advise me that at that time it was not tendered.

MR. MINAKER: I wonder if the Honourable Minister could advise if there is any intention of getting this type of service as a competitive quote this year?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I believe the Member for St. James has some, either professional background or work experience in the computer field, and he knows well that once a computer program is established, to change it by tendering or by any other means, it means that you have to revise the whole program, you have to rewrite, as I understand it, the whole program. So with that

extensive consideration in mind I can advise him that it would not be my intention to have this contract tendered. In any case, I believe there is a contract in existence, I'm sure there is, and that would be binding.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister could advise is the contract a fixed sum, in other words, is the department committed to the \$255,000 expenditure this year, whether they use the time on the computer or not? Are they buying a block time of that computer and committing themselves to that expenditure?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I would assume that that would be the purpose of the \$255,000, yes. I mean, as all the information comes in from the 27 schools, through the network, I assume that the \$255,000 is to buy time on that computer.

MR. MINAKER: I wonder Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, the Minister indicated earlier that he was drafting a letter to send out offering this service, if I understood him correctly, this computer service to the various divisions, is that because there doesn't seem to be a demand for the services at this time, that maybe there could be a reduction in the amount of hours bought on the machine and thus show some saving?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, quite the reverse is true. I understand that schools are lining up to get onto this computer, to get on to this program.

A MEMBER: Including River East.

MR. TURNBULL: Including River East in particular I am told, and that is one of the reasons why the draft letter will be going out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(g)(2)—pass; Resolution 51(h) Instructional Media Services — Salaries \$1,027,300 — The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I notice that the sum voted in 1976 was almost \$1.5 millions and the expenditures as they are now given to us there indicate about \$1.7. The estimate for this year, the appropriation that the Minister is asking for, is \$1.9, so we have had nearly a \$400,000 increase in the period between last year and the appropriation for this year. I wonder if the Minister could account for this rather sizable increase in the cost of instructional media services to the Department of Education? What specific items have contributed to this increase in that time?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I do have a reconciliation of the 1976-77 voted to the 1977-78 estimate book, which I hope to have proved eventually, transfer in two staff, one consultant, one secretary from Field Services, that was \$35,000.00. A transfer in two and a half staff from CDSS because special material transferred to Instructional Media Services — \$21,000.00. Transfer in operational money coming with staff — \$10,000.00. Transfer in operational money for special materials — \$83,000.00. That totals \$149,200.00. Increases beyond the normal salary and inflationary increases, particularly for, well increases beyond normal salary and inflationary increases come to \$100,000.00. That makes \$249,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(h)(1). The Honourable Member for

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, the cost of operating this Department is now getting up to an amount of approximately \$2 million. What are the qualifications and experience of the co-ordinator or administrator of this branch? Is it a person with some experience and background in the field?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I know that the Member for Brandon wants to complete his dossier. I will tell him for his information that the Director of the Media Instructional Services Branch is a former Assistant-Superintendent in one of the Schools. I have met with her on a number of occasions. She certainly seems to be alert and energetic. She certainly seems to be getting this whole section co-ordinated.

I can tell him from past experience, going back ten years, that of all the material that used to be available from the Department of Education, it wasn't very useful to the teachers in the field because you could not get it on time and if you ever did get anything at all, you often got what you didn't order. So that anything that can be done to co-ordinate the distribution of that material, the dissemination of that material, I think is to be commended.

The whole point here, since the lady in front of me has become Director, is to do just that, to bring this material together, to shorten the turnaround time, you know for the material that the Department has in inventory, and to keep it out in the field more. I think that is very important because it particularly benefits as you know the individuals who are teaching in the rural areas, in those areas where they don't have the large libraries that they have say in St. James-Assiniboia or Winnipeg or wherever.

I might also point out to the Member for Brandon West that of the \$100,000 that are increases beyond normal, salary and inflationary increases, \$52,700 of that is for the Correspondence Branch markers, you know the people that mark the correspondence material that comes in from students in the areas in the province. Of the balance of that \$100,000, \$47,300 is for printing the correspondence courses. I know from my experience in my previous portfolio with the Queen's Printers that both — I see the Member for Fort Garry looking at me over his glasses, he has had some experience in this area, he knows, that the cost of paper and the cost of printing has risen dramatically in the last few

years. So of that \$100,000, as I say, \$52,700 is for Correspondence Branch markers, \$47,300 is for Correspondence Branch printing.

To complete the dossier of the — I'm told that the Anglo-Saxons pronounce the word "daw-see-ay", but the Director of the Bureau of French Education pronounces it "doe-see-ay", so the Member for Brandon-West can take his choice. Anyway she tells me for the completion of his dossier that she has a Bachelor of Education, a Master of Arts, three years as Superintendent as a background, twelve years teaching experience at all grade levels. She was an English teacher involved in innovative courses and in the use of media.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I gather from the Minister's reply that the principal qualification here is one of administrative ability and experience rather than a specific experience in media services per se and that the experience possessed by the present Director is related to the transmittal of this material that is available as rapidly as possible to those schools that are requiring such services.

I would ask, Mr. Chairman, can the Minister advise the House if it is correct to say that the school library services, which are part of the Instructional Media Services Branch, I believe, if that school library service has entered into a contract on a continuing basis with the National Film Board which contract has a fee of approximately \$40,000 a year. Could the Minister confirm that there is such a contract and would he tell us exactly what that contract covers?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, when I heard about that contract some months ago I knew that the Member for Brandon West would raise it. Yes, this Branch has entered into a contract with the National Film Board. It is getting a number of films. It is a one-year contract and the reason for doing it, quite simply, was to acquire more good films from the National Film Board and at a good price I'm told of 45 percent discount. It is a good deal and I congratulate the staff and the National Film Board for working it out.

The reference that the Member for Brandon West made earlier to the fact that the Director has more of an administrative background than a background in media, I think needs to be adjusted somewhat. I perhaps read the note too quickly, but, I indicated to the Member for Brandon-West that she had taught school for twelve years and that that teaching involved her in innovative courses in the use of media, so that she has a background in that particular area in the field, which I happen to think is very important for people coming in to the Department. I am not saying it is essential or necessary but it sure is important.

I think that really deals with the questions that the Member for Brandon West raised.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(h)(1). The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I just have some questions about the program itself, particularly in the supply of library services to the schools. I think that it has been acknowledged in this House previously that the general provision of library services in the rural areas is pretty poor, in fact it is almost non-existent. I am just wondering to what degree does the school library services that are now being developed, according to the Education Report, that are now in the schools themselves, provide a community use of the libraries. Are there any? —(Interjection)— Community. In the rural areas, are the school libraries in these areas designed primarily for school use itself or do they in fact try to fill the gap that is created by the almost total lack of a library policy by the Department of Tourism and Recreation which is supposed to be looking after the other library system in the province?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, again I know the Member for Fort Rouge was otherwise engaged but we did have a discussion in the House about the use of the Mobile Reading Van which, if memory serves, cost \$60,000 capital and which is running at about \$16,000 operating this year. That van does get out and around the province and I think it is a useful device for getting reading material into rural areas.

We do provide two staff people in a full-time capacity to give direct assistance to school librarians so there is that kind of support that is going on. These two people do give this assistance primarily in the rural areas of the province of Manitoba, where I think the main problems exist. I don't think the Member for Fort Rouge or the Member for Assiniboia, his seatmate, are going to argue that Winnipeg and St. James-Assiniboia and St. Vital and Norwood are lacking in library services or trained personnel. Those libraries are quite good, especially compared to many rural areas. So the emphasis of the department in this area has been to give personnel support in the rural areas.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, the Minister anticipates too readily my acknowledgement of the quality of services that are being provided in Norwood, Fort Rouge or Assiniboia. I do not acknowledge that. I don't think the library services are adequate in these areas as well. Certainly it has come to my attention that many school libraries in the city are seriously short of the proper personnel to enable the library to offer a proper service within the school. Most libraries are not able to provide any form of library aids in that the school librarian, which is not generally covered under the school grants programs or if so only in those very rich school divisions of which Norwood is not one and the City of Winnipeg is hard-pressed in many other cases, find that they can do no more than simply, in some cases, catalogue books and not provide any of the numerous range of services that

libraries would otherwise provide.

Equally so, Mr. Chairman, in the absence of an adequate library service in the province, both rural and in the urban areas to many extent, there is not the kind of . . . The question is and still hasn't been answered is, to what degree are the school libraries, such as they are, made accessible to a wider community and are they trying to partly fill the void? And perhaps it leads me to a more broad-based question than that and that really is, the extent to which the Department of Education has undertaken any recent assessment of the whole delivery of library services through the school system?

Again, I, reading the report, can see a number of activities, consultants and so on, in the field. What is not apparent and I don't think has ever really been presented to this House at least since I have been here, in discussing Educational Estimates, is some honest, candid, frank assessment of the adequacy of library services in the school system and to what degree they are in fact providing a major resource for school children — particularly, as I understand, talking to some librarians as I was able to do at their recent convention about two weeks ago, that many of them feel that because of the many new sorts of educational requirements, the many new fields of education that we are getting into, particularly in the vocational fields, the technological fields — there has not been the updating of the library services in the school to ensure the students have full access to them.

Certainly the disparity is most apparent in the rural area, but in any case, many urban schools, both in Brandon and in Winnipeg, suffer from the same kind of relatively low-grade service. It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that the library service per se is not an auxiliary component of the school system but an essential ingredient to it. It is one that I would suggest has generally been down-played or has been given fairly low priority as have libraries generally in this province.

I'm just wondering if the time has not come for the Minister to initiate a fuller assessment of the kinds of resources that are available so that if he must provide some compelling arguments to his colleagues or to whatever future decision-makers that may be around, that they would at least have an accurate appraisal of exactly what the demands are, what the present resources are, and what might be needed to eventually begin building up an adequate library system in the province so that there would be proper interchanges between school divisions of materials, that there would be a proper plug into the audio-visual services and to the other kinds of resource centres that I think libraries are attempting to become.

I can only think, for example, Mr. Chairman, of the case that is now raging to some degree in the central part of Winnipeg, that with the absence or the pull-out of the Central City Library from William Avenue, that many school children who normally go to Hugh John MacDonald and Victoria Albert and other schools in that area, are going to be almost, from their admission, deprived of any place where adequate library services are involved. And if there is no replacement — now, it's not a direct provincial responsibility but it is a serious fault that one of the few areas where children had a place to study, where they could get access to materials, is being pulled out of a community where perhaps the greatest need exists almost in the whole province, or certainly one of the greater needs. And there doesn't seem to be any way to fill that vacuum.

It just bothers me a great deal to see that we kind of each year go through this area of Estimates Debate without really having any standards or measures to mark against to what degree we are improving because we don't really know where we are starting from.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Fort Rouge has touched on a very sensitive point. He has alluded to the old Central City of Winnipeg Library on William Avenue. He and I are both out of order in talking about this but I'm going to talk about it anyway, as he did. My parents took me down to that library when I was six years old and I attribute to that library and Andrew Carnegie whose portrait used to hang just as you went up the front stairs, a great deal of what I learned in past years. I'm not much concerned with what the government thinks about this or what anybody else thinks about it but I wish that they would keep that library there as a library and I wish that they would keep it there to serve the precise population in that neighbourhood that has been served by it over these many many years, going back to my youth. So if he wants my opinion on that, that's it.

With regard to an assessment of library services in the province, I can tell him that the department did begin two months ago the initial stages of planning and assessment of school library facilities and services within the province of Manitoba. This assessment will be under way, if it is not already under way now.

With regard to the community use of schools, this too is a rather sensitive issue with me. It seems to me only common sense that particularly in rural areas, that schools be used on a community basis and that the library services in those schools be available to the public at large. I cannot think of anything that makes more sense, Mr. Chairman, than that. Why divisions through the province have not seen fit to do it, I really can't answer for. I will try to find out, but at the moment I just can't answer for it. There are problems, I recognize, in terms of school administration, that is the security of the school, but I think that these can and could be overcome. But our assessment anyway, presumably, will get to this particular point.

I was in one school library a short while ago in Selkirk where the school library in the Regional Comprehensive School was a community school open to the public and the public, I understand, did use it. That school, of course, is in the school division which has a board chaired by one George Schreyer, a progressive and enlightened individual and perhaps that is the explanation why we have a community library in that division.

It should be the kind of operation that exists across the province, assuming it can be done in a sensible way and with fiscal economy.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his expression of interest in some of the problems being faced by library services in the province and I would hope that he would use his position as the Minister of Education to begin working towards a greater integration of the library services. It seems to me when there is such an obvious need that is not being satisfied, that we should try to make the maximum use of the scarce resources that we have in libraries and it brings me to another point. And that is that in his previous life the Minister was responsible for the introduction of certain innovations in the communications system, particularly the dissemination of cable systems into some of the rural areas and he may recall that he and I had some debate at times about the use of that cable system, what uses it might be put to. I was wondering, now that he has a new life, or at least a different perspective on it as he has arisen anew, whether there has been any planning done by the Department of Education as to how it may make better use and have greater access to those community cablevision systems to provide school broadcasting in the schools? I can only think, Mr. Chairman, of the quality of the Ontario educational television service which I suppose has been acknowledged by its awards as one of the high quality television educational networks in the world, in Ontario.

While it's an expensive item and I don't suppose in this time of restraint that we would be applauded for suggesting big expenditures, I would suggest that the introduction of the cable systems have not been in any way utilized to any effect by the school system, primarily again because it doesn't seem to me that the access has been given, that those very rich revenues that the Manitoba Telephone System derives by rental from the cable companies, a lucrative — what's the last count, \$800,000, perhaps even higher than that, the Minister would know the figures better than I, that the Manitoba Telephone System sort of siphons off out of the cable licenses and immediately peels off into his general revenues so that we can promote Princess telephones and "walking through the yellow pages" and other kind of extraneous expenditures. Those moneys might be much better spent if they were devoted to the development of a proper educational use of our cable television system and therefore provide perhaps the replacement for the relatively poor services that we have for lack of money.

I would both ask the Minister to what degree that he will now apply himself to that objective considering his previous experience working in new communications work; and to what degree that some work has been done to initiate the kind of integration of educational services onto the cable system now that the cable system is becoming much more widespread throughout the province?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, while I was Minister of my previous portfolio, I did have discussions with the then Minister of Education about this very matter and I understand that the staff of the Department of Education at that time or somewhere thereabouts, did look at the use of cable, commercial cable, and that is MTS cable facilities, for the dissemination of educational material. There is one problem, as the Member for Fort Rouge well realizes, and that is that the system, that is the cable system, and the microwave system, is not yet in place to deliver that service to the rural areas.

He did make reference to the Ontario authority for film and TV services. I think their budget four or five years ago was more than the total departmental budget that I have excluding the grants package, of course. So that the comparison there is not a very good one.

There will be, without question, a continual contact with the telephone system and the Department of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services Communications Branch to ensure that where opportunities exist and where it is financially feasible, this kind of service will be delivered. That type of delivery, narrow casting, is contained, as the member realizes or remembers I hope, in the policy paper of the government issued in May, 1974. It's a matter of getting the hardware in place, really, before we can utilize it. That is the main problem here.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I'm a little bit confused by the Minister's reply because I believe that I offered to him in part a solution to his financial difficulties, now that he is Minister of Education, I would assume that he would be in a position to introduce a tough bargaining position with his colleague to acquire some of those revenues which the Manitoba Telephone System acquires which is almost sheer profit for it because the actual capital costs of providing cable is relatively low as he well knows and that they are able to derive a fairly bountiful return on their capital investments which I again think should be turned to programming. That's the key cost to it.

Secondly, the utilization of the media services presently are available to the community colleges and the universities are to my mind certainly

under-utilized in that all the equipment for programming is certainly available for improved educational programming that would be available here. Certainly, as we all know, the cable system is already in place in the City of Winnipeg and could be used in that context and be the beginning, origin of a kind of educational programming system.

I guess it simply comes back to what concerns me a great deal, Mr. Chairman, about this government, that they are able with some degree of frequency to produce policy statements but when you go back and examine what has happened two or three years later, you find that they are still, as Councillor Slaw Rebchuk of the City of Winnipeg used to say, "Not really worth the paper they are written on." They are still simply that; they are a piece of paper with some high-blown objectives and rhetoric attached to them with no real implementations. And again, we are wondering why it is that a number of provinces in this country as well as a number of other jurisdictions in the United States, have been able to introduce highly proficient and helpful educational systems and this province hasn't been able to. I guess I'm still not very clear as to whether the Minister has any policy or any intention other than to undertake some minimal conversations from time to time with his counterpart, the Minister of Consumer Affairs. That really is not an answer. I think he well recognizes that conversation is cheap. I think what we are trying to ask him is, do we have a now policy to begin both deriving the revenue and introducing the kind of programming that would make use of this new technology and in particular, begin using it as a resource centre not just for direct integration of programming but for a number of resources as well?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Fort Rouge made a number of allusions there, including something about scraps of paper which of course many people have said about treaties and other things that are written on paper.

I believe that the Department of Education, the staff of the Department of Education, will be doing everything that it can to provide the instructional services over cable or over broadcast TV that it is possible to provide. They are doing it now and I expect that they will do it in the future.

Indeed, I have suggested to the Director of the Instructional Media Services that she go down and talk to the two cable company operators and see how willing they are to provide any kind of service for the schools in the province of Manitoba. I can tell him that I have had some experience in this regard trying to get cable service delivered by one of those companies into the polio ward of the municipal hospital which happened to be in my constituency. The negotiations were very very slow and the companies were not always willing to come with rapidity to a conclusion on the discussions although eventually the service was indeed provided.

But the Director will be talking to the people who own the cable companies and we'll see what we can work out for the City of Winnipeg. That still doesn't solve the problem for other areas of the province. Cable will not ever likely get into every farm-house or every school rather in the province of Manitoba. It's possible, I suppose, but in terms of the technology and the money available at the present time, it is not very likely.

And then of course we all know, or maybe just he and I know, that one of the greatest inhibitors of the development of cable television in this country is not the MTS or the provincial Department of Education, but the Canadian Radio-Television Commission which seems to have all kinds of political jobs assigned to it such as the one it has recently had assigned to it, to check into what the CBC is reporting with regard to Quebec.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, some time ago in this discussion under this branch, I questioned the Minister about a contract with the National Film Board involving an annual fee of \$40,000 and for some reason, Mr. Chairman, the Minister said he expected I would ask a question about this contract and why he would expect that I would ask a question about this contract, now excites my interest. There must surely be some uneasiness in the Minister's mind about the whole entering into of an annual contract with the National Film Board, so I would like to ask another question of the Minister.

He tells me that this is a way in which they can get new and useful films from the National Film Board and that the fee is one that he finds acceptable, \$40,000.00. Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that teachers may borrow National Film Board films without any cost at all? Is it not a fact that these films are available without cost if the teachers apply for them?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, my understanding was that the discount that we got from the National Film Board was 45 percent. The member mentioned a figure of \$40,000.00. I don't think that is an accurate figure; his pipeline must be distorted in that regard.

The films that are being provided are films that the media services will have available for the distribution to schools. I think that it is useful for them to have the films in their inventory of materials available to the schools for the simple reason that if they have them there, they can keep them in repair and they can keep them circulating as rapidly as possible. This branch serves the schools. The National Film Board, as I understand it, serves the general public at large and not the school system.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I don't propose to belabour this point but I must question the Minister on why he thinks a contract like this would be better because it enables them to keep these films in

repair? Is his school system better able to keep the films in repair than the National Film Board which has a lending service and which provides these films without cost, presumably in good repair, to the teachers of the school system? Now, there must be some reason other than those which the Minister has suggested which would necessitate establishing an annual fee for the use of films.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Brandon West begs the question. The point is that the National Film Board simply was no longer able to provide a film service to the schools. The volume was just too great. They wanted, as I understand it, to get out of that particular service that they were providing to the schools. So the Media Branch was faced with having to make a decision on how to have a sufficient number of films of Canadian content for use in our schools, and the decision was made to buy.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I understand the Minister is saying it was either/or. Either we enter into a contract and pay an annual fee or there wouldn't be films available on the old basis. Is that correct?

MR. TURNBULL: Not quite, Mr. Speaker. I said that the service of providing the films to the schools was no longer to be provided by the National Film Board. So the department made a choice as to what it would do to get films of Canadian content and the choice was to buy the films at the discount that I mentioned. This branch, in its film area, sends out 60,000 films a month — 60,000 films a month, it says here — an enormous number of films, so I think . . . The Member for Brandon West is chuckling and assuming the figure is correct we have an enormous volume here and it's easy to understand why the Film Board would find it onerous.

MR. MCGILL: I suppose 60,000 films a month, that would be about 3,000 a working day, and if there were 3,000 in and 3,000 out, that would be 6,000 units handled in a day. I would wish to compliment the co-ordinator of the department. I think they are handling a tremendous volume of films.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, the Director is of course quite happy and able to accept the compliment but she can't because of the procedure in the House, so I will accept it on her behalf. She tells me there are truckloads of films going out and in of 1181 Portage every day. Perhaps the Member for Brandon West and I should go down and see this activity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(h)(1)—pass. Resolution 51(j) Native Education Branch: (1) Salaries \$333,200.00—pass; Other Expenditures \$182,000.00. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: I wonder if the Minister could give me some idea of the Metis counselling services that are provided at Camperville and if the service is still being offered and if it is functioning up to the expectations of the Minister and the department.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that that counselling service provided by the department is in existence, it does continue and I'm told that it is well received in the community and the person is doing a good job there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(h)(2). The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the Minister how many people are employed in this particular branch?

MR. TURNBULL: The Estimates House Book that I have, Mr. Speaker, indicates 12 staff — I call them staff person years — in this branch.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, are there a number of native people employed in the branch? — (Interjection)— Are a number of these 12 people native people?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, as the Member for Riel knows, we do not ask people their ethnic origin when they are hired and if we did, it would indeed be, as I understand it anyway, a violation of the Human Rights Act.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't think that it would be a violation of the Human Rights Act or the best intentions of human rights to have a member of this Chamber ask a Minister of the government whether the Native Education Branch was staffed by native people. As a matter of fact, if the human rights aspect is so important, I'm surprised you put the word "Native" under this item. You should have "Ethnic Undisclosed Education Branch."

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I do know, if the Member for Riel is interested in this, I happen to know the answer. — (Interjection)— Okay, perhaps I should tell him privately. I know that the Member for Riel regards it in a rather facetious way but I think in a way it's a kind of question that I would prefer to avoid dealing with in the House. I don't think it makes any difference really. But I can tell him that the Director is of native ancestry, yes, because I happened to ask him one day and he told me. And I think the majority of the staff are.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I should say that I'm pleased to hear it, if that's the case. That's the point I was after. I think it is important to have people who have a background, a better understanding if they are from the community which they are attempting to serve.

I have one further question with regard — I presume it's to this branch although I'm not sure — I noticed in the Order for Return with regard to travel, that there were six attendants from the Department of Education at a meeting in Albuquerque, New Mexico, with regard to native education

—(Interjection)— Well, I advised the Minister, it's before his tenure of his post as Minister of Education but I think it's a legitimate question to ask the Minister whether the department has discovered that there is an experience to be gained from in the southern United States — presumably it's with regards to, yes, it is, native education, in Albuquerque, New Mexico with six people to a convention all at the same time. I don't know that it is a convention but perhaps he can advise whether there is some sort of a program carried on with groups in the United States on this particular topic.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, what was the topic again?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, the topic is Native Education.

MR. TURNBULL: The topic of the conference in Albuquerque? Mr. Chairman, the for Riel sat down saying is there an experience to be gained by sending people from the Department of Education, Native Education Branch, to Albuquerque for that topic, and I don't think he mentioned the topic. I'm trying to get from him what the topic of the conference was, what the theme of the conference was.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, there's no way of determining from the Order for Return whether it was a conference or what type of meeting took place or what it might be. All the information is that there were six people who travelled to Albuquerque, New Mexico at the same time on the topic of native education. My question to the Minister is whether there is an exchange program going on, whether it was a conference, or whether there is a major experience to be gained from communication with people in Albuquerque, New Mexico to justify six people travelling there and back? —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, it was January 22nd of two years ago.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, if that Albuquerque conference occurred in January of 1975, then the Order for Return was not filed by me. I'll have to take the question and try to find out what the conference was all about, who went and why and I'll try to have that for him tomorrow. I hope we can pass the appropriation, if he wouldn't mind. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(h)(2). The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I thought we were going on to (k).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise a question with the Minister which I think properly comes under this category but it's one that I believe carries with it a much more serious implication. As I understand it, about three years ago the province of Manitoba signed an agreement with the Federal Government to allow the education of children on Treaty Reserves to be, . . . their education program off reserves in the public school systems, in towns and communities that might be surrounding or close to reserve areas. This was done, as I understand, on the theory that this would provide a better educational experience and might improve the quality of education. It's been my experience in the last three or four months, Mr. Chairman, visiting several reserves in the province and talking to people there that in fact in some cases you still find that the drop-out rate of Indian children attending public schools outside the reserves is still around 70 or 80 percent of the children dropping out before grade 7 and that in fact many of them suggest that the public schools in those areas are not in any way geared or directed toward providing the kind of educational experience or arrangement that would be most suitable and adaptable to Indian children who are coming out with both different languages and different cultural background. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think we all recognize in this House that one of the most severe social difficulties we have in the province is enabling children of Indian-Metis background to get a proper and decent education so they have a chance at getting jobs and making it in this province and it seems to me that the solution has not yet been found and I would really want to know and I ask the Minister out of some real concern as to whether they are, the Native Education Branch, if that's the right group to be doing it, has been in fact assessing the experience of this Federal-Provincial arrangement for the education of Treaty children — which I believe is now three or four years old, I think that the signing of it goes back about that long — and determining whether, in fact, it really has lived up to its expectations or whether, in fact, a better answer must be found and to what degree we are, if that arrangement is to continue where Treaty children are to be taught in public schools, what is being done to assist those public schools in responding to the particular needs that exist, in particular I think from the simple performance criteria that I just mentioned that a drop-out rate of 80-90 percent by grade 7 cannot be considered much of a success and I would really want to know from the Minister if he has an opportunity to observe that particular program and determine really what the results are and whether, in fact, it's being reconsidered as a way of re-organizing the educational program in a different way to come up with better results?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I am not familiar with the agreement that the Member for Fort Rouge is referring to, he did not give the title of it. I do know that there is a master tuition agreement that has been one of long-standing between this province and the Federal Government, at least ten years, it might be longer than that. That master tuition agreement enables the province to recover moneys from the Federal Government for the teaching of children of Native ancestry in the unitary

school divisions and districts of the province. That agreement is purely financial. There is, within the Native Education Branch, though, an effort made to develop curriculum material, if that's what the Member for Fort Rouge is referring to, and there are teacher handbooks that have been developed — I have some of them here — by the Manitoba Native Education Branch, Resource Material Native Peoples of Manitoba, another one Teacher Handbook Resource Materials Pertaining to Indian, and Metis cultures. Teacher handbook called Native Games, teacher handbook on Hides, etc., and it goes through a number of topics. This material is available. I assume that it is used and has relevance to people of Native ancestry in our unitary schools and school districts. This material pertains to matters that would be of the Native culture.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I find it hard to believe that the Minister of Education, who has been a teacher himself, would begin to suggest that the problem I described is going to be solved by having five or six curriculum pamphlets available in some of the unitary school divisions. Mr. Chairman, I'm talking about a situation where not in far northern reserves, although the problem is desperate and deep there, but in many of the reserves within the southern part of the province within an hour's drive of Winnipeg, where Native children, in fact, are . . . there is no school provision on the reserves themselves, their primary education is received off reserves in the public school system in the unitary division.

Education, if you want to call it that, but education . . . that primarily most of these children are leaving the school before they obtain grade 6 and 7 and, in fact, their standards of performance in those schools are such that the levels of reading and other basic skills are almost nil and those become the children who, when they become 15 or 16, migrate to Winnipeg or Selkirk or wherever it may be and usually end up getting into some form of trouble or ending up in really being pretty ruthless and lost and there's a direct connection and having visited these reserves and talked to them, but other than in some areas where there may be a kindergarden or a nursery school program or, in some cases, a Day Care program that's paid for again usually out of LIP money, there seems to be almost an absence of mind on the solution. Yet I think that we should recognize that if there is an educational problem in this province, Mr. Chairman, that's it, and the one that should be commanding the most serious attention, more than adequate resources, I mean I don't think policies of restraint apply in these kind of conditions because I think any attempt to cut corners or cut pennies will simply end up in lost dollars because there's no way of saving money if you don't provide decent education for kids; and yet the only answer I get from the Minister is that he's got four pamphlets to offer these schools. Well I don't think that's good enough. Frankly, if that is the extent of what we're trying to do, then I would think that we are fundamentally off base and that the department, the Minister, the government along with their Federal authorities are simply not adjusting themselves seriously to the problem of education of Native children.

I would first like to know, then, if the kind of impressions that I've gained, not on a scientific basis but simply by visits, can be confirmed by the Minister from the more exhaustive resources that he has as a head of a department; and secondly, what is he going to do about it? What does he have ready to do about it, because if he hasn't, then I would simply say he's a failure as a Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(h)(2) pass. Resolution 51(k) Vocational Education (1) Salaries \$102,900. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, pending the Minister's explanation of this particular item and appropriation, I must express some concern at the lack of emphasis, at least at first glance, that appears to be placed by the department in this very important area of educational opportunity. The Annual Report of the department, in its reference to vocational education section, offers approximately one column inch as explanation on the section, on the bottom of page 11 and the top of page 12 and the appropriation that we're dealing with here seems to me to be a very meagre one. There is a reduction in the amount we are being asked to vote as compared to last year, not in the item having to do with salaries but in the other parts of the appropriation. I repeat what I said with respect to another appropriation in these same Estimates, and I'm not suggesting that I would like to see the overall budget of the department increased but I do seek some assurance that what rationalizations are necessary have been done without downgrading very important areas. There are areas, no doubt, from which fat could be trimmed and in which expense could be saved. There are other areas in which reductions in expenditure, reductions in the appropriation would seem to me to be inhibitive of the kinds of programs that the department should be supporting. I have a good many expressions of concern forwarded to me from parents, teachers and students with respect to the shortcomings some of them feel exist in the whole

I am field of vocational education. interested in advice from the Minister as to whether the teacher grant structure has been programmed to take into account the desirability of having as much vocational instructional input as is possible and practical in schools and in school divisions. I know that there are vocational grants that are paid to school divisions to cover this aspect of education, quite apart from the appropriation that we are looking at here, Mr. Chairman, but I still find it

somewhat dismaying that the aspect itself seems to enjoy a very low priority, both in terms of the attention it receives in the report and the amount we're being asked to consider at this stage of the Estimates. I think that one can make the case and the point fairly, that notwithstanding the necessity for a major emphasis on the basics in education, the basics being academic in my view, there is, nonetheless an almost equally important need, particularly in society today, for a fair emphasis on vocational educational opportunity.

So I put that concern to the Minister, and as I say, pending his response, I have some considerable dismay and concern at the moment. He may be able to clear that concern up.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I share the Member for Fort Garry's concern about the need for vocational education. There is no question about it. We need to train in a technological society people who have the skills necessary to keep that technological society going and one of the places they can obtain those skills, of course, one of the places is in a regional secondary vocational educational school and I have been in some of those schools, several of them, and they are really quite remarkable. I am rather sorry that ten years Fort Garry, which he and I know well, for some reason did not see fit to go for a regional vocational educational school in that part of the city.

The amount of money that he sees here in the printed Estimates book really is a tiny part of the amount of money that the department provides for vocational education. One of the differences that I can tell him exists here in this appropriation is a transfer out of this appropriation to Frontier School Division school budget \$50,000 for vocational alternative programs. So that's one amount, it accounts pretty well, well more than accounts for the difference that he sees before him.

In addition to that, of course, there is the increase in the vocational educational grant, we increased it this year from \$325 per pupil to \$475 per pupil, making available a total this year, this school year, of \$3.2 million with the existing student count, so there's \$3.2 million there.

In addition to that I have attempted, and I think the government is agreed, to move into a re-equipment program of vocational education schools. Some of the equipment, as the member well realizes, has become worn and there is need for replacement, so some \$700,000 in capital re-equipment for vocational schools will be provided in another part of the budget, so if we take that together that's \$3.9 million there, plus the amount of money that he sees before him, plus the \$50,000 in Frontier School. So the amount of funds available from the department has increased substantially this year, despite what the figures in front of him may indicate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Minister's answer as information. I assume that there's been no change in the teacher grant structure that would accommodate any sort of practicable increase on the part of individual schools and school divisions for vocational teachers under grant on their establishments. Is that correct? Is that schedule pretty much as it has been in the past, or is there opportunity in that schedule now for schools to add additional vocational and industrial instructors under grant?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, the member mentions that the teacher pupil authorizations have not changed, have not been changed in a way to affect vocational education teachers and the authorization for them and he is correct in that. However, the grant that I alluded to, the one that went from \$325.00 to \$475.00 per pupil, will certainly enable school divisions in that area of vocational education to pay considerable costs including costs of teachers, so the money is there, even for teachers.

A MEMBER: \$400,000 for Fort Garry alone?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: With respect to that particular grant to which the Minister has just referred, I assume that to qualify for that kind of a grant a pupil has to be in a vocational course fifty percent or more of his or her time, is that correct?

MR. TURNBULL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, for that particular grant a student would have to be in a vocational education program fifty percent of his time, I believe that is correct.

There is other money, of course, available — when we get to the grants' package we can discuss all this — for other programs besides the ones that I believe he is alluding to, which is vocational education fifty percent of the time, normally carried out in a vocational educational regional school.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(k)(1)—pass; (k)(2) Other Expenditures. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. GEORGE MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Honourable Minister could advise the Committee with regards to the fact that in our Public Accounts that we just received, which unfortunately they are always a year behind and we are talking about expenditures a year hence from now, that it shows somewhere in the order of \$123,000 was expended back a year ago and now we are looking at something like \$18,600.00. I wonder if the Minister can elaborate on that. Does that mean that this is now being looked after under a different section or have they discontinued this type of service from his Department?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I didn't quite follow the question, but I am told that the answer is that Program Development is now in Program Secretariat.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(k)(2)—pass; (k)(3)—pass; Resolution 51(l) Small Schools - Salaries \$65,100.00. The Honourable Member for Brandon-West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, just a brief word of explanation from the Minister. I don't believe this heading has appeared before in the Estimates — Small Schools, perhaps the Minister could tell us just what that items covers. I wondered if it was something to do with the positions that have been frequently stated in the Legislature by my colleague, the Honourable Member for Swan River, that maybe the Minister had at last got the message and that they giving some consideration to that.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I alluded to small schools, and the Member for Swan River, the other night when I told him that I really believed that was a small one-room school in fact what we now call an open area school. And I think that the small school in that way has worked quite well.

This program did evolve some time ago in part in response to the need that some divisions experience, particularly those divisions that had small schools within their jurisdictional areas.

We have defined a small school as one having an enrollment of up to approximately 300 pupils in Grades X to XII, and a small elementary school was defined as one in which each teacher had at least two grades in each classroom and in which there were not more than five teachers in total.

The point of setting out small schools as a separate appropriation is indeed to highlight it. I think that the services provided here are important. There are quite a few small schools in the province and this particular section, personnel anyway, are involved in organizing in-services for the teachers and staff of these small schools. I think that that function is a useful one for the schools and will be in turn useful for the students in them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(l)(1)—pass; (l)(2)—pass.

Resolution 51(m) Co-operative Educational Services Salaries \$33,400—pass; Other Expenditures \$57,100—pass.

Resolution 51(n) Bureau de l'Education Francaise.

The Honourable Member for Brandon-West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, this is a branch and covers an area of activity of the Department that has not received perhaps the attention that it deserves in past years. We believe that probably this year, because of the increasing influence in bilingualism in our country and in our province, that this branch of the Department deserves some consideration at this time.

I would like to introduce a series of questions relating to the operation. If the Chairman considers that it would not be appropriate to enter into this area at this time I would consider it ten o'clock if he so wishes.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Honourable Minister and the Members would like to continue for some period because giving sort of a mental calculation of a week or so in each Estimate, it would seem that we have to spend some more time. If the Honourable Member is suggesting that we might make better progress tomorrow then maybe we could stop. But if there is a chance of getting through some additional work tonight I think we would like to do it.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, we are quite agreeable, of course, to continuing. The questioning in this area is fairly extensive. I question whether we would complete it this evening. We might very well.—(Interjection)— Okay.

The whole area of the use and the introduction of the limited use of French as a language of instruction in the schools of Manitoba goes back, of course, to the Progressive Conservative administration in the 1960's when the first steps were taken in this direction.

Mr. Chairman, I think as a prelude to our questions we should remind the Committee that we have favoured the use of Francaise programs where there is a sufficient population whose first language is French and where the local authorities make the decision after consultation with the people in those divisions.

We have already, Mr. Chairman, in our reply to the Speech from the Throne suggested that it would be a very useful direction in

which to go to have instruction in French as a second language for children from as early an age as is educationally feasible and on through the grades, so that interested children may achieve a foundation for bilingualism. And in both these areas, that is, Francaise and French as a first language or French as a second language we would hope that there would be a fairly high percentage of funds for instructional purposes with a consequent limiting of funds for administrative purposes.

We have also too felt, Mr. Chairman, that we would like to encourage the expansion of the student exchange program in order to give further assistance to teachers in the classroom and to bring reality to the students learning French.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the activities of the Bureau de l'Education Francaise we note that there has been some change in the direction in which the Bureau has been going. In its original form in April of 1971 it had an Associate Director and two Consultants, a Librarian and three clerical secretarial staff, and they were dealing with two main functions. One was the writing of complete Francaise programs

in all subjects from kindergarten to Grade X, or at least supervising the writing of those programs, and the planning and writing of other subject programs for most of the courses in Grade XI and Grade XII. They were concerned too with the

in-service of teachers and the implementation of these courses in the schools that elected to teach them. These two basic activities, two main functions, kept that small staff, fairly small staff I would think at that time, quite fully occupied, and the section continued to operate on that basis until April of 1974, April 1st. At that time the new B.E.F. Director or the new Bureau really, was set up with Mr. Tremblay, who came in from Quebec as the Co-ordinator. At that time as well the former Associate-Director of the French section returned to the Curriculum Branch, where he took up responsibilities for part of the modern languages program, in particular French as a second language.

Mr. Chairman, the staff of the Bureau was increased and continued under the direction of Mr. Tremblay until the spring of 1976 when he returned to Quebec. Mr. Raymond Hebert became head of the Bureau as an Associate Deputy Minister in July of 1976. It was at that time, Mr. Chairman, that French as a second language was removed from the Curriculum Branch and placed under the B.E.F., the Bureau.

The Associate Director who had worked on French and other second languages in the intervening two years or more was asked to return to the Bureau, but this he declined to do. I believe that was Mr. Corriveau. And he resigned from the department after some twenty-five years of service.

So, Mr. Chairman, there was quite a change really and one of the major changes was the removal of French as a second language from the Curriculum Department and placing it under the Bureau.

I think we are all interested in the way in which the funding that is available for French as a second language and Francaise programs, in the way that funding which comes to us from the federal government is used in our school programs. And I note that in the Estimates a much larger sum of money was granted by Ottawa for the encouragement of French language instruction, that is both Francaise and French as a second language, than is shown in the Estimates in the previous year. Last year I think we showed as recoverable from Ottawa — \$418,900 and this year \$872,500.00. Now there must be some reason for this sudden increase, Mr. Chairman, and I wonder if the Minister could tell us why the difference in this amount which is provided by federal sources?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, the member has given us, given me anyway, a very interesting summary of the history of the Bureau, but I believe he referred fairly regularly to an Associate Deputy Minister, the position is an Assistant Deputy Minister, there being some difference there.

He also made allusions to the exchange program and the desire to increase it. I can assure him that there has been a fifty percent increase in that exchange program. And the monitor program too has increased. It is sponsored by the Council of Ministers of Education and the federal government.

The funding question that he particularly requested — why the increase in recoverable from Canada to \$872,500, is one that certainly deserves an explanation. The difference between last year's amount shown as recoverable and this year's amount shown as recoverable is in the special programs for the promotion of bilingualism. It was transferred to BEF from Continuing Education. I think that, I'm told, is the answer to the question. It doesn't seem to be quite complete but it is full recovery we are talking about.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, then the difference, the increase as shown, really doesn't relate to a change in grants from Ottawa but really is because the FSL program has been moved into BEF. Is that the reason why the grants now show a larger amount for this particular branch of the department?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, it is not the conversation course, which I think is perhaps what the member is referring to, that accounts for the difference, but the annexes that have been transferred. The annexes are a series of documents that relate to bursaries paid to students who are engaged in learning French.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wally Johannson): Resolution 51(n)(1).

The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. STEEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell me under this item in the Budget in the recoverable from Ottawa, does his department pay the various school divisions that run the immersion courses a per student grant and what that figure might be?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, the question seems to be based on two different assumptions. There is no payment for French education to school divisions that is based on a per pupil count. What it is based on is full time equivalency. In other words, it depends on the amount of time a student is studying French or learning in French and that is the basis of the province giving the money to the school division. A full time equivalency means: "the product of enrolment and the percentage of instructional time in the minority language calculated as of September 30th of each year." Where all the subjects are taught in the minority language, the full time equivalency is equal to one. In other words, it's quite a sophisticated formula for ensuring that the divisions get an amount of money proportionate to the amount of instruction in French and the number of students they have taking the course but it is not a flat per pupil grant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. STEEN: Again, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister in his annual report it does mention as Item No. 3 on page 37, the immersion section and I am wondering: is the \$872,500 Recoverable from Canada, what portion of that goes to the immersion aspect of this particular bureau?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the program that is referred to and I gather this annual report was a special project and the funding for it has, I believe, been altered now to the kind of funding that I have just described, the basic full time equivalency, but if you give us a moment, I'll check the specific references. Could you just give us the page number again, you went through it rather quickly. — (Interjection) — Thirty-seven.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, this discussion about accounting procedures is all very interesting, I think it still begs the issue about French language schools which has come about in this province and the one voice we have not heard a great deal from is the statement by the Minister of Education in terms of the present issue that has emerged of whether you have full language training in French as opposed to the partial language or dual language programs which have provided a high degree of conflict in some school divisions and I believe that certain members of the department have been involved in interpreting the studies that have been done by the St. Boniface College Research Centre that was asked to assess the pedagogical results of one program versus another. And what I would really like to know at this stage: has the Minister been able to decide where the government stands on this particular issue if it stands anywhere at all or does it have the same forthright position it takes on native education and that is that there is no position at all really. And that's what we would really like to know, on this particular issue: what is it that the government is prepared to take a stand on and how does it relate its financing on those areas?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(n)(1) — pass. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I was so engaged in the side comments of the Premier that I didn't hear the extensive answer offered by the Minister of Education. Could he indicate to us what his present policy is in this area and if he hasn't one, do we expect one or does he affirm the position taken by the director of his own BEF research or does any one affirm it. We would simply like to know where the Department of Education stands on this issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(n). The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a comment here that although we seem to hear a great deal in the news about some of the problems that exist where we have school divisions that are caught in the position of it becoming a political issue whether or not they have extensive teaching of French and whether it's immersion or whether it's instruction in French or instruction of French, I want to say that the school division in which I reside myself has done some pretty extensive background work in preparing to be able to have both types of education in the division. I think probably they've been a model of success in the Lavallee School in particular where the school is architecturally and otherwise designed to provide for the greatest of experiments, experiments with the greatest potential for success in this area and I think they are succeeding.

I also want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that every once in a while a person does say something in this House that he may want to read in Hansard, I have never done it but I do recall speaking on this issue in the House here about 1970 when the federal bilingual program was brought into Canada. I went out of my way at the time to say during the Education Estimates that if the federal government at that time when they were launching into that program had taken the same number of dollars and put them into the educational system, they would have had a far better return in terms of promoting the concept of bilingualism and by way of using the carrot rather than the stick which they did use, the stick they used by legislating bilingualism and had they put the same number of dollars in through the school system, it may not have benefitted, got the immediate sort of productiveness that the federal government wanted in terms of teaching adults to be bilingual, but I am sure that it would have. It may not have been the demonstration that the government of the day in Ottawa felt that they needed to demonstrate to Quebec that they were going to bring about a situation in Canada that would demonstrate once and for all that Quebec had equal opportunities in the other parts of Canada that the rest of Canada had in Quebec. But, from all practical purposes, had the direction been taken at that time of saying to the upcoming generations of Canadians, "We have a heritage in Canada that we're going to attempt to provide a continuance of if there is an appetite for it and that is through the educational systems of Canada" and they would have had no difficulty in getting the co-operation of the provinces in undertaking a program of that type.

They would also have got a much higher degree of co-operation from the point of view of seeing the schools used for adult education for the purposes which they wanted for making the French language available for adults as well. But they chose the course of going the compulsory route through legislation and got the results that have not proven satisfactory and are unlikely to prove satisfactory in terms of having any measurable effect in bringing about an accord between the different parts of Canada.

So I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that there seems to be some direction now being taken by Ottawa to

recognize that they may have to raise their sights and provide for bilingualism in Canada by using the educational system, fostering it in the educational system and providing it for the young people and not the people who can neither absorb it as readily nor appreciate it.

I would say simply that the debates that have taken place in this Chamber before, although they were certainly not heard elsewhere and probably were said in many of the provincial chambers across Canada and were never heard in Ottawa, seem now to be registering only because of the bitter experience the federal government is having in the bilingualism program particularly that it has taken legislating it through the civil service. Lest there be any doubt, there is a place in the educational system and an expanding role for the educational system to provide for greater opportunity in this entire area.

Now whether the specific Estimates that we are looking at here or not are adequate or otherwise, I don't know or whether they're the entire picture in fostering the federal program and funneling their efforts through the educational system. The Minister may want to make comment on but certainly the direction, if bilingualism has half a chance of succeeding in this country, it is going to be through education and not through the system and approach that the federal government has been taking over the last half-dozen years in Canada.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(n)(1) — pass. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, if I can go back again to the difference between the recoverable figures from the federal government as shown in the two different years and almost doubling, do I understand the Minister to say that the difference is due to annexes from other areas, in other words, the total federal support has not then changed materially but the amount now recoverable and allocated to BEF is increased? Now that must have come from some other branch or some other area; what other areas have been reduced by the amount which is now shown as an increase to the BEF program?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, there have been a number of points made that I should attempt to deal with. First of all, I heartily agree with the Member for Riel in the remarks that he made about the necessity of improving French instruction in our country through the school system. I think that the approach of the federal government as they readily admit now is one that has not in fact led to the goals that they had sought.

I believe that the Member for Fort Rouge in the remarks that he made and perhaps I shouldn't refer to, should take them and compare what he said in Hansard with what Bill 113 does provide. This province, I think, has enacted a legislation which is progressive; I believe it enacted that legislation before any other province did; I believe it is legislation which gives to the parents of children the opportunity to ask, to petition school divisions and boards to provide groupings for students in the division. That legislation also provides that the parents or the board rather, may enter into agreements with divisions that are adjoining to make sure that there is sufficient and efficient utilization of space.

The grants formula that we have developed in this province as far as I can ascertain is the best formula that exists across the country. It is one that enables the school divisions in this province that have set up programs of the kind that we are describing to receive adequate compensation for the cost of providing those programs. What we have here, I am told, is a model, not only in legislation but in terms of the grants formula that the province uses to pay money to the school divisions.

The Member for Crescentwood did allude to a particular program in the annual report. I think I gave him an answer although he looked somewhat perplexed. I can only say to him that the program in the annual report was a special project; it was funded fifty-fifty with the federal government. What we have now is the full time equivalency formula which applies equally to all types of programs where there is instruction in French and I think as I say, it's a progressive type of formula.

The annexes that I alluded to earlier I could perhaps mention to the Member for Brandon West. One of the annexes provides for travel bursaries for students who cannot pursue their post-secondary studies in their own language within reasonable commuting distance from their home. Another annex provides bursaries to second language and minority language teachers; a third provides fellowships of one year duration for second language study to provide students with an opportunity for immersion in the environment of their second language and another annex provides for special projects to provide assistance to provincial governments for areas considered to need special attention.

Now the comparison that the Member for Brandon West seeks is one of his more detailed questions. I believe I have answered him correctly and adequately. The increase from the recoverable amount shown in this year's Estimate as compared to last year's Estimate is based on these annexes. The difference as far as my staff can ascertain is \$394,600.00. That's it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I think . . .

MR. TURNBULL: If I may, Mr. Chairman, the point there was that the annexes are 100 percent

recoverable from the federal government.

MR. MCGILL: Annexes being bursaries for various student activities relating to French language, FSL or Francaise, I presume. Students and teachers.

MR. TURNBULL: Yes.

MR. MCGILL: But how is it that this now is credited to BEF this year and where did it go last year? I mean, you have annexes that account for this increase but where did those amounts show last year on the program?

MR. TURNBULL: I would like to thank the Member for Brandon West; he has now crystallized the question. The money last year was in Universities and Colleges. Now we can, I suppose, extract it all and get it all down into a form if he wishes but that's where the money was; that's the problem that he's encountering in trying to make the reconciliation there.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, has BEF taken over some function that was formerly under Colleges and Universities?

MR. TURNBULL: The answer, Mr. Chairman, is yes. What functions? The annexes which I just read out.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, there were some comments made with respect to this item which I think probably deserve some clarification particularly by the Minister and I think that again he's still leaving some questions unanswered about the kind of policy that the government has now established. I think he has certainly been in government long enough to recognize that a piece of legislation is not necessarily a policy. There are many pieces of legislation which either are only partially implemented, sometimes not implemented at all and certainly conditions change; new conditions arise requiring different kinds of responses from government in relation to the kind of programs that they are prepared to provide and I think that that is certainly true in this day and age. Some members have spoken that there is now a growing recognition or acknowledgement that the wider extension of French language training in the schools is a desirable objective in terms of securing national unity. I agree with that objective. I think that some members have forgotten a little bit of their own recent history though, and that is that the bilingual program was initially set up to respond to a crisis situation where there was some serious strains in the lines of national unity and that one of the first requirements of that was to provide for basis rights of people. And it was not possible, Mr. Chairman, for seven-year-old children, who had immersion courses, to become civil servants to enable French-speaking Canadians to get the proper access to their own federal government which they had been denied in many respects.

So while the use of education and expansion of that is a necessary and important component of a bilingual policy, it is not the sole component. I think we would be making as much a mistake to all of a sudden hang onto that fashionable trend as it is now appearing and forget that there is still a requirement to provide basic language rights in this country. That is what the point of the initial bilingual program was and that's why it had to be a crash program.

But in saying that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to still say that the issue of how we intend to provide for the training of French language as a second language in the province, is still very unclear in this province. The legislation is on the books, there is now an apparent willingness by the federal government to supply more funds — they have certainly made more money available to the province of Ontario, they don't seem to have made more available here, perhaps because they haven't been requested to make more, I don't know. But what we want to find out first is does this particular government have some objectives and program in mind as to what they would like to see happen throughout the province in the next three or four or five years as this issue becomes a more pertinent one and one of greater relevancy?

And secondly, I know it's easier to duck the issue, and I'm sure that the Minister of Education and the government would prefer to duck it, but there were some reports issued this year that were commissioned by this department suggesting certain pedagogical approaches as to the training of the French language, reports that were endorsed by the Director of the Bureau Francaise, and we would like to know, is that really the kind of advice and direction that the government now intends to take? We're simply wanting to know at this case because in a situation when there is a lot of emotion and a lot of, sometimes some conflict involved — there are many examples, as the Member for Riel points out, where things have been worked out in a reasonable way, but there has also been, as the Member from Crescentwood probably knows and the Member from St. Boniface would also know — areas of conflict.

And we would simply like to say that if there is to be an extension of the French language training program in the schools in this province, to what degree is the provincial government going to provide the guidelines that are necessary to ease that transition and ease that extension and try to avoid those conflicts? What advice can they give us? Is the report that they provided do their own research, are they prepared to stand behind them and say, "That's the way it should happen." Or are they simply going to let the fight be fought out in the local school divisions?

I think if that is the kind of question that we have surely we should have some policy available to us

so that we know what we are talking about. And I don't think it's sufficient to say that the legislation passed in 1970, which this party certainly agreed with and had been promoted many years beforehand by a member that had previously been in our ranks and now is a member of the opposite side, had supported. So we're simply saying that 1970 is not 1977, we would like to know where we stand now.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, the policy that the Member for Fort Rouge seeks is one that the department is developing and I will announce it when it is drafted in a form that I think is appropriate. I hope that that policy will be drafted in a form appropriate very soon.

To deal with the Estimates before us, though, I think is what we should be doing. We have an increase in the amount of money paid out for instruction in French. The program is working, it has all party support and I think that, you know, as the Member for Riel, I believe, did, we should recognize that. It's working. What the Member for Fort Rouge seems to want is for me to, from the top of my head, enunciate a policy about French education and how it should be administered in the schools and, Mr. Chairman, I just will not be bulldozed into doing that. That policy will be developed and it will be put forth by me at the time that it's ready. The Member for Fort Rouge will just have to wait until then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. STEEN: I would like to get some further clarification from the Minister on the financing and I'll mention an example. In the Winnipeg school division they operate a school in the centre core area of the city called Sacre-Coeur which is an excellent school and, I'm very proud to say that I have a daughter that attends it so I have a very biased interest. But there are a number of persons in the Crescentwood and River Heights area that do have children that attend this school, and last year the Winnipeg School Division No. 1 had attempted to expand this program and move it into the Brock-Corydon School where I understand there were some classroom vacancies, but a number of the parents in the Brock-Corydon School area opposed it. They didn't like having the local school division ramming down their throats a mixture of some classes under the immersion program and some under the straight English program, so the Brock-Corydon program did not go ahead.

Did I understand the Minister to say earlier when I asked him about the financing that it is a 50-50 split between the provincial government and the federal government, and if that is so, then the Winnipeg School Division saves money actually by having students attending an immersion program. Can he clarify that for me, please?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I did not read the section that the Member for Crescentwood was referring to in the Annual Report, but once again let me try to make clear what the position is. The money that is received from the federal government that is shared 50-50 is for special projects. It is for special projects. The money that the department pays over to the divisions, whether it's for Sacre-Coeur or some other school, is based on the full-time equivalency which I defined for him earlier in the debate. That money is available and if the School Division of Winnipeg No. 1 wanted to set up an immersion course or indeed any kind of course where there was instruction in French, they would get grants in proportion to the number of students and the amount of time that the students are being instructed in French. That is the position. Does that make it clear for the member?

MR. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, therefore the Winnipeg School Division or any other school division must have an X dollar figure for educating each child within that division and that must vary from division to division. What I'm trying to drive at, does the Winnipeg School Division save money by having students, on a per student basis, save money by running the immersion program because there is some federal input as well as additional provincial input and therefore the cost of educating that child at Sacre-Coeur, for example, as opposed to Rockwood School or Grosvenor School, is less for the Winnipeg School Division?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I suppose I shouldn't answer that question because it's really outside of the jurisdiction of the department, but if the member will think about it for a moment, the movement of students from Crescentwood to Sacre-Coeur likely costs more money than moving the students from Crescentwood to Brock-Corydon. So that I would think, I would guess that the reverse of what he said would be true.

MR. STEEN: All right, then, we are onto the transportation aspect of it. Who pays the transportation for such students going to these special programs, the Winnipeg Division, in the example I am using, or the Department of Education? The Minister mentioned the transportation of students and it was carrying on in my example which is the one in the Winnipeg School Division, of Sacre-Coeur. And he goes on to say, yes, it does cost more money to move students from south Winnipeg downtown than it would moving them to another school in a nearby neighbourhood in south Winnipeg. Who pays the transportation charges, the department or the particular division?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, the grants that are paid out to the school divisions is really under another appropriation. Now, I'm trying to accommodate members of the committee and answer their questions and I have answered the member's question. But if they want to get into a protracted debate on this, I suggest that the place for it is under vote 53(a), rather than under the appropriation

we are under now which is merely the appropriation for the BEF.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(n)(1)—pass? The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: I would like to ask the Minister about new courses or programs of instruction that have been written by the Bureau Francaise since April 1st, '74. The question would be, how many courses or how many new courses or programs of instruction have been written since it became a separate bureau and not just an arm of the Curriculum Branch? That was April 1, '74 to the present. Could he just give me the names of those new courses that have been written and the dates that they were implemented.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, the exact names of the courses, the staff apparently don't have with them, but I can get that information for the member if he wishes it. I would like to pass the appropriation. I mean, we can still provide that information; it's a routine kind of thing, it's a listing of items.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(n)(1). The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, the question was, the new courses or programs of instruction that have been written and he is going to get that information for me and also the dates on which these new courses were implemented in the program.

My next question, Mr. Chairman, would be why was French as a second language, FSL, placed under BEF? How many staff members of BEF spend their full time on French as a second language?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, it was thought appropriate to consolidate the administrative functions of the department with regard to the French language within one section, it's just administratively logical. In addition, as the member knows, Mr. Corriveau did retire and we have a person doing the equivalent of his work, one person, so that, from my understanding there is still the same number of persons doing the work that was required for what we referred to as the French Conversation Course. But the transfer, in my recollection, as I say, was just one of administrative logic.

There is, you know, another section, I think it's under Consultant Services, where other languages are, how shall I say, domiciled. There is an adviser there, a consultant there, who does work on the other languages as well, German, Ukrainian, Portugese, Spanish, etc.

MR. MCGILL: I don't quite follow the logic. There may well be some in the Minister's explanation, Mr. Chairman, but French as a second language it seems to me is a curriculum subject the way mathematics and other subjects are. It would seem to me that it would be logical to have it in the Curriculum Branch as another of the subjects that would be offered. I can see a certain problem arising if the present arrangement is continued if, for instance, at some date in the future French should become a core subject in the elementary schools and would be part of the core requirement in those stages. Then would it not be an awkward situation to have one core subject and not other core subjects transferred to a separate bureau. It seems to me there is a different function here between Francaise programs, French as a language of instruction, and French as a second language.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, my logic, I suppose stems from the British North America Act, 1867, which sets out that there are two official languages in this country. If the Member for Brandon West will look at the Public Schools Act, Section 258, he will see there that reference is made to the legality of teaching in French or English as these are the official languages spelled out in the British North America Act. So because we are dealing with the second official language in the country, in my mind, it was logical to have it located in the Bureau instead of in some other place in the department. But I agree with the member that I suppose it doesn't make all that much difference, but this is the second official language of the country that we are talking about so it is in with the Bureau which is the section that deals with instruction and all the pedagogical work that is done with regard to instruction in French or instruction of French as a subject. To me it is not only logical but simple logic.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, this change took place within the last recent time, two or three years I presume, between the removal of French as a second language from the Curriculum Branch to the Bureau Francaise. If the BNA Act had something to say about that debate now, or has now, it must have said it two or three years ago when the arrangement was in the other sense, that is, it was under the curriculum branch so I don't see why suddenly it should become so illogical to have had French as a second language considered as one more subject in the curriculum branch as the Minister now says it's completely illogical to have it in the new arrangement. However, Mr. Chairman, we will not deal with that at any great length because I think the Minister has said all that he's going to say in that connection.

I would like to ask him another question related to this general subject. What happened to the English language advisory committee that was set up to assist in the encouragement of French as a second language? I believe there was such a committee that was active and its purpose was to assist in the encouragement of French as a second language. This was an English advisory committee. Can the Minister tell me what happened to that committee?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I do recommend that members read Section 258 of the Public

Schools Act. That Act does set out in different sections that there shall be two language advisory committees, one for English and one for French. The English language advisory committee is to give advice on English as a second language, that is my understanding of its function and it is required by statute to meet before the end of the last calendar year. It met in December and there will be re-appointments made to it before the end of this month as is required.

MR. MCGILL: So to the knowledge of the Minister there is now and there has not been any input by an English language advisory committee into the encouragement of French as a second language, is that the Minister's understanding?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, this committee — I should perhaps ask for the statute and we could read it — is an advisory committee to me, and it's just that, an advisory committee, and that's really all there is to say about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister for Corrective and Rehabilitative Services.

HONOURABLE J. R. (BUD) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): The Member for Crescentwood mentioned a school and I thought I would just take this opportunity — I'm sure the Minister won't mind my intrusion into his Estimates — but I would like to commend the staff that is working hard to solve some of these problems because I too have a youngster who went through the Sacre-Coeur system and in Grade 10 she's completely bilingual and I was appreciating the thrust of the Member for Brandon West's question because I, for one, think that if we are going to deal with this difficult problem, as many Anglophones are committed to bilingualism, we have to, as best we can, encourage our young people to take a second language. I was at a school last week where they had three languages, many students speak German, French and English. I think the staff is to be commended on what they have accomplished since Bill 113 and to move this into place.

It's going to be interesting to see, you know now that Mr. Spicer has resigned his position to listen to some of his comments. I am very much impressed with his understanding of the complexities of the problem but nevertheless I really appreciated the remarks of the Member for Riel also because it reflects my particular view on this, that we have to work on long range terms and we of the Anglophone community have to encourage our children to become part of the system rather than saying somebody's trying to shove it down our throats.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(n)(1) — pass. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I have a question here relating to the staff members of the bureau. How many staff members now work for the bureau either in the central departmental office or in other locations, for example, how many are engaged in research in St. Boniface College?

MR. TURNBULL: I assume the Member for Brandon West knows the difference between contract and SMY. There are no SMY's employed in research at St. Boniface College. That's the advice I have.

MR. MCGILL: Well, can you tell me how many in total work for the Bureau in any of the locations, both contract and SMY's?

MR. TURNBULL: There are 14 SMY's, 10 contracts, for a total of 24.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 51(n)(1). The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: That's 24 in total and are there any contract, of these there any of those at St. Boniface College doing research?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I've answered that question; there are no contract people employed by the Bureau that are doing research work at St. Boniface College.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I want to enquire then about the general activities of the branch. The Minister on many occasions has professed his great enthusiasm for decentralization of the departmental authority and activity and I wonder if he could assure this committee that the activities of this branch, this Bureau Francaise, are in keeping with his professed position on decentralization? Is it a matter that the Minister is able to say with some satisfaction that they are a bureau that is not relating itself to decisions within divisions? I would imagine that he would consider that as the very antithesis of decentralization if there was any suggestion that the bureau would take a side in a matter of some decision made by the residents in a particular school division. Is there any indication that the bureau is keeping itself aloof from those local divisional decisions or are they in any way becoming involved in the decision-making process at the division level?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, you know I think there is a general policy here that one should recognize, that when my staff are working as civil servants, I expect them to carry out departmental policy. I do not know, I have not enquired, what they do outside of their regular hours and outside of the time during which they would be representing the Department of Education and the Minister of Education but it is my expectation that they are not involved in the decision making of divisions. That is my expectation. Now that does not mean, of course, that they are not involved in providing consultative services to divisions, as are other staff in the department. Indeed, decentralization of our education system which has been going on for decades, has led now to a situation where the department in this branch and in others does send out into the field departmental people to give support to teachers in the job that the teachers are doing in the classroom and that's going on here as it is in other places in the department.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has assurances then from his Bureau Francaise that there is not any attempt to influence the decision making process in the division when votes or matters are taken respecting the introduction of Francaise programs in the school?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I have just asked for that assurance and I have got it from two gentlemen in front of me.

MR. MCGILL: Then, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister can assure the House that the activities that the consultative help that he mentioned that would be available from the Bureau Francaise to divisions, is that being provided in the teaching of French as a second language? I wonder if he could be specific in this area? In the matter of consultative help, the teaching of French as a second language, is this help being provided to divisions?

MR. TURNBULL: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that there are two consultants in the bureau working as curriculum consultants and they go into divisions to develop curricula with regard to French as a second language.

MR. MCGILL: I understand then that there are two members of the Bureau Francaise who have this as a full time occupation, that is assistance in the teaching of French as a second language and that assistance being provided to the divisions in Manitoba?

MR. TURNBULL: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Brandon West asked a specific question and I attempted to give him a specific answer. That consultation is provided from this branch as it is from other branches of the department depending on the particular subject area involved, but if he wishes to lead me with questions, that is his prerogative. If he's got a particular point of view or question that he's got to put, I wish he would do that, but I have given him the answers to the best of my knowledge with two staff people in front of me advising me.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell us what branch of the Department of Education determines the distribution of the money received under the Federal Minority and Second Language program? On what basis is the distribution made? I could repeat that or has the Minister got the question?

MR. TURNBULL: I am not overly clear, Mr. Chairman, what money the member is speaking about; it certainly isn't in this appropriation, I can tell him that.

MR. MCGILL: Well, there is a Federal Minority and Second Language program for which money is available from the federal government. That must come into the educational branch and it must be allocated to various departments. Is there a formula or basis upon which this distribution is made?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I thought the member was referring to money for languages other than French but he's still referring to the French language. I've answered that question I think four times now. The money that he is referring to is money that goes into the annexes and I have read the annexes.

MR. MCGILL: May I put the question in this manner, Mr. Chairman. What was the total amount of money received from Ottawa, or receivable for the fiscal year 1976-77 under the Federal Minority and Second Language program?

MR. TURNBULL: Under annexes it was \$307,000, but I think the member wants the total amount of money received from Ottawa for a particular period.

A MEMBER: The question couldn't be given to the honourable member some time in the future, if it requires any compilation the honourable member will get it, or does he need it for his follow-up?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, in response to the House Leader's question, I did have a follow up question to that amount.

A MEMBER: This would be a good time to quit then.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, if I may, if the member for Brandon West has this question and one other, I would like to get the appropriation passed. I'd be quite happy to stay here until twelve or something . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: I didn't understand the honourable member to be saying that; what I understood him to be saying is that he has a follow-up question depending upon the answer to the one that he has just put and that he has other questions on the department, that it wasn't that question and another. And that being the case, there was no suggestion that we were going to be able to finish that item tonight and therefore I would suggest that it's a good time to adjourn. I would move the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, directed me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON: Mr. Speaker, I move that the report of the committee be received.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have a seconder?

MR. JOHANNSON: Seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hour of adjournment having arrived, the House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.

ESTIMATES — AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. D. James Walding (St. Vital): We have a quorum, gentlemen. The committee will come to order. I direct the attention of honourable members to page 7 in their Estimates books. Department of Agriculture Resolution 13 — Crop Production a Regional Division. (1) Salaries. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if it would be convenient for the members to receive copies of our summary and evaluation paper of the Farm Diversification program which we had promised to bring in earlier this afternoon. Perhaps it might be appropriate to go over the one page summary. This is not an up-to-date report; it doesn't include the total numbers but as of the date that this report was developed, presented, we had a total of 2,295 farm diversification clients out of which 366 graduated. That means at the end of the second year. Farmers stayed the program for an average of 32 months; range 17 to 48 months. A sample consists of 108 farmers or 29.5 percent of the graduates. The major enterprise was 67 in beef production; 25 dairy producers and 16 hog producers. The gross sales represented a 100.7 percent increase. By enterprise, in beef the gross sales moved from \$10,483 to \$15,014. In dairy, from \$10,938 to \$31,905. In hogs, from \$8,818 to \$27,368. In terms of land base improvement, the acres improved were 278 to 329. Land base with total acres owned and rented — 531

to 606. Beef producers: the average number of cows increased from 22 to 38; average herd size increased from 45 to 86; more producers were finishing cattle from 28 to 46; calving percentages were improved from 83.8 to 85 percent; weaning weight 382 pounds to 423 pounds per calf; 73 percent installed or improved handling facilities; 21 percent improved feed handling facilities.

In dairy production, average number of cows increased from 18 to 25; additional 16 or 64 percent of dairy producers reached quality "A" standard; 84 percent made major renovations or constructed new barns and/or milksheds; 32 percent started shipping milk.

In hog production, the size of herd increased; sow weaning 22 to 47 sows; farrow to finish 24 to 32 sows; finishing 121 to 222 market hogs. Pigs per litter increased from 8.6 to 10.5; 87.5 percent made major renovations or constructed a barn. Major improvements were reported in most farms in four areas: land, water, handling facilities and barns. The majority of clients were not previously using the department services. Farm advisors made an average of 36 contacts by phone, in office or on farm. Specialists were called upon to assist farm advisors. Farmers were introduced to new farm practices, i.e. farm plan, records, A.I., feed testing, soil testing, use of supplements, fertilizer and herbicides. And then the rest, Mr. Chairman, I would leave to the members to peruse if they wish.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, when you state that you gave advice and assistance in respect to land, water, handling facilities and barns, can the Minister indicate what the qualifications were for a good water supply, say for instance, in a hog-marketing operation, were there any qualifications that were set down for the quality of the water and if so what are the qualifications?

MR. USKIW: Well, I'm not sure that I have that kind of information here. Perhaps Mr. Hudek can give us some advice in that connection. I am advised that there is a water quality standard that is set for livestock.

MR. GRAHAM: Does that water quality standard differ as between beef and pigs?

MR. USKIW: Apparently it does, yes.

MR. GRAHAM: The reason I ask the question, Mr. Chairman, is that it has only been in the last six or ten years that farmers have come to realize that the nitrate content in water is a very critical element, especially in the raising of hogs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 13(a) (1) — Pass. (a) (2) Other expenditures. The Honourable

Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I would probably like to ask the Minister first what these Other Expenditures entail; there is a slight decrease but . . .

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I think you can go by the job description. Specialists and ag reps . within the regions. You have their salaries and then you have the other expenses related to their activities so that you have your automobile, office and so on expenses that attach. We have the programs totalled up in larger packages on the description side but nothing particular relating to this item.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, maybe I'm too late now but I was going to ask another question in regards to the Crop Insurance Program, and ask the Minister if the Federal Stabilization Program has had any effect on the membership of the crop insurance in the Province of Manitoba in this past year.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe we are passed the Crop Insurance item but to date we have had a fairly high participation rate. Our experience last year was, I believe I am right to say, the highest participation rate that we ever had. That's correct isn't it? Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 13(a) (2) — Pass. (a) — Pass. Resolution 13(b) Soils and Crops Branch: (1) Salaries. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture , in this particular appropriation does this include all of the staff at the University of Manitoba or is part of that covered through the Universities appropriation?

MR. USKIW: No, we have no staff at the University whatever.

I am wondering whether the member is asking the question as to the location of staff because while we have staff there, they are not part of the University budget; they are part of our budget, the Soil Analysis Lab and the Agricultural Services complex and so on.

MR. GRAHAM: I was just wondering what portion of the University complex is covered by the Department of Agriculture and what portion of the agricultural faculty at the University is covered by the University Grants Commission?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, all of the University is covered by the University Grants Commission, although the Department does provide additional grants to the Faculty of Agriculture — \$700,000.00. That is research grants.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: That \$700,000 then is not included in this appropriation whatsoever.

MR. USKIW: No, we have already passed that item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 13(b)(1)—pass; (b)(2) Other Expenditures. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I notice that there is a decrease here of approximately \$150,000.00. Does this mean that the — oh pardon me, I'm looking at the wrong column.

In the Crops Branch of the Department of Agriculture, is there any increased activity in the field of the production of drought resistant varieties of cereal grains for Manitoba farmers?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know that we have the answer to that question. That is a University function, Mr. Chairman, we are not involved in that kind of research within the Department.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, if we are not involved in it I think that perhaps it is time we were involved in it, because Manitoba in all likelihood, with all the prospects that are being forecast, we may very well be into a severe, fairly long-term drought cycle. I think that it is incumbent on the Department to recognize that and to put some money into the research and the production of drought resistant crop varieties.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I presume the Member for Birtle-Russell is suggesting that the Department launch into a brand new area, however, we have to recognize that we do have research establishments across the country that play a major role in this field , and in particular, the federal government has a research centre in Swift Current, Saskatchewan, specifically related to questions of that kind, which they support very very substantially. So we do have to, in my opinion, rely upon those institutions to carry out these kinds of studies and experimentation. It would be a duplication on our part to set up institutions. similar

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would think that if the Province of Manitoba, and particularly this government, is willing to wait on the federal government to provide the leadership that is so essential at this particular point in our history, then I think we have missed the boat. In my own personal experience I've found that the federal department usually is two or three years behind the provincial government in reacting to the problems that exist in the current year's operation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 13. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, just to pursue this a little further because I think my colleague

from Birtle-Russell raises a very valid and important point insofar as our crops are concerned in the Province of Manitoba. I heard the Minister say that there is, in Swift Current, research work going on, but I also understand that the Department of Agriculture, that is the University of Manitoba, have also been working in conjunction. One would have thought that maybe the Minister would have something to report from the joint efforts, as I understand it, from both Manitoba and Swift Current, Saskatchewan, and on that basis I would think that we should have some information coming out of this Department.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, that is something that has been ongoing for decades, it is not something that has been just thought of today. The Swift Current operation has been there for many many years and that is one of its main functions. We do receive reports from all of the research that is carried out by all institutions, federal and provincial, so that if the Opposition Members wish that I dig up the research material on these things, we can do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate those comments from the Minister but I think that, as my colleague from Birtle-Russell said, you know, we could be in a drought cycle for a number of years to come, although we hope it doesn't happen. But nevertheless we have to be concerned about producing the kinds of varieties of grains that are going to withstand such things as may be hazardous from drought and rust and so on. For instance, in our wheat varieties we are concerned, and this is something that I would hope that we would have to keep abreast of, and if we don't we are going to be in serious trouble.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: The Committee representative of the three departments that I had mentioned earlier that are looking at the possibility of drought problems continuing into the summer, are involved with the various research people, in particular the government station at Brandon and the University in Manitoba here. So they are very much involved with that question at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 13(b)(2)—pass; (b)—pass. Resolution 13(c) Canada - Manitoba Northlands Agreement, (1) Salaries. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Just by way of explanation, what is this all about?

MR. USKIW: This has to do with a thrust in Northern Manitoba with respect to northern horticulture. It is part of the Northlands Agreement, I don't know what the sharing of it is.

This is a provision, I am advised that we are not yet in a position to know the full parameters of it. It is something that is under negotiation and it is going to be cost-shared on a 60-40 basis but we are making provisions for it pending the finalization of our discussions.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, having some understanding and knowledge of how alluring federal dollars always are to any provincial department, I would ask the Minister again what is it all about? Is our goal to grow African violets at Thompson or Churchill or black I am just asking what we intend to do within the field of horticulture or otherwise with these proposed moneys?

MR. USKIW: The proposal here, Mr. Chairman, is to help the local communities develop local community gardens in order that they might produce some of their own fresh vegetables and things of that nature.

MR. ENNS: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 13(c)(1)—pass; (c)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; (c)—pass. Resolution 13. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,229,100 for Agriculture—pass.

Resolution 14 Marketing. (a) Marketing Branch (1) Salaries. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, on Marketing it indicates providing market analysis, development and promotion of agricultural products produced in Manitoba. I wonder if the Minister could tell us the story on the pork situation in the Province of Manitoba. I think I understand another contract with Japan has either been negotiated or is in the process, I wonder if the Minister could enlighten us on this particular product.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I am aware that the current contract is about to end or terminate and that there have been discussions between the Hog Marketing Board and the Japanese buyers, and that our Department has been involved in some capacity in trying to develop those discussions, but I am not in a position to indicate just what is the result to date, that has to come via the Marketing Board itself before I can give a full answer.

MR. EINARSON: Then I would like to ask the Minister, since he wasn't able to give us the price on the previous contract, now that having been completed, can the Minister indicate what that price was in regards to the negotiated sale with . . . in the past three years.

MR. USKIW: Well again the Member for Rock Lake wants to continue to confuse the issue. The Minister was never in a position to reveal somebody else's business which they don't wish to be revealed and I am talking about the hog board and the company with whom they are in contract. That question can be put to the Hog Marketing Board. It is not a question that I am in a position to answer

because it is none of my business quite frankly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, it seems rather strange that the Minister should make these comments because I think if my memory serves me correctly, I can go back to about 1973 when a member of the Hog Marketing Board was elected by a group of hog producers and the Minister indicated that if this person didn't desist from making the kind of comments he didn't like to hear, he was prepared to ask for this person's resignation. I rather find it strange that the Minister feels now that he is not able to give us this information; he has to get permission from the Board while, at the same time, he threatens a member who was elected by hog producers that if he doesn't follow and do the things and say the things that he would like him to say, that he would ask for his resignation and I would like the Minister probably to explain his position in that regard.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, what the Member for Rock Lake is suggesting is completely untrue so, therefore, there is no point in responding to it.

MR. EINARSON: Is the Minister indicating that when he asked for a certain Mr. Cameron's resignation that it is not true?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, that's quite a difference from telling the Board how they should run their business. The member in question ran on a ticket of destroying the Board.

A MEMBER: The unfortunate thing is he got elected.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think this

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think this gentleman was elected by a group of hog producers and you know, I'm finding it hard to understand and the Minister always gives us this kind of answer when we want to seek information which is I think the responsibility of the Minister to give information to members of the opposition when we are wanting to find out what the price of a contracted product has been for the past three years. Now, wherein does it say that the Minister doesn't have that prerogative or has the agreement with the Hog Marketing Board that he's not able to give this information which we are now seeking?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Rock Lake knows full well that the Minister of Agriculture knows not of the details of any contracts between boards and their buyers of their products, whether it's the hog board or the turkey board or the egg board. A copy of those contracts do not enter upon the Minister's desk and I suppose if the Minister, whoever he may be, from time to time requested same, it's possible that a board may furnish him or her with that information but that is not common practice. Governments do not play a role in the day to day operations of marketing boards, not especially if they are producer elected. It's quite different if they are marketing commissions appointed by the Minister and who must answer to the Minister.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I agree wholeheartedly with the comments the Minister just made. My point, as I indicated, is that when the Minister asks for a resignation of one person who has been elected to a Board by the producers, I find it hard to understand how he can put himself in that position.

MR. USKIW: Well it's very simple, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Agriculture can make very good suggestions for the good of agriculture at any time.

A MEMBER: A little slippery though sitting on both sides of the fence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Resolution 14(a)(1). The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: I pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: I would just like to ask in 14(a), Mr. Chairman, for what reason is the budget in this particular section being reduced as — yes, there is a reduction there. Could the Minister indicate to us, have some services been reduced or what is the reason for the reduction in this figure?

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This has been a program that has been developed over the last four or five years with a great deal of aggressiveness on the part of the department. We are now in a position where we have at least I believe alerted the various commodity groups in Manitoba as to the value of market development and research programming, especially the marketing boards that exist in the province and we feel that our role should not continue to be as aggressive in terms of doing all of the things that we were doing on a continuing basis into the future now that we have open doors and avenues for the various producer groups, especially those that have marketing boards, that they should assume part of that responsibility with the assistance of the marketing branch so that while we are conspoken out against the establishment of a beef marketing board . . ." and etc. etc. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take some minutes of the committee's time to accept that challenge that the Minister has put forward.

Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons why we from time to time are in fact and appear to be as hard

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I think we should wait until we get to 7(b) before the Member for Lakeside wants to discuss that question because the Marketing Branch has

nothing to do with the Marketing Board per se and the Member wants to discuss the present referendum and marketing boards in general.

MR. ENNS: That's fair game, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 14(a)(1) — Pass. (a)(2) Other Expenditures — pass. (a) — Pass. Resolution 14(b) Manitoba Marketing Board. (1) Salaries. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, as I was saying, one of the reasons why we in the opposition get as exercised as we do with respect to the behaviour of this Minister from time to time is because of his willful distortion of historical fact with respect to the development of marketing boards. Mr. Chairman, I intend to go into some history with this respect. There has been a repeated attempt made by the Honourable Minister and this government to equate government appointed commissions, commodity commissions, and confusing them with producer controlled marketing boards. I refer to the specific commission that he like to refer to most often, namely the Hog Marketing Commission that was established by a Conservative administration back in the years of 1963 or 1964 or in that time period. That commission, Mr. Chairman, came about as a result of a study that the Minister is well familiar with, the Shewman Livestock Commission Report. It happened to be a commission that his First Minister served on and, in fact, led everyone to believe that he concurred with its majority report although in the final stages in the House, did in fact differ with it. But let me remind the members of the committee that at that particular time, it was deemed that a voluntary marketing agency, voluntary in every sense of the word and no hog producer was under any compulsion to ship his product, to market his product through that Board. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, even the supposedly compulsory check-off was voluntary in the sense that any producer could sign a card demanding full return of the check-off that was made for administrative purposes. Now the Honourable Member for St. George shakes his head but this happens to be historical fact — this happens to be historical fact.

Another situation that happens to be historical fact is that the NDP party at that time agreed to that only on the basis that there should be a vote two years hence, it was a resolution of the House, on the question of the future of marketing of hogs in this province and that if any change were to be contemplated, it would only be brought about by a vote of the House. It was my privilege to be a Minister at that time when that two year period came up; the honourable present Minister was in the House at that time when I canvassed him as well as the hog organization, the Pork Producers' Association of the province, the Manitoba Farm Bureau as well as the National Farm Union at that time and asking them as to whether or not the industry would be well served to carry out the resolution of the House that called for a vote within that two year period. By common consent, Mr. Chairman, and the records are on file, the letters are on file from these organizations and no objection was raised by the now Minister who sat in the House, who was not one to sit quietly in opposition, I might add, Mr. Chairman. He was known from time to time to at length lecture the then government and the then Minister of Agriculture about how he was mismanaging the affairs of the province. No objection was raised, Mr. Chairman, at that time about the voluntary concurrence on behalf of all that a vote on the question of the future of the marketing of hogs was not in the interest of the industry at that time. The Minister then chose to wait out a period of two or three very difficult years within the hog industry when pork prices ran around 118-19-20 cents astutely waiting for that period that happens in the cycles of all commodity groups when he knew the price was rising to without a vote introduce a compulsory hog marketing board. That's history, Mr. Chairman, history that the Minister I know will not refute. I only repeat it simply because the Minister likes to mix up apples and oranges when he talks about the creation of present marketing boards and the present capability of the beef producers to have the free and democratic way of deciding how their product is to be marketed as compared to those dark medieval days of former Conservation administration when we appointed boards. Mr. Chairman, it is apples and oranges. We're talking commissions and compulsory producer marketing control boards.

Mr. Chairman, what is wrong with Minister's and this government's and this department's approach to the marketing issue is that they vacillate from time to time on a decision that happens to be very important. The procedure that is set out by and large, I know it doesn't have to be followed but certainly has been followed — indeed, Mr. Chairman, if you point out to those successful boards that are operating in this province, boards that are working to some extent to the interests of the producers that they serve, it is well known to the Minister application is made to the senior body of the Manitoba Marketing Board; a plan is drawn up which is given time, six months, a year, a year and a half, two years in the case of turkeys, to circulate among the producers to come to some agreement at the producer level, to come to some agreement among the producer level as to the acceptability of that plan.

Mr. Chairman, what were some of the mechanics in drawing up these plans? For instance, it was agreed, in the case of chickens or broilers that for those people that want to have a few hens around their yard or that raise a few chickens just for their own use, that they are not a significant factor in the overall production of this commodity and as such should not come under the jurisdiction of this

board and as such should not have a vote on the board. That was very acceptable to the producers of that commodity group in the case I believe, unless it's been changed, but certainly at the time of the establishment of the broiler board, it was deemed that anybody that grew 300 chickens or less didn't really have a significant impact in the marketing, you know, of that commodity and as such, were not going to be affected by the board and therefore should not in fact be in a decision making role either by vote or otherwise in the creation of that board.

I needn't remind the Honourable Minister, Mr. Chairman, that in the case of potatoes, and let's talk about the Vegetable Marketing Board, one that I have a great deal of memory for. It was my baptism on the fire, you might say as a green Minister of Agriculture, and the role is uniquely reversed. You see, Mr. Chairman, on that particular occasion, it was this Minister of Agriculture that was defending the "fat-cats" the big boys, the Ed Connerys, the Walter Kroekers, the ones that had \$100,000 incomes and over in the vegetable industry against the little farmers, the little vegetable producers along the Assiniboine, along the Red River, the little one-acre, two-acre vegetable growers. That's how the line-up at that time stacked up and it's amazing, Mr. Chairman, how these roles reverse all of a sudden. Now, he was battling the feedlot owners, the fellows that feed 500 or 600 or 1,000 head of cattle; they're the villains of the peace; they're the freedom fighters that he wants to plow into the ground.

Well, Mr. Chairman, coming back to my dissertation on marketing boards, again, the importance was — in fact I will be so bold as to say that one of the difficulties that my immediate predecessor had in the Department of Agriculture in bringing about a vegetable marketing board in the Province of Manitoba was that there was a lack of unanimity within the vegetable industry and from Day Board faced extreme difficulties because there weren't sufficient safety valves in it, there weren't sufficient relief clauses in the Board. The Minister — I believe, he has not overturned that vote — when we had re-introduced some of the compulsory features in the vegetable industry, we made such provisions, for instance, that growers of potatoes of four acres or less, again, didn't have a serious economic impact in the terms of marketing of that product and as such shouldn't come under the control of the board and as such shouldn't have a vote on the board. Because we were dealing with a concern of the commodity and how it's being marketed, we weren't at that time concerned about one producer-one vote and the halo that we have now kind of put around, for very good reasons that I will come to, in the current beef vote.

A MEMBER: Potatoes and meat are a different thing, Sir.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, why is it important, Mr. Chairman for this kind of step-by-step procedure as we move into these marketing plans? Mr. Chairman, recently a study was undertaken by some agencies studying principally federal legislation. They were concerned about legislation that was seriously eroding basic and fundamental rights and interestingly enough, it was front page news in one of the daily newspapers — the marketing legislation across this country was singled out as being possibly one of the biggest violators of rights, of rights that we would otherwise take for granted in this country. Mr. Chairman, that's why it's very important that we understand what we're doing with this marketing legislation. There are rights that would frighten the hell out of most citizens of this country that are bestowed upon the inspectors and officials of any marketing board operating under the Natural Products Marketing Act in this province or in any other province or in this country. The fact that inspectors can barge down my door at 3 o'clock in the morning, seize my books without warrant, without court order, is granted to them when we established marketing boards. Mr. Chairman, let's understand this, the police could have every reason to believe that I had just finished robbing the Toronto-Dominion Bank of \$50,000, but they could not come into my home to search and seize anything without a proper court warrant, without a proper warrant for entering my home. A chicken inspector, a beef inspector, a turkey inspector like that can do that at any time, to any Manitoban farmer's home.

I do not lay that on the doorstep of this Minister — that legislation was there when I was there, in fact George Hutton put it in the damn legislation and it was there likely in D.L. Campbell's days. I'm simply pointing out that it is massive responsibility that we, as a senior government, transfer to a relatively small group of people, a minority group of people, powers that we put into their hands. Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether you were in the House, but it was this kind of power that so deluded one marketing board, namely the Vegetable Marketing Board, that they decided that they were going to put a firm out of business and they put him out of business - completely. Furthermore, they they decided that if any relative of that firm went anywhere else in the Province of Manitoba to work, they would put that firm out of business. They persecuted, in this case a family by the name of Gershwin, . . . to their sisters, to their cousins, or aunts and it brought about a massive indictment — you know it reads like a document from medieval times. I forget the Chief Justice, Justice Solomon I believe, that heard that on the Queen's Bench and it cost this particular marketing board, I believe a settlement of X number of thousands of dollars and I'm happy that justice prevailed in this instance, but the point of raising the question, Mr. Chairman, is simply to indicate the powers that we are transferring, the powers that we are transferring to a commodity board in this instance.

Mr. Chairman, when you're drawing up the plans for a board that give into the hands of a producer group, a commodity group, these powers, surely we, as senior parliamentarians, can't entirely divorce ourselves of our responsibilities. Surely, Mr. Chairman, as was the case in the development of the Turkey Board in this province, when there was a protracted period of negotiations, when it took a year and a half before the government of that day granted to the turkey producers of this province the right to establish their board because negotiations had to be arrived at as to how industry would live with this board; concern had to be expressed as to were we shutting off all opportunities for establishing highly desirable convenience food industry in this province. Surely, Mr. Chairman, we had to take time in developing the plans for these boards that there will be minimal abuse of the powers that we grant them.

Mr. Chairman, historically the pattern, development of the boards now in existence have followed that procedure as laid down — I don't say it's laid down; as a Minister I'm well aware, Mr. Chairman, of the Minister's power, the Minister has massive power, in this respect, under the Act. He need not call for elections; he need not call for immediate elected members to a board; the Minister can ignore referendums as an expression of opinions by producers, but, Mr. Chairman, I would like to believe that we, and this Minister, in the final analysis, you know in serving the agricultural community, is here for the purpose of representing that community and their interests and not a particular ideological point of view, no matter how strongly he believes it. And that if the producers of a particular commodity from time to time are out of step with the Minister's point of view, then I would like to think the Minister would be in a position to say, "Well, so I think they're wrong but I am their Minister of Agriculture and this is how they want to run their industry and why should I really be interfering with it?"

Mr. Chairman, the kind of games that the Minister has played with us on these questions, in kind of taking pleasure out of willfully mixing up commissions with boards and their responsibilities, the kind of suggestion that now for the first time in the history of Manitoba a commodity producers group is being given the opportunity for democratic expression as to how their commodity should be marketed. Those are the kind of things that excite and raise the ire of my friends and colleagues, particularly the Member from Morris and others. When he knows that he has used his prerogative power in any way that it suits him; in the case of hogs, no vote; in the case of hogs, eighteen months to get an elected group of directors; in the case of beef, immediately.

A MEMBER: One month.

MR. ENNS: One month— immediately. So we see this kind of instant ongoing, you know conversion of Paul on the road to Damascus that has made him a Buddhist, a Christian and a Jew all within the period of — getting halfway there. That Mr. Chairman, is what exercises members of the opposition, and that, Mr. Chairman I must also say, is that despite the fact that it is without question under this ministry, the Department of Agriculture has probably put more dollars, has had a higher profile in the agricultural field than, I would be prepared to say, than any others,

A MEMBER: For ideological reasons.

MR. ENNS: And yet, Mr. Chairman, I'm very proud to say that I and my colleagues represent 90 percent of the farm community in this Legislature, and coming June 28th of next year, we'll represent 100 percent of the farm community of this Legislature, and that has to be something that, if the Minister isn't concerned about, then at least his First Minister should be concerned about.

Mr. Chairman, the question before us with respect to the current question before us, with respect to the current Beef Marketing Board, I would ask you to put into context over the remarks that I just said. The Honourable Minister as a potato grower fully accepted the concept that a four-acre and less grower shouldn't really be entitled to a vote, but in the case of this beef marketing vote, one calf, one cow is equivalent to the fellow that is raising 1,000 cows, 1,000 steers. In the case of hogs, no vote to establish the board; in the case of beef, we have to have a vote and we have to have letters going out with the ballots from the Minister explaining the vote, and we have to have words on the actual ballot. It's not an affront enough, Mr. Chairman, for the Minister to tamper with what should be an open ballot but he has the effrontery to put on the actual ballot: "Make sure you read the Minister's letter before you mark." On the actual ballot, Mr. Chairman. Here is the Minister's letter — that effrontery enough, Mr. Chairman, to any concept of an open election, but on the ballot itself it says: "and . . . are you in favour of the establishment of a Manitoba cattle producers' marketing board with the duties and powers described on page 2 of the Minister's letter to all beef producers?" On the ballot itself. Just in case you mislaid the letter, you know, you're supposed to rush back home and read the neutral letter again.

Well, Mr. Chairman, it's not a great deal of pleasure on the part of the opposition to be that hard on our Minister of Agriculture. I've said this before, he is my Minister of Agriculture; he's everyone's Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Chairman, the Minister deserves the rebuke that he gets from the agricultural community for the games that he plays with us and the distortions that he deliberately puts into the public record when he refers to, particularly the issue of marketing.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I say that the kind of powers involved in marketing boards are such

that should be weighed very heavily by any government before they pass them on to a small handful of minority producer groups. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the provision that was in the Act that a minimum of sixty-six and two-thirds of the vote should carry before it is considered that you have any degree of unanimity within the commodity group, simply because, Mr. Chairman, again you're not tinkering with ordinary processes of decision making; you're transferring powers and rights. Mr. Chairman, I could perhaps best demonstrate that by — we have a continuing debate going on right now with respect to the repatriation of our Constitution of this country — now, we don't put that on a simple 50 percent majority, 50 percent plus one majority. What is the debate all about? We're concerned, there are those who believe that the amendments to the Constitution should require 100 percent unanimity; there are others who believe in combinations of Quebec and Ontario and three other provinces, because we are dealing with fundamental decisions, fundamental rights, fundamental freedoms. I am not so sure, Mr. Chairman, that there is anything undemocratic, anything not right when we're transferring these kind of powers to a minority group, that we should not seek, and we should not demand a far greater degree of unanimity, a far greater degree of willingness on the part of these producers who are prepared to put themselves under this control than the simple 50 plus one majority that the Minister now demands and has changed the Act to conform to his wishes.

Mr. Chairman, I have no idea how the vote will turn out on the beef referendum and that's really not the gist of my overall remarks. I'm suggesting to the Honourable Minister through you, Mr. Chairman, that the whole business of a granting to commodity groups the rights of the all-powerful legislation that's contained in the Natural Products Marketing Act is something that any government, any senior government has to be very cautious about. I'm not at all sure that the consumer groups of this nation are fully aware although, thanks to the work of one Madam Plumtre and others, that I believe Canadian consumers are finally finding out that these kind of commodity groups can work pretty directly against the consumer interests of this province. I think that the glaring examples of some of the failures in the supply and management concept in these producer groups has, because of the immediate coverage, slowly brought home an awareness to many of our urban cousins who really up to now we didn't give a damn what farmers did with our products or how we decided to sort out our marketing problems. But it does bother them all of a sudden when producer groups and marketing boards such as the egg board destroys eggs, artificially keeps eggs up at a high level, and when they find out that these same eggs are available to them at considerably less dollars across the line. It should worry any government when producer groups are given this power to the point where they can, albeit in acting what they believe to be in their interests, are in fact not acting in the public interest.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister has shown a degree of capacity to distort and to move around the situation that is wonderful to behold. Except, Mr. Chairman, that in so doing, he has somewhere along the line, from his positions that he took from the time that he was critical of the then Minister of Agriculture with respect to the Vegetable Marketing industry, through to the time of the development of a Hog Producers Board, through to the period of time when last night he indicated to me, very forcibly, that the reason and the rationale why the Milk Producers Board needs to have a regulating agency is because they cannot be entrusted with the full power. Well, he said that there has to be a watchdog over them; there has to be somebody representing consumer interests which the Minister indicated was essentially the role of the Milk Control Board now, to set prices. The turkey producers set their prices, the egg producers set their prices, the hog producers demand their prices, they don't set their prices because we operate not in a closed shop arena; we operate on the North American continent.

All I'm trying to point out, Mr. Chairman, is that in the space of the seven or eight years that this Minister has occupied office, he has shown all six or eight or nine sides of the coin — if there are that many sides to a coin — on the question of marketing. Whatever the political situation of the day suited him, it is for that reason that there is such a degree of hostility in this present vote. Mr. Chairman, it is unbelievable that a Minister that has put more money into the hands of the beef producers than any other Minister of this province before, that he should not be able to walk into any hall and any pubs in any part of this province, and be greeted with cheers. Much less have fire alarms turned out on him or lights turned out on him. You know, that to me is, you know I wish that I would have had the clout in my days to get that kind of money from my cabinet colleagues to support my industry to that extent. But, Mr. Chairman, the inditement is clear. This Minister has dismally failed in understanding what the beef producers want in this province; he has dismally failed in trying to interpret those wants into legislation and into programs. What he is doing, and that's what the beef producers understand, he is doing what he wants to do and that isn't necessarily what the beef producers want to be done. The Minister has the right to do that but he should know that it is for that reason that the Minister is not winning the popularity contest with the beef producers whom he has treated with some generosity, with considerable generosity. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I listen with a great deal of interest to the comments of the Member for

Lakeside and they are not new comments; they are comments that have been uttered before, so I am not going to take up too much time in rebutting them again. But I would like to point out to the Members of the Committee that one would want to ponder what the discussion and debate would be like here today on this item if we had proceeded towards the establishment of a beef marketing board in this province without a vote. I wonder what kind of discussion we would have here, Mr. Chairman, it's very interesting to note that there is some hostility with respect to the vote on the part of the members opposite and that, Mr. Chairman, does surprise me. At least they should say, "Well at least we're thankful that the Minister has allowed the producers to make the decision, whatever that decision is going to be." But here they are bemoaning the fact that we are holding a referendum. And, you know when you take into account, Mr. Chairman, that we had had a whole host of studies, many meetings throughout rural Manitoba, meetings conducted by an advisory committee, not of my choosing but people nominated or selected by the various beef growers associations or producers associations in the province and who submitted two recommendations to me, a majority recommendation and a minority recommendation, both of which advocate the setting up of a marketing agency without a vote. Now I can appreciate, Mr. Chairman, why the Member for Lakeside would have preferred that I had accepted that recommendation because he would have had then cause to call and to question the Minister's actions and his disregard for the rights and freedoms of people who may have other opinions and he would have reason to question whether a majority of beef producers in Manitoba were really in support of such a measure. But having received a recommendation that we proceed with the setting up of a marketing board, a unanimous position of 12 members of the advisory committee and their signatures are on the two documents, it's not a figment of my imagination, you know, 12 people out of 12 recommending that the Minister not refer the question to the producers by way of a plebiscite, I think it's worthwhile to recap. It says, "The committee therefore recommends that an agency known as the Cattle Producers Agency be established under The Natural Products Marketing Act without a . . ."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lakeside, I'll supply him with a ton of these copies because it's there in point by point form, that an agency be set up without a prior plebiscite of producers . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please.

MR. USKIW: Yes, under the Natural Products Marketing Act, you can only set up a board under the Natural Products Marketing Act by way of a producer referendum.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I will desist from interrupting the Minister if you will allow an interruption at this point.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the member can put his question at the end of my remarks.

The second point, the provisional directors of the agency be cattle producers appointed by the Minister of Agriculture. Now maybe the Member for Lakeside perhaps cannot be faulted for dwelling on the word "agency" but, you know, I had to dwell on that word when that report was presented to me because I said to them you're recommending a measure under The Natural Products Marketing Act, you can only establish a marketing board under that Act. They said, yes but it has a little more color to it, more presentable if you don't call it a board, Mr. Minister, so we would prefer that you call it an agency. That is the distinction that my honourable friend, the Member for Lakeside, is trying to make.

Point number three, the provisional board be authorized to make regulations with respect to weighing . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside state his point of order.

MR. ENNS: The Minister is stating an untruth. It is quite possible to set up different forms of agencies or commissions under The Natural Products Marketing Act. The previous administration set up the Hog Marketing Commission, not a board, under the same Natural Products Marketing Act referred to by the Minister.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lakeside is quite correct. If we were to set up a marketing commission as such, that is correct, but that is not precisely what has been recommended by the majority report but rather by the minority report, representing 4 out of the 12 people. The following recommendations were also presented:

That the provisional board be appointed by the Minister of Agriculture.

That the provisional board be authorized to make regulations with respect to weighing, settlement and identification procedures in plants and auction markets and with respect to disclosure of prices paid by packers for animals sold direct — by the way, that would require powers under the Natural Products Marketing Act to do that.

To investigate alternative markets and to test competitive methods of selling cattle on a rail grade basis.

To investigate producer complaints.

To require buyers to post prices and discounts offered for rail grade purchases.

To collect and disseminate market and price information.

To exercise such additional powers as may be approved by a producer plebescite.

The provisional board be replaced by an elected board within two years.

Mr. Chairman, in the whereases, it says here that Where as it appears that most producers prefer that the directors of such an agency be elected at the earliest possible date — in this referendum it will be on Day One, that's as early as we can make it — the directors be elected by registered producers within districts established on the basis of producer numbers and recognized geographic boundaries.

Number six, which the Member for Lakeside completely wishes to ignore. The elected board have all powers exercised by the provisional board and such additional powers as may be necessary to carry out all other functions as recommended by the Manitoba Livestock and Meat Commission, complete, Mr. Chairman, the powers to carry out all those functions under recommendation number six.

Powers additional to those specified in number six be granted to the elected board only upon approval of producers.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is quite clear what the recommendations of the majority of the committee of 12 were. Now the minority report recommends that the Minister set up a marketing commission, without a referendum to determine whether the producers want it and that within three years, or after three years, a vote be called to determine, not whether this commission should continue or not but whether it should be converted to a producer marketing board.

Mr. Chairman, when those two documents were presented to me, it was obvious that I had less than a unanimous position on the part of the advisory committee and so the question is what do you do when your own advisory committee is split on the question. The obvious answer is that you probably should consult with producers and that's why the referendum.

But you know, apart from the official record, which I have documented and which anyone can get a copy of, we went around the table and we asked the producers, the advisory committee, if they had their personal preference, not withstanding what they think the general populace wants, if they had their personal preference, what would their recommendation be. Well, 7 out of the 12 said that they would want an elected board without a plebescite on the question, 7 out of the 12. Four out of the 12 said they would want a commission without a plebescite, so we now have 11 out of 12 saying, Mr. Minister, an elected board or a commission, both without a plebescite. One person out of 12 said, have a commission with a plebescite first. Now, that explains the reason for the Minister's action and that is that the question was referred to the producers and, of course, the results will be known very shortly and whatever the results are, whether they are positive or negative on the question, at least we will know what the opinion is in the majority at least of the producers, whether we want a marketing board or we don't, whether we want to change the system or we don't and we will respect that opinion, but at least we will have it for the first time in our history. We have never had that question put before.

Now the Member for Lakeside questions whether everyone should have a vote. I have to agree with him that with respect to the referendum on potatoes that there was a four acre exemption and that was decided, not because it was preferred that way, but because that was the government's position, that they were getting so much static from the two or three acre producers who didn't want to be regulated, that they decided that the way to handle this would be to exempt the small producers and to regulate the larger ones and I didn't quarrel with that at that time and I don't quarrel with it today, but that was the reason for the exemption at that time, it's to save the Minister from all of the flack that he was receiving at that time in that referendum. But I think it was a right decision, it did help bring about a resolve to the then dispute on the question.

With respect to a later marketing agency that was established under this government or during the term of office of this government, I refer to the egg producers marketing board. There too was an exemption, where anyone who had less than 500 hens would not be subject to the regulations and would not have a vote. No different than what was done with respect to the potatoes. But in both of these commodities it is not difficult to identify an exempt product. I dare my honourable friend, the Member for Lakeside, to tell me how the industry would handle an exempt product delivered to the stock yards by some transfer, from some farmer —(Interjection)— Yes. Well, in any event, Mr. Chairman, it is not a practical thing to suggest that we can have some means of exemptions so that farmers who do not wish to come under this plan, that they somehow would not have to pay the levy. I don't know how you would set up that kind of mechanism, with the size and scope of the beef industry of this province and the multiplicity of mechanisms in the sales area. I just don't know how you would do it, mechanically speaking.

Secondly, it is also open, no matter what the results of this vote are, that a producer has a choice to sell through the auction ring as they do now on a live basis, or they will continue or choose to sell on the rail grade basis. The only difference that is going to be made if this vote is carried, is that all sales

will have to be competitive. Today we do not have a competitive marketing system. We had something like 13 commission firms in St. Boniface a few years ago and now we have about four and the stockyards in St. Boniface handle about 25 percent of the market, slaughter market cattle and yet that is the market that everyone sort of hangs their hat on, that should set the price for Manitoba even though it only handles 25 percent. Seventy-five percent is bypassing it. It's kind of a ridiculous situation. Now at some point in time and I don't know when but I suppose if that market continues to erode and it gets down to 15 percent or 10 percent, it will not exist, cannot carry on and therefore there will be no bench mark whatever established in Manitoba for the value of livestock. Every deal will then be a private transaction between a producer and a packer and one farmer will not know what the other one is receiving for his product, would not know how to judge the competitiveness of the market or the value of his product and that would result in absolute total chaos in terms of the market place, even though it's almost there today. So it's not as if we don't have a problem. But that is the only change that is going to be made if this vote carries, that all cattle for slaughter will have to be marketed competitively and openly, so there will be options for the producers, regardless of the result. In fact, less options if the result is negative than if it is positive.

Now, the Member for Lakeside made a major point of the powers under The Natural Products Marketing Act, the powers of inspection, you know, he wants to frighten every Manitoban with the powers in that Act. Well, I suppose they could be frightened by it, it's been there a long long time and we have had eight marketing boards established under that legislation but, somehow everyone has survived and we haven't had one request for the dismantling of any of the marketing boards that exist, in all the years that I've been there, not once, with all those awesome powers. Then who has the power of inspection? The Member for Lakeside doesn't — perhaps he's forgotten or perhaps he chose not to tell us where the power lies. The power doesn't lie in the hands of the Producer Marketing Board, the powers lie in the hands of the Manitoba Marketing Board, which is the supervisory agency over all boards and who receive complaints from producers about the action of their board, or complaints from processors or buyers, or whoever else is involved in the industry and they are the umpire of the whole system. They have the powers of inspection, to determine whether or not the complaints are valid or invalid, to apprehend people who are trying to bypass the laws of the land, the regulations that apply to that particular commodity. Those powers are only used when there is a complaint launched and where there is some mischief-making in the system, very much the same as the powers that are used by the enforcement people in the enforcement of The Highway Traffic Act. They don't make a nuisance of themselves, they try to leave the public well on its own most of the time. But when there is a problem on the highway system they have to be there to protect the interest of the public. That is really the role of the Manitoba Marketing Board and the powers in that legislation.

The Member for Lakeside also made the point that we should go back to the same sort of rule which they employed in the establishment of marketing boards. That is, that it should be required that two-thirds of the people, the producers, should vote yes before a board could be established. He suggests that it's such an awesome thing that, you know you really must have that kind of majority before you make such a major change. Well, you know the biggest change that I can think of is a change in government, whether it's at the national level or provincial level but somehow we get by there with about 40 percent of the electorate making the decisions, or less, sometimes a little more but never much more. The most important decision that the people make collectively, is made always with less than 50 percent of the vote. The Member for Lakeside suggests that somehow, in this decision, we should have a two-thirds majority. Well, that is not a democratic position from my point of view, I do believe that if 50 percent or more of any given group come to a common frame of mind, that that is a success story. It's very difficult to get people to think in like terms on a given issue. If you can get 50 percent of them thinking in one direction, you have achieved something and especially, especially Mr. Chairman, if it relates to the beef producers of this province. I have said this from day one in this referendum, if 50 percent plus one were able to get together on one issue, we will have achieved something great in this province because that is one group that has been most difficult to get together on any issue, most difficult and this will serve as a good test, just to see whether there is common ground and how much of it there is.

Now the Member for Rock Lake said in the House the other day that he's convinced that 95 percent of the people don't really want this thing. Well, if he is right and I'm not going to doubt him' Mr. Chairman, I'm going to let the Returning Officer tell us when the ballots are counted; but if he is correct, then the vote will be 95 percent against and five percent for and we will live with that decision. That is going to be democracy at work and no harm is lost in the process, no harm done rather in the process.

Now the Member for Lakeside suggests to us that people should be voting on something that they know nothing of or about; that the Minister should never introduce with the ballot the question that is being put to them. That's what the Member for Lakeside is suggesting; that they should not know what it is that they are voting on. And you know, the Minister's letter only talks about what the implications of the vote are if it's yes and what they are if it's no and the duties of the board and the

powers of the board are spelled out — precisely spelled out — and attached to the ballot so that there would be no misunderstanding as to what they are voting for or against. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that if that were not so, the Member for Lakeside would then be asking this Minister, "Why are you asking the producers to vote for something that they know nothing about?" That's what he would be saying, Mr. Chairman, so I reject completely the notion that the producer should not have attached with the ballot, information as to the duties and powers of this agency should the vote carry and what will happen should the vote not carry. I think that is the least we can do in order that the producers can cast their ballots in the most intelligent way.

Now the Member for Lakeside went on to suggest to us that he has an example of mismanagement and he used the Egg Board. Well, you know, the Member for Lakeside should have done some research on that one because when you — (Interjection) — well, Mr. Chairman, the member says he doesn't have staff — I would have been prepared to assist him, Mr. Chairman. Normally, when there is a very small surplus of a given commodity, that very small surplus in an open market system destroys the whole market. It can only be a one or two percent surplus but it has the effect of destroying the whole of the market. And so the success story of the egg agency is that notwithstanding the fact that they had a small surplus, 28 million eggs counted one by one by the Winnipeg Free Press and others who didn't want to count them in dozens or in cases, one egg per Canadian plus a portion, that was the surplus problem that we had at that time, that at that particular time, proved to us the success of the program because the price of eggs didn't drop even though they had 28 million eggs too many.

MR. ENNS: I just wish there were / a few consumers in this room while you're making that statement.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lakeside wants me to apologize to the consumers over this. The consumers also have a benefit from it in that they don't have to worry about the supply and demand question, that when the producers have a steady return on labour and investment, they are not opting in and out of production and the consumer prices don't bounce around like a yo-yo from one year to another — three dozen for a dollar one day; nine months later it's a dollar a dozen because everybody went broke for a while and there are no eggs. That's the kind of market that my honourable friend, the Member for Lakeside believes in. Well that's fine, that's his privilege. It has not been my belief ever nor will it ever be. But, certainly the producers have a right to determine for themselves whether they wish to bargain collectively and that's what this legislation has been put on the books for, and I give credit to whoever the government was that put it there and I believe it was a Liberal government at that time. It was sorely needed at that time, in fact, in some instances perhaps it isn't needed anymore because some of the commodities that we now produce are produced by so few people in this country that we almost have to think in terms of applying the anti-combines legislation with respect to those commodities. But nevertheless, it was designed for the protection of the vast numbers of producers who had no bargaining power; it is only in the last ten years that commodity groups across Canada seized on that legislation and put it to work and only in the last five years that the Government of Canada passed similar legislation in order to complement and enjoin with the provincial legislation across Canada in order to make a market system work to the advantage of the nation as a whole.

So when the Member for Lakeside suggests to me, Mr. Chairman, that those are bad examples — those are, by the way, very good examples. They have worked relatively well despite the fact that the farmers in question — they weren't complaining about the price of eggs or the price of milk, they said "All we want is more quota. We want to increase our rights because we are satisfied with the margins that we are receiving for eggs or for milk." They didn't say "Knock out the props, let's get back to the free market." They said "We must have more quota." I dare any beef man to say he wants more quota today, when he is losing on every head that he produces because your loss multiplies by the numbers of head that you have if you are losing on every one of them. That is not their position today and that is why this province has poured out \$34 million of assistance, of subsidy over the last two years in order to keep the beef industry alive.

Now the Member for Lakeside makes a point that the Minister should be greeted with cheers, having advanced so much of the provincial revenues towards the rural development of this province. Well, you know, he hasn't been with me at these meetings; he hasn't been there, and the particular one he chose to make reference to, where the fire alarm was set off — I should remind the Member for Lakeside that that was a very good meeting, but it did have one or two nuts at the meeting . . .

A MEMBER: The fire alarm went and there was no fire.

MR. USKIW: That's right. It did have one or two characters at the meeting and that is the element that my friend the Member for Lakeside wants to associate himself with. Well that's his credit, Mr. Chairman, if it is a credit, not mine. I do not wish to associate myself with that kind of element because that is a destructive element, it is not a constructive element.

So, Mr. Chairman, I believe I have belaboured the point; I enjoy the opportunity to debate with my friend the Member for Lakeside.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, it has been interesting to hear the comments from the Minister of Agriculture on this whole beef referendum, and I think if the truth were known, he is aware and we are all aware that the Federal Minister of Agriculture believes in supply management, as he does. One of the things that concern me, Mr. Chairman, insofar as this referendum on beef is concerned, if this vote were to pass, 50 percent one or better, it would be the first Beef Marketing Board on the North American continent. Many farmers have said to me, "This is a very very big step forward insofar as this Minister is concerned." It is not the kind of a step that many farmers have said to me that they want to take. You know, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Agriculture has done a beautiful job, really a beautiful job of confusing the issue so completely that farmers just didn't know what to make of the whole thing.

Now I take you back, Mr. Chairman, when the Manitoba Farm Bureau had their annual meeting — and I say the Minister was courteous to come to speak to that meeting — he was posed of a number of questions and he talked about the clubs in the House the other night when replying to the Throne Speech. The clubs that he referred to were the Beef Growers Association of this province, the Cow-Calf Producers of this province and he referred to them as just glorified clubs. I, Mr. Chairman, took a very dim view of the Minister's comments in that light and it indicated to me the respect he has for those organizations and the work that those organizations have done on behalf of the cow-calf operators and the beef producers of this province, working for the last several years on behalf of those two respective groups. So the Minister doesn't have to say that they have not been in consultation with them. At this annual meeting, Mr. Chairman, when they found out there was going to be a plebiscite, they asked the Minister if there would be any chance of curtailing the vote for say a month or so and, as I understand it, the Minister was in the negative. They also asked if the Minister would allow those organizations to have some input into what the ballot would be. In other words, assist in drafting the ballot so that farmers would clearly understand what this thing was all about.

I have had many farmers and they have written to me and asked me if I could have any influence on this Minister as to the contents of that ballot, and what they wanted to know, because the Minister — he received the majority report from the Livestock Advisory Committee, and what that report recommended is not the wishes, or at least the hopes that the Minister was looking for, namely a marketing board for beef with full powers. This, Mr. Chairman, and I say on behalf — I think I can speak on behalf of an awful lot more farmers in this province than the Minister can — when I say that the farmers were not and are not asking for a marketing board with full powers.

Mr. Chairman, I as well as the Minister, and I agree with him that there are marketing problems in the province insofar as beef is concerned. And you can't compare a beef commodity with pork because you have so many different varieties. In the ballot that was sent out to farmers the Minister indicated, and it states — and I want to reread it again: "Ballot under the natural powers of the Marketing Act" and it asks "Are you in favour of the establishment of a Manitoba Cattle Producers Marketing Board where the duties and powers described on Page 2 of the Minister's letter to all beef producers in Manitoba — and you know on Page 2, Mr. Chairman, the number one duty of the board is to act as a selling agency on behalf of all Manitoba producers who sell their slaughtered cattle on a carcass grade and weight basis.

To act as a selling agency, in other words that is taking complete control, Mr. Chairman. The farmers have not asked for this. The farmers have not asked for this, I repeat, Mr. Chairman, and this is the area in which the farmers, I would say, — and we'll know around the 18th of this month as to whether I am right or whether the Minister is right. If he is right, all well and good to him.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is a very very important issue when we talk about marketing boards and farmers are very concerned about it. The Minister indicated, when he started this crusade a few months ago, that he was going to remain neutral. I can say to him that I have maintained that neutrality but I can't say the same thing for the Minister. — (Interjections) —

The Minister indicated in the House — I am speaking, Mr. Chairman, of myself. If the Member for Portage la Prairie wants to get in debate I would be interested in hearing what he has to say about the beef industry in the dying moments of his political career, I would be most interested to hear his comments.

Well, Mr. Chairman, one of the things that really concern me, when the Minister referred to my colleagues and myself as the big lie, the kind of propaganda that he was indicating to us was being passed around in the last few months. I would like to know who on our side was passing out propaganda that wasn't accurate and correct. I can indicate to him, and I'll speak for myself, that I attended a few meetings, gave no indication as to how they should vote, but I did state to farmers, "I hope that you will be properly informed so that you will know how to vote intelligently." This to me, Mr. Chairman, has been one of the issues that certainly has been a very concerned point of view insofar as the producers of beef are concerned.

The other area — my colleague from Lakeside was talking about how they should determine who will be entitled to vote. I have been given to understand, Mr. Chairman, that in the Beef Promotion

program, when the Minister found, in December of 1975 that he wasn't happy with the number of applications or the number of sales that he had made, he put on a blitz for another month to sell his program. I am given to understand, Mr. Chairman, that — I will give an example — where there is, say, father and son, each have their own farm, produce their own feed, sell their own cattle in their respective names, and if they belong to the Beef Promotion program, they were automatically on the list for a ballot. On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, if a similar case down the road, there was a father and son in a similar operation — I should have said in the first instance, Mr. Chairman, that father and son in this case, if they were members of the Beef Promotion program, they had their cattle in the same area for the winter months, that was the one thing omitted and I say it now. Now getting back to say, a father and son situation that didn't join the Beef Promotion program, everything was similar but just because their cattle were in the same area for the winter months, the Marketing Board stated there would be only one vote. In other words, the father would get the ballot and not the son.

I mentioned this to the Minister in the House so he tried to skirt the issue by saying, "well, if we are going to do that, we can give the father, son, the wife, the daughter and the uncle and all the rest of them a ballot." This is being hypothetical, Mr. Chairman, and it is being, if I may say, just a bit ridiculous when the Minister replies in that fashion when I make the claim that — and my point was this, that I don't think this was being totally democratic, because I am wondering how many farmers who I feel are entitled to a vote are not going to get the ballot that is going on right now.

I would like to hear some comments from the Minister before I go further.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, the point that I wanted to bring up was the eligibility to vote and my colleague here has covered it very thoroughly as far as I am concerned. I don't think that I have that much more to say about it. The Minister has always proclaimed very pompously that the NDP democracy is the end-all of everything. To me this business of belonging to any government program and being automatically set up for a vote and an individual like myself or one of my boys has to go down and pick up a ballot, have his signature notarized, put down their social security number — well, to me this is typical NDP democracy, there is no doubt about that.

A MEMBER: What's wrong with it?

MR. FERGUSON: What's wrong with it? All right, certainly I will tell you what's wrong with it. I believe that every person that has sold cattle in this province is entitled to a vote. I don't believe it should be because he belongs to a government program; I don't believe it should be somebody that lives in the City of Winnipeg, the Town of Gladstone or the City of Portage, that's maybe got a calf and a cow on his father's farm or his brother's farm and he sold one calf, and that vote should kill 500 or 1,000 votes; or a guy that has 500 or 1,000 cattle on a feed lot.

A MEMBER: Should get the cows to vote, it would be 500 to one.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, that's quite true. At least you had the decency when you were going through a . . . vote over four acres, they had a vote, but when it came to broilers you went over 500.

MR. USKIW: Partnerships had one vote too. One vote.

MR. FERGUSON: Well then would the Minister explain why, that if a family farm, there are four people involved, that they would get a vote and if you are a family farm and don't belong to the program that only one gets a vote. This is what I would like to hear.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, we have gone through this many times and I don't mind doing it again.

The fact is that the rules apply equally to people enrolled in any program and those that are not. The only reason for the registration requirements for those that are not in the program is for the sake of identifying that they are there, that they exist and that they are entitled to a vote. There is no knowledge, that is we have no knowledge of the numbers of producers in Manitoba and where they are and who they are. So wherein we don't have knowledge of the existence of a producer, they had the opportunity to fill out a registration form, to have it notarized to claim eligibility for a ballot. That is the only way in which it is possible to be done.

Now there is no point in requiring that to be done of a person who is already on a list or a roll, where we know that they are producers, they are on contract with us as producers, so there is no doubt as to their eligibility. But there is no difference in the application of the father-son partnership corporation-co-operative concept in terms of their entitlement of a vote. Whether you are in the program or whether you are out, that rule is equal to all. There is no difference in the rule set down by the Manitoba Marketing Board and the Returning Officer in that regard. It applies equally to all, whether you are in government programs or out it makes no difference. So a person does not automatically get a ballot because he or she happens to be in partner with another person or more. Only one person will get a ballot per unit regardless.

Now, the Member for Rock Lake makes the point that we will know on the 18th or thereabouts whether he is right or whether the Minister is right. Now in making that statement he is assuming that the Minister is putting forward a proposition that must carry and he is assuming that his proposition is that it must not carry.

Well, Mr. Chairman, it matters not what the Member for Rock Lake would prefer or what the Member for Lac du Bonnet or the Minister of Agriculture would prefer. What matters is what the producers prefer and that is a result that we are looking for, and it is not whether the Minister is right or wrong is in question at all; it is the very reason that there is a vote because the Minister wasn't sure as to how we should proceed on the recommendations that were made to the Minister by the Advisory Committee. That is . the reason for the vote. There wasn't even a unanimous recommendation; so therefore the logic of it was that the best way to find out would be to refer the question to the producers.

If the Minister thought that the producers were overwhelmingly in favour, you know, one could have given some credibility to a recommendation that said, "set it up without a vote, Mr. Minister". It's very easy to do that. But it is precisely because of the lack of knowledge, of not knowing whether there is adequate support for such a major move, that we have the referendum. That is what it is all about, to find out.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, here again we have gone through a mountain of paper during the past month or six weeks to try and improve eligibility or whatever the case may be. Now would it not have been just as simple — basically no one knew that this vote was coming as of the 1st of December, so would it not have been just as simple to enclose a weigh slip that proved that you had sold one animal during the past year. Would that not have proved that you were in the business. It wouldn't have? Well to me it would have. But of course, the Minister, you would have to be involved directly with him and get his sanction before you would be entitled to a vote. I would certainly like the Minister to explain to me why a weigh slip wouldn't be proof enough that you are in the business of selling cattle.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Manitoba Marketing Board has been there a long long time, longer than the Member for Gladstone was a Member, and longer than the Member for Gladstone is perhaps a producer.

They have set out criteria on how they would conduct referendums and it is not new criteria. They have conducted many referendums long before my time in government. At the time that the Member for Lakeside was the Minister and at the time that the former Minister George Hutton was there, we had referendums. And the same Board established the same rules on each of those referendums. The same Board, the present Board consists of people that were appointed by a Liberal government, , a Conservative government and this government. . The present makeup of that board consists of people from all three governments.

So if my friend wants to question the motivation and the integrity of the Manitoba Marketing Board he is free to do so. I happen to have a high regard for that group.

MR. FERGUSON: Well I am speaking of the integrity of the people that are producing cattle. If you want to go back to that I don't think there was social security numbers back when the Minister is talking about the Marketing Board being formed either. He has got himself in the position that he will not accept the truth on behalf of the producers that are not enrolled in his programs.

I had one fellow phone me last Sunday who is a war veteran. He has been involved in the business of producing cattle with his father since 1945 and he is not getting a vote.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, on that very point. I pointed out to the member that each unit of production is entitled to one vote. Now that is a historic procedure with respect to the Manitoba Marketing Board.

MR. FERGUSON: Then hold it to your program. One vote toward the unit too if it is on one place.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I have pointed out to the members that there is no difference between people enrolled in the government program, the Beef Income Assurance Program, or people not enrolled in it, in terms of their eligibility for a ballot. They are all treated equally, there is no difference.

MR. FERGUSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, there certainly is a difference. They automatically get a ballot if they are enrolled in your program. Read your regulations.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, they do not automatically get a ballot. They get one ballot per unit of production. No matter how many are enrolled from that unit of production in the Beef Income Assurance Program, are entitled to one ballot per unit of production.

MR. FERGUSON: Very well then. I take it that if you are enrolled in your program you are automatically a unit of production. That is what you are trying to tell us, is it?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, there are partnerships in corporations and co-operatives that are enrolled in the Beef Income Assurance Program. They are entitled to one ballot each, not one ballot per person, one ballot per partnership or per corporation or per co-operative. And that applies equally to everyone in Manitoba.

MR. FERGUSON: Then we will start out from Day One again, Mr. Minister, and we will say that we have a father, a son and a daughter; they are all enrolled in the beef stabilization program. They have four separate contracts. Consequently, they automatically receive four ballots.

MR. USKIW: No' absolutely not. Not if they are one unit of production.

MR. FERGUSON: But if they are four units of production . . . ?

MR. USKIW: Yes, absolutely.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I think in all the advertisement and publicity — I don't have it here in black and white before me now, that they specifically stated that anyone who was in a beef promotion program and anyone who was in the business of producing dairy products under the Manitoba Milk Producers Marketing Board, automatically got a ballot. When meetings were held throughout the country the ag reps were there for the purpose of providing information as I have been given to understand and those who were not automatically eligible, there were forms for them to fill out, signed by a Notary Public or a Commissioner of Oaths, and you also had to put your social security number down on it and then having done that, it was submitted to the Manitoba Marketing Board and it was there where they decided as to whether you qualified for a vote or not.

I would like to go onestep further, Mr. Chairman, and ask, after a certain period of time the ag reps were doing an excellent job in providing just information and all of a sudden on a Thursday morning the Deputy Minister of this office notified all the directors and all the regions saying, "No more will the ag reps attend any of these meetings." I'd like to ask the Minister to explain that one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, that's not difficult to do. First of all I want to point out to the Member for Rock Lake that the Manitoba Marketing Board did not issue ballots to everyone enrolled in the Beef Income Assurance Program. They were automatically registered, and then the registration list had to be checked to take out the duplications where there were more than one person involved in one production unit. That process had to be undertaken for those eligible producers as well. — (Interjection)— Well, you can check all you want, Mr. Chairman, I have no problem with that. That's the rule laid down, not by the Minister but by the Manitoba Marketing Board who are in charge of the referendum.

A MEMBER: You called a vote.

MR. USKIW: Well of course, Mr. Chairman, we called a vote. But we have a marketing board whose responsibility it is to conduct referendums whenever they are called; that is their role to set up the ground rules.

Secondly, anyone is able to challenge the list if they feel that someone is in receipt of a ballot that is not entitled to and so on. So all of those procedures were well laid down and publicized.

Now with respect to the question that the Member for Rock Lake raises, that the ag reps were not allowed to participate. —(Interjection)— No, from Day One, Mr. Chairman, the Beef Growers' Association, amongst others, requested that the Department be neutral in this referendum. That we not utilize the resources of the Department, its staff, in promoting the vote one way or the other. At that stage an instruction went out to all of our staff that they not participate in this referendum, that the producers should set up their own meetings, distribute their own literature and do their own thing on each side of the question, that we would not be involved, because we did not want to be accused of being partial with the resources of the Department.

The same group immediately challenged us that we denied them our staff in the calling of meetings and the distribution of their propaganda, so they wanted it both ways. If we had not gone along with it they would have attacked the government. Had we gone along with their request that we be neutral they still attack the government for not allowing the staff to be utilized at their meetings.

So it's just a bunch of nonsense, Mr. Chairman, and my friends opposite are part of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I enter into this debate with some trepidation because my four honourable Conservative friends across from me are all experienced farmers and have a great deal of knowledge with respect to the cattle business.

But for some months now I have been listening to the pros and cons that the various organizations have formed, some of them rather quickly, some on the government side and of course some against. But what concerns me is that I would like to know exactly what the Conservatives' stand is on this. I would think that legislators, and whoever's interested, would like to see first of all some kind of settling of the question — and I've made four points here.

The first one is, those concerned should have the right to vote on it and only those concerned. So we're talking about a fair vote, what is a fair vote? Now, the Member for Gladstone has given examples where he doesn't think it's a fair vote, that there have been some people excluded or some people have got a ballot automatically mailed to them, and I'm inclined to agree with him. But I think if we examine the principle of whether or not we should have this problem resolved, then how do you go about it? So you're looking for a fair vote. After that, whatever the vote is you're looking for time — well even before the vote you need time for discussion so that opinions can form — and this is taking place. I don't think in recent years I've seen so much interest and so many meetings held by parties who were on one side of the question or the other.

Now after the vote is held I guess you need more time for discussion based on the results and then some assessing of the results, and if the government has the authority to proceed under the

marketing Act, they do so.

I have in front of me two documents that I would like to know where the Conservative Party stand on. One is a letter, or it's a brief from the Manitoba Independent Cattle Producer organization, and basically they ask three questions of the Premier, Mr. Lyon and Mr. Huband. This is who the directive is addressed to. The first question is, "Are you and is your Party in favour of orderly marketing of agricultural products of Manitoba?"

Now to leave the letter for a moment, I made a few notes: We have a Honey Marketing Board established in 1953; a Hog Marketing Commission and then a board which was established in 1964; a Turkey Marketing Board; Chicken Broiler Board; Vegetable Marketing Board and it's broken down into potatoes and root crops; a Milk Marketing Board and an Egg Marketing Board. So I think that's a fair question, "Are you and is your Party in favour of orderly marketing of agricultural products of Manitoba?"

The second question is: "Would you or your Party continue the existence of our eight producer marketing boards?" which I've just named, "in Manitoba as now constituted after the next election if you formed the government?"

A third question is: "In view of the answer we received from the Honourable Sam Uskiw re our brief enclosed that we presented to him at Minnedosa, Tuesday, February 15th, 1977, can you and your Party, if you formed the government after the next election, give us a commitment regarding your Party's position re powers that you would be prepared to extend to a Manitoba Cattle Producer Marketing Board in future your this referendum is "yes" on March 18th? Now I know that's a hypothetical question and Mr. Enns, who is now leaving the room is fairly sure he's going to be the Minister of Agriculture in the next election . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would remind the honourable member, we are in Committee of Supply and he should name the members by constituency and not by name.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: The present Member for Lakeside is so sure that he's going to be the Minister of Agriculture that he's answered my question before he left the room.

Now the Member for Rock Lake said about a half hour ago that he has a personal position on this and when I said to him that his Leader has a position on it he appeared to be annoyed. But I must quote from a newspaper article of The Tribune, January 25th, 1977, and I only quote part of the article but I hope not out of context: "Mr. Lyon urged cattlemen to vote "no" in the coming mail referendum on the question and wait for a Conservative Government which he said will act in accordance with the wishes of the majority of cattlemen." Well, Mr. Chairman, I know the Member for Souris-Killarney represents a rural riding. I thought it was rather impudent of him to suggest that people who were trying to decide their own destiny should wait until he solves his own personal affairs or his own personal problems. I would like members on the opposite side from me to say is this party policy, that if it's beneficial to them to postpone and forget about whether it's good or bad or indifferent for the people affected — and right now we're talking about the people who grow cattle for sale in Manitoba. It's only an opinion and I could be wrong, but I think that a political person unless he can offer some constructive comment has no right to interfere in what people are trying to decide with respect to their own particular business.

This has far-reaching consequences. It should not depend on who gets elected and who gets defeated, and you shouldn't be asking people to postpone decisions that affect them on the basis of who's going to win the next election.

I would like, Mr. Chairman, through you, to have members of the Conservative Party tell me where they stand on this. Now we all say that we want a fair vote, but are you for it or are you against it? Tell us. I'd be very interested to know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, I guess we're not dealing with the Minister of Agriculture now, we're dealing with the head of the Liberal Party and he's talking about Mr. Lyon's statement in the press.

Now Mr. Lyon is an elected representative, I expect . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Would the honourable member refer to a member by his constituency and not by name?

MR. FERGUSON: Souris-Killarney, I'm sorry, Sir. Speaking as an elected representative from the southwest corner of the province, unfortunately the Liberal Party hasn't seen fit yet to have their Leader in the House. They seem to be always sitting in the gallery or somewhere. Consequently I do feel that when our party, if and when they do become elected, won't have any problem forming policies and projecting them, and until such time as the Liberal Party finds themselves in that position I would expect that maybe they'd go on with the business that they're here for, and that is to criticize the government that is in power.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I didn't think we'd have to direct our attention to the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, but since he is now retiring from the field of politics possibly we should

do him the honour for just a few moments. The comments he has just made reminds me of the many speeches that he's made in replying to The Throne Speech in the House, I often wonder why he wasn't on the government side because that's exactly the way he spoke then as he is speaking tonight. And as I reiterate to my colleagues here, he read out the three points by this Independent Cattlemen's group, who were endorsing the Minister's marketing board with complete powers; I fail to understand how they can entitle themselves with that name for their organization.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, as my colleague said, when we become government we're prepared to answer for the Estimates and I think that that is a fair comment insofar as our position is concerned. I know Mr. Usick, he wondered how we stood on this thing. —(Interjections)— The Member for Portage la Prairie is doing the same thing as the Minister's friend, Mr. Usick — he thought he could set a trap for us but he didn't succeed.

I think, Mr. Chairman, with those comments, are we going to continue or are we going to adjourn?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee is in charge of its own affairs and may adjourn at its wish.

Resolution 14(b)(1) . . .

MR. EINARSON: Just a minute, I'll move adjournment, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Adjournment has been moved, is it agreed? (Agreed)