

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

A DYNAMIC MODEL FOR SIMULATING
RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM IMPACTS IN THE
INTERLAKE AREA OF MANITOBA

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES IN
PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

by

Fu-Lai Tung

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS AND
FARM MANAGEMENT

February, 1975

A DYNAMIC MODEL FOR SIMULATING
RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM IMPACTS IN THE
INTERLAKE AREA OF MANITOBA

by

FU-LAI TUNG

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

© 1975

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVER-
SITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this dissertation, to
the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this
dissertation and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY
MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this dissertation.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the
dissertation nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

ABSTRACT

A DYNAMIC MODEL FOR SIMULATING RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM IMPACTS IN THE INTERLAKE AREA OF MANITOBA

by

Fu-Lai Tung

Federal and Provincial Governments have been involved in attempts to improve the low income and unemployment situations in the Interlake Area of Manitoba by means of public investment of \$85 million in natural, social and human capital during the period of 1968-77. Of the \$85 million Fund for Rural Economic Development (FRED), \$20 million is designated for resource development programs including drainage, land clearing and farm management training programs. There is an urgent need to provide quantitative information relevant to the effectiveness of these programs for improving the economic conditions in the Interlake Area. This information is required so that informed decisions in regional and resource planning can be made more effectively. A significant gap exists in the capability of current economic models to provide answers to current issues related to the potential impacts of resource development programs on regional economies.

The basic purpose of this study, therefore, is to develop a model for analyzing the accumulative long-run economic impacts of resource development programs on structural change in the agricultural sectors and their contributions to related sectors of the economy in the study area. More specific objectives of this study are: (1) to explore a method to incorporate changes in trade and primary resource

input coefficients in an input-output model with particular reference to agricultural sectors; (2) to establish a set of economic development indicators to assess program impacts for public concerns; (3) to project economic development indicators specified in five target years, 1971, 1976, 1977, 1981 and 1986; and (4) to simulate impacts of resource development programs, drainage, land clearing and farm management training programs, on selected economic development indicators to assess the program effectiveness.

To meet the objectives, a 24 sector input-output model constructed for the Interlake Area is used as a framework. The 24 sector input-output model is modified in constructing three alternative simulation models referred to as static, comparative static and dynamic simulation models. Each simulation model includes the resource constraints, labor and land, so that the realized gross output is determined not only by the demand factors but also by supply constraints. The static simulation model is the conventional input-output model neglecting changes in trade or technical coefficients as well as primary input requirement coefficients over time. The comparative static simulation considers the changes in trade coefficients as well as primary input requirement coefficients over time but investment is assumed to be exogenously determined. The dynamic simulation model permits the trade and primary input requirement coefficients to change over time. In addition, investment is determined endogenously by the dynamic simulation system.

Productive capacity limitations by farm size class are used to derive the changes over time for trade coefficient and primary input requirement coefficients employed in the comparative and dynamic simulation

models. Each farm size has its productive capacity limits resulting from the fixed technical as well as primary input requirement coefficients associated with the size of farms. The technical coefficient as well as primary input requirement coefficient changes are caused by the structural changes represented by increases in the number of large size farms and decreases in the numbers of small size farms. A modified Markov process emphasizing migration relationships is used to project changes in farm numbers by size class and projection results are employed to adjust the trade as well as primary input requirement coefficients over time for the comparative and dynamic simulation models.

The impacts of the three resource development programs on the selected economic development indicators are determined by the difference between projections and impact simulation results. The projection results represent the performance of the Interlake economy without the three resource development programs. The impact simulation results include changes in the economy due to the cumulative effect of three resource development programs as well as changes projected to occur as a result of economic growth without programs.

The three alternative simulation models mentioned above are used to project the performance of the Interlake economy represented by gross output, employment, area income by sources and primary resource utilization rates. These results are compared with historical observations in assessing the results of the three alternative simulation models. The results indicate that the dynamic simulation model performs best among the three alternative simulation models: (1) the dynamic

simulation model yields consistent estimates of investment; (2) the projected trade and primary resource input coefficients are very close to the actual observations indicating that these coefficients in fact do change over time as a result of structural changes in agricultural sectors; and (3) the simulated economic development indicators for 1971 are all within 12 percent deviation of the historical series for 1971.

Given that the dynamic simulation provides the best estimates of economic performance in the Interlake area, the impacts of the three resource development programs on the selected economic development indicators are derived from the dynamic simulation model. The results indicate that all of the simulated resource development programs yield positive impacts on each selected economic development indicators. The three resource development programs generate increasing employment opportunities for Interlake people. An additional 1,300 jobs are attributable to the three resource development programs in 1976. The area income is estimated to be \$88 million if weather conditions were normal in 1971 as compared to actual figure of about \$85 million. The three resource development programs contribute about 8 percent of total area income to the Interlake economy in 1971 and this contribution is estimated to be 10 percent of income by 1976. In addition, about 80 percent of income generated from the three resource development programs is farm income. As a result, each farm, on average, has gained an additional thousand dollars of farm income due to the three resource development programs.

The magnitude of impacts per million dollar program expenditure is different for each program and for every selected economic indicator.

In general, there is no consistently "best" resource development program relative to the FRED objectives of increasing employment opportunities and income and improving the standard of living for the Interlake people specified in the FRED plan. The farm management training program in general, is more favourable than the other two programs in terms of their impacts on FRED plan objectives.

A number of policy implications of the results are noted. The most significant implication of the results is that the three resource development programs will not be able to prevent the out-migration of agricultural labor force. Some complementary manpower training and education programs for agricultural labor force are required for monitoring the potential manpower problems in agricultural sectors. Another implication which is useful for regional development planning and program evaluations is indicated by the results that the impacts of each resource development program on the selected economic development indicators are different from one time period to another. The magnitude of the impacts on the selected economic development indicators is not equal for each resource development program. The implication of these results is that governments could be more effective in their pursuit of development targets by making objectives more specific in terms of the selected economic development indicators and analyzing the economic structural changes for both short and long-run caused by particular programs.

Additional findings and some of the limitations underlying these findings are discussed and suggestions are made for further research. The modified dynamic model has the potential for overcoming many

problems in estimating the impacts of government development programs on the structure of a regional economy which is a requirement for effective regional development planning.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to many organizations and individuals who have supported my graduate study and contributed significantly to the completion of this dissertation. In particular, I would like to express my appreciation to the following:

I am deeply grateful to my advisor, Dr. James A. MacMillan, for his help throughout this study. Professor MacMillan generously shared his ideas and his personal contributions are many more than I am able to acknowledge in this page. Without his guidance and constant encouragement throughout the entire period of my study, helping me with patience and care in other matters than study, this research would not have been possible. Participation in several research projects with Professor MacMillan provided excellent opportunities in gaining research experience.

I am also grateful to Dr. Charles F. Framingham for his continuous guidance in the organization and the writing of this dissertation through from one draft to another. I also benefitted from his constant encouragement and moral support especially when he served as acting advisor during my graduate study while Professor MacMillan was on leave.

Special thanks are due to my dissertation committee members, Dr. James Seldon and Dr. R.M.A. Loyns, for their thoroughly and patiently going through from one draft to another and making important suggestions towards improvement. I am deeply indebted to them. Thanks are also due to Dr. Wilber R. Maki, Professor of Agricultural and Applied Economics, University of Minnesota, for his careful reading of the dissertation and valuable suggestions.

I also wish to thank Mr. R. Ali who had made helpful suggestions and comments during the initial stages of writing. My thanks are also extended to Mr. Ed. Somers, FRED Co-ordinator, the Manitoba Department of Agriculture, who provided data and background information for this study.

I am grateful to the Canada Council and the Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Manitoba for their financial support for my graduate study.

I would also like to thank Mrs. Edna R. Smiley, typist at the Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Manitoba and Mrs. Rita L. Emerson for their excellent typing and careful reading of the thesis.

Finally, I would like to extend my most sincere appreciation to my wife, Yung-Tei, and my son, David, for their patience and understanding throughout the entire period of my graduate study and to my parents who sacrificed much to finance my earlier education in Taiwan.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.	viii
LIST OF TABLES.	xvi
LIST OF FIGURES	xxv
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.	1
A. Problematic Situation.	1
B. Study Objectives	6
C. Policy Implications.	7
D. Organization of the Study.	8
2. REVIEW OF REGIONAL GROWTH THEORIES AND EMPIRICAL MODELS.	10
A. "Demand-determined" Regional Growth Models	11
Types of Demand-determined Regional Growth Models.	11
Limitations of Demand-determined Regional Growth Models	18
B. "Supply-determined" Regional Growth Models	19
Types of Supply-determined Regional Growth Models.	19
Limitations of Supply-determined Regional Growth Models	23
C. The Patterns of Regional Growth in the Long-run	24
D. The Basic Input-Output Model and Its Limitations.	27
Basic Input-Output Model As a Simulation Technique	28

The Input-Output Model For Projection or Simulation.	31
Limitations of the Basic Input-Output Model	35
E. Review of Methods for Adjusting Technical Coefficients.	36
The Theil and Tilanus Method	36
The RAS or Bioproportional Method.	38
The Incremental Technical Coefficient Method	40
Linear Programming Method.	42
Regression Method.	46
3. MODEL SPECIFICATION AND SIMULATION PROCEDURES.	50
A. Introduction.	50
B. General Assumptions Concerning Determinants of Regional Growth	51
C. Model Framework	52
Components of the Model.	53
Final Demand Submodel.	57
Trading Coefficients Submodel.	64
Primary Resource Requirement Coefficients Submodel	72
Capital Requirement Coefficients Submodel.	74
Primary Resource Constraints Submodel.	85
Realized Gross Output Determination Submodel	90
Impact Determination Submodel.	104

D.	Mathematical Description of the Model.	108
	Notation.	108
	The Model Expressed Mathematically.	122
E.	Description of Simulation Procedures	128
	The Procedures of the First Step (Projections).	129
	The Procedures of the Second Step (Impact Simulation)	132
F.	The Nature of the Model.	134
4.	EMPIRICAL PROCEDURES FOR MODEL CONSTRUCTION	138
A.	Construction of 1968 Social Accounting System for the Interlake Economy.	138
	Scope and Estimation Procedures	138
	The Components of the 1968's Interlake Social Accounting System.	141
B.	Construction of Dynamic Trading and Factor Input Requirement Coefficients	162
	Trading Coefficient Differential by Size Class in Agricultural Sectors	162
	Projection of Farm Size Distribution.	171
	Estimation of Each Target Year's Trading Coefficient Matrix.	176
	Estimation of Each Target Year's Factor Input Requirement Coefficient Matrix.	182
C.	Construction of Expansion and Replacement Capital Coefficient Matrices	190
	Measurement of Capacity	190
	Estimation of Expansion and Replacement Capital Coefficient Matrices.	193

D.	Projection of Resource Constraints.	198
	Projection of Land Constraint.	198
	Projection of Labor Constraint	202
E.	Final Demand Projections.	203
	Projection of Household Demand	204
	Projection of Government's Expenditures.	218
	Projection of Gross Private Capital Formation.	239
	Projections of Exports, Inventory Change and Unallocated Final Demand	242
5.	SIMULATION RESULTS	247
	A. Assessment of Alternative Simulation Models	248
	B. Discussion of Dynamic Projection Results.	254
	Projected Realized Gross Output.	255
	Factors Associated With the Projected Growth	259
	Projected Employment	261
	Projected Gross Fixed Capital Requirements	265
	Projected Land Requirements.	266
	Projected Area Income.	268
	C. Discussion of the Dynamic Impact Simulation Results	270
	The Scope.	270
	Estimated Direct Effects of Agricultural Resource Development Programs.	272
	Simulation Procedures.	279
	Discussion of the Simulated Dynamic Impacts.	281

D.	Aggregate Projection and Impact Results	296
E.	Evaluation of Alternative Resource Development Programs	300
	The Bigger the Better Criterion.	301
	Effect on Income Distribution Criterion.	309
	FRED Plan Objectives Criterion	310
6.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	313
A.	Summary.	313
	Summary of Problematic Situation, Objectives of Study and Method of Analysis.	313
	Summary of the Results.	319
B.	Conclusions.	326
	General Appraisal of the Model and Data Used in the Study.	326
	Implications of the Study Results.	329
	Suggested Areas for Further Study.	333
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.	336
	APPENDICES	348
I.	Sources and Estimation Procedures for Capital and Primary Resource Accounts	349
II.	Estimated Trading Coefficient Matrix for the Base Year and the Target Years.	362
III.	Estimated Demand Elasticity Matrices, and Projected Real Per Capita Disposal Income and Consumer Price Indices for Each Target Year, Interlake	369
IV.	Procedures for Estimating Direct Effects of Agricultural Resource Development Programs in the Interlake Area	376

V.	Calculated Income Coefficients by Sector and Procedures for Estimating Labor Productivity or Labor Input Coefficient Changes Over Time Resulting From Agricultural Resource Development Programs in the Interlake Area.	422
VI.	Characteristics of the Model Results, System Variables and Exogenous Variables	430
VII.	The Simulated Impacts of Resource Development Programs on Gross Output, Household Income, Employment and Government Revenues by Sector in the Interlake Area, 1969 to 1977.	458

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
2.1	Input-Output Model Components.	29
3.1	Summary of the Characteristics of Alternative Simulations.	93
3.2	Variables and Coefficients Used in the Model	109
3.3	Summary of the Model Expressed Mathematically.	122
4.1	Interlake Area Transactions, 1968.	144
4.2	Estimated Total Labor Force and Employment By Sector in the Interlake Area, 1968.	150
4.3	Types and Uses of Land in the Interlake Area in 1961, 1966, 1968 and 1971	153
4.4	Distribution of Agricultural Land Between Agricultural Sectors in the Interlake Area, 1968	153
4.5	Intersectoral Gross Fixed Capital Transactions, Interlake Area, 1968	157
4.6	Intersectoral Expansion Fixed Capital Transactions, Interlake Area, 1968	159
4.7	Intersectoral Replacement Fixed Capital Transactions, Interlake Area, 1968	160
4.8	Summary Statistics of Expansion Fixed Capital Formation by Sector, Interlake Area, 1968	161
4.9	Summary of Sources and Uses of Capital Formation, Interlake Area, 1968	163
4.11	Average Per Farm Purchasing Patterns by Farm Size for the Agricultural-Livestock Sector, Interlake Area, 1968	165
4.12	Average Per Farm Purchasing Patterns by Farm Size for Agricultural Crop and Other Sectors, Interlake Area, 1968	166
4.13	Average Per Farm Sales Pattern by Farm Size for the Agricultural-Livestock Sector, Interlake Area, 1968	167

4.14	Average Per Farm Sales Pattern by Farm Size for Agricultural Crop and Other Sectors in Interlake Area, 1968.	168
4.15	Percentages of Per Farm Purchases From and Sales to Aggregated Sectors for Agricultural Livestock Sector, Interlake Area, 1968	169
4.16	Percentages of Per Farm Purchases From and Sales to Aggregated Sectors for Agricultural Crop and Other Sector, Interlake Area, 1968	170
4.17	Estimated Manitoba Transition Probabilities Matrix	172
4.18	Projected Farm Numbers by Gross Receipts for the Target Years, Interlake Area, 1968.	173
4.19	Farm Numbers by Size Class and by Gross Receipts, Interlake Area, 1968.	175
4.20	Base Year and Projected Farm Numbers by Size Class for the Target Years, Interlake Area	175
4.21	Farm Numbers by Size Class and by Sector, Interlake Area, 1968.	177
4.22	Base Year and Projected Farm Numbers by Sector and by Size Class for the Target Years, Interlake Area	178
4.23	Summary of Trading Coefficient Changes Over Time, Interlake Area, From 1968 to 1986.	181
4.24	Factor Input Requirement Coefficients, Interlake Area, 1968.	183
4.25	Factor Input Requirement Coefficients by Size Class and by Sector in Agricultural Production, Interlake Area, 1968.	185
4.26	Estimated Annual Growth Rates of Factor Input Average Productivities, Manitoba, 1961-71	187
4.27	Estimates of Capacity and Changes in Capacity for Interlake Area, 1968.	194
4.28	Estimated Expansion Fixed Capital Coefficients (b_{ij}), Interlake Area, 1967-68.	196

4.29	Estimated Replacement Fixed Capital Coefficients (d_{ij}), Interlake Area, 1968	197
4.30	Base Year and Projected Land Available for Agricultural Use Without and With Land Clearing Program for the Target Years, Interlake Area.	200
4.31	Base Year and Projected Population and Potential Labor Force for the Target Years, Interlake Area.	203
4.32	Estimated Budget Shares and Engel Functions, Interlake Area, 1968.	210
4.33	Base Year and Projected Household Consumption Expenditures by Sector, Interlake Area, 1968-1986	217
4.34	Base Year and Projected Federal and Provincial Government Expenditures by Sector, the Interlake Area.	220
4.35	Estimated Regression Coefficients of Local Government Expenditure, Linear Form, Manitoba	227
4.36	Base Year Local Government Expenditures by Sector and by Category, Interlake Area, 1968.	229
4.37	Distribution of Local Government Expenditures by Sector and by Category, Interlake Area, 1968	231
4.38	Projected Local Government Expenditures by Sector and by Category, Interlake Area, 1971.	233
4.39	Projected Local Government Expenditures by Sector and by Category, Interlake Area, 1976.	234
4.40	Projected Local Government Expenditures by Sector and by Category, Interlake Area, 1977.	235
4.41	Projected Local Government Expenditures by Sector and by Category, Interlake Area, 1981.	236
4.42	Projected Local Government Expenditures by Sector and by Category, Interlake Area, 1986.	237
4.43	Summary of Base Year and Projected Total Governments' Expenditures by Sector for the Target Years, Interlake Area.	238

4.44	Estimated Regression Coefficients of Investment Functions by Industry, Linear Form, Manitoba.	240
4.45	Estimated Annual Growth Rates of Gross Output by Sector, Manitoba, 1961-1970.	243
4.46	Base Year and Projected Exports, Inventory Changes and Unallocated Components of Final Demand for Each Target Year, Interlake Area	246
5.1	Indices and Compound Growth Rates of Realized Gross Output (RGO) to 1986, Interlake Area.	256
5.2	Percentage Shares of Major Sectors in Total Realized Gross Output for Base Year (1968) and Projection Years, 1977, 1981 and 1986, Interlake Area.	258
5.3	Indices and Growth Rate of Labor Requirements by 17 Sectors, Interlake Area	262
5.4	Base Year and Projected Personal Income for the Target Years, Interlake Area.	269
5.5	Values and Percentage of the Impacts of Agricultural Resource Development Programs on Farm and Non-Farm Income, Interlake Area, 1969-77	287
5.6	Summary of Resource Development Programs Contribution to Increases in Farm Income and Per Capita Personal Income, 1971, 76 and 77	289
5.7	Summary of the Simulated Labor Requirements With and Without Resource Development Programs and Available Labor Force, Interlake Area, From 1969 to 1977.	291
5.8	A Comparison of Government Revenues and Expenditures Associated With Resource Development Programs, Interlake Area.	295
5.9	A Comparison of Goal Variables Between Historical Observations and Model Results for the Interlake Area, 1971 and 1976	297
5.10	A Comparison of the Average Annual (1969-77) Impact Per Million Dollar Expenditure of Resource Development Programs on the Selected Regional Economic Development Indicators, Interlake Area.	303

5.11	A Comparison of Employment Impacts Per Million Dollar Investment on Each Resource Development Program, Interlake Area.	305
I.1	Distribution of Gross Fixed Capital Formation by Sector, Interlake Area, 1968.	354
II.1	Estimated Trading Coefficient Matrix for the Base Year 1968, Interlake Area	363
II.2	Estimated Trading Coefficient Matrix for Target Year 1971, Interlake Area	364
II.3	Estimated Trading Coefficient Matrix for Target Year 1976, Interlake Area	365
II.4	Estimated Trading Coefficient Matrix for Target Year 1977, Interlake Area	366
II.5	Estimated Trading Coefficient Matrix for Target Year 1981, Interlake Area	367
II.6	Estimated Trading Coefficient Matrix for Target Year 1986, Interlake Area	368
III.1	Estimated Demand Elasticity Matrices Employed in Household Expenditure Projections for the Target Years, Interlake Area	370
III.2	Projected Real Per Capita Personal Disposal Income and Consumer Price Indices for the Target Years, Interlake Area	372
III.3	Percentage Distribution of Household Consumption Expenditures by Sector and by Different Commodity Groups, Interlake Area, 1968	374
IV.1	Allocation of the Drainage Expenditures by Sector, Interlake Area, 1969 to 1973	379
IV.2	Estimated Total Reclaimed Land by Sector Through the Drainage Program, Interlake Area, 1968 to 1977	382
IV.3	Estimated Increments in Input Purchases Associated With Increases in Production on the Reclaimed Land Through the Drainage Program, Interlake Area, 1969 to 1977.	385

IV.4	Estimated Farm Household Consumption Increases Due to Increases in Farm Income Derived From the Reclaimed Land Through the Drainage Program, Interlake Area, 1969 to 1977.	387
IV.5	Actual Land Cleared and Government Expenditures Under the Land Clearing and Demonstration Program, Interlake Area, 1967-68 to 1972-73	389
IV.6	Government Expenditures on the Land Clearing and Demonstration Program by Sector, Interlake Area, 1968-70	390
IV.7	Government Expenditures on the Land Clearing and Demonstration Program by Sector, Interlake Area, 1967-68 to 1972-73.	392
IV.8	Estimated Direct Effects Associated With Clearing Costs Incurred by Farmers on Land Clearing, Interlake Area, 1967-68 to 1972-73.	394
IV.9	Estimated Weighted Percentage of Cleared Land in Production in Each Year, Interlake Area, 1967-68 to 1972-73.	396
IV.10	Estimated Total Acres of Cleared Land in Production Under the Land Clearing and Demonstration Program, Interlake Area, 1967-68 to 1976-77.	397
IV.11	Estimated Increments in Input Purchases Associated With the Increased Production on Cleared Land Through the Land Clearing and Demonstration Program, Interlake Area, 1969 to 1977.	400
IV.12	Estimated Farm Household Income Increases Associated With the Land Clearing and Demonstration Program, Interlake Area, 1968 to 1977.	403
IV.13	Estimated Farm Household Consumption Increases Due to Increases in Farm Income Derived From the Cleared Land Through the Land Clearing and Demonstration Program, Interlake Area, 1969 to 1977	405
IV.14	Number of Graduates and Training Costs for the Farm Management Training Program in the Interlake Area, 1967-68 to 1972-73.	407

IV.15	Estimated Government Expenditures by Sector For the Farm Management Training Program in the Interlake Area, 1967-68 to 1972-73.	409
IV.16	Estimated Increments in Input Purchases Associated With Increases in Production Through the Farm Management Training Program, Interlake Area, 1969 to 1977	413
IV.17	Estimated Farm Household Consumption Increases Due to Increases in Farm Income Through the Farm Management Training Program, Interlake Area, 1969 to 1977.	414
IV.18	Summary of Increments in Required Input Purchases Associated With the Drainage Program, Interlake Area, 1969 to 1977	416
IV.19	Summary of Increments in Required Input Purchases Associated With the Land Clearing and Demonstration Program, Interlake Area, 1969 to 1977.	418
IV.20	Summary of Increments in Required Input Purchases Associated With the Farm Management Training Program, Interlake Area, 1969 to 1977.	420
V.1	Calculated Income Coefficients by Sector For Base Year and Each Target Year, Interlake Area, 1969 to 1977.	423
V.2	Summary of the Procedures For Estimating Labor Productivity Changes and Changes in Labor Input Coefficients for Agricultural Sectors Over Time Due to Farm Management Training, Interlake Area, 1969-1977	425
V.3	Summary of the Estimation Procedures and Estimated Labor Input Coefficients Resulting From the Drainage Program, Interlake Area, 1969-1977	428
V.4	Summary of the Estimation Procedures and Estimated Labor Input Coefficients Resulting From the Land Clearing and Demonstration Program, Interlake Area, 1969-1977.	429
VI.1	A Comparison of the Values of Selected Goal Variables Between Model Projection Results and Historical Observations	441

VI.2	Summary of Program Impacts on Goal Variables and Effects on Dynamic Model Simulation Results.445
VI.3	A Comparison of the Values of Selected System Variables Between Historical Observations and Those Employed in the Simulation Models.447
VI.4	Summary of the Values of Selected System Variables Employed in the Dynamic Impact Simulation Models.453
VI.5	A Comparison of the Values of Exogenous Variables Employed in the Projection Models and Historical Observations.455
VI.6	Summary of the Values of Exogenous Variables Employed in the Dynamic Impact Simulation Models457
VII.1	Estimated Impacts of the Drainage Program on Interlake Area's Realized Gross Output by Sector During the Period 1969-77.459
VII.2	Estimated Impacts of the Land Clearing and Demonstration Program on Interlake Area's Realized Gross Output by Sector During the Period 1969-77460
VII.3	Estimated Impacts of the Farm Management Training Program on Interlake Area's Realized Gross Output by Sector During the Period 1969-77.461
VII.4	Simulated Impacts of the Drainage Program on Household Income by Sector, Interlake Area, 1969-1977.462
VII.5	Simulated Impacts of the Land Clearing and Demonstration Program on Household Income by Sector, Interlake Area, 1969-1977.463
VII.6	Simulated Impacts of the Farm Management Training Program on Household Income by Sector, Interlake Area, 1969-1977.464
VII.7	Simulated Employment Impact of the Drainage Program by Sector, Interlake Area, 1969-1977.465
VII.8	Simulated Employment Impact of the Land Clearing and Demonstration Program by Sector, Interlake Area, 1969-1977.466

VII.9	Simulated Employment Impact of the Farm Management Training Program by Sector, Interlake Area, 1969-1977.	467
VII.10	Simulated Impact of the Drainage Program on Government Revenue by Sector, Interlake Area, 1969-1977.	468
VII.11	Simulated Impact of the Land Clearing and Demonstration Program on Government Revenue by Sector, Interlake Area, 1969-1977	469
VII.12	Simulated Impact of the Farm Management Training Program on Government Revenue by Sector Interlake Area, 1969-1977	470

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE		PAGE
3.1	The Components of the Model.	54
3.2	A Diagrammatic Presentation of the Modified Simulation Model.	130

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

A number of agricultural development programs have been designed in Canada to increase agricultural productivity and improve incomes of low income farmers in marginal agricultural areas. These include programs under the Agricultural and Rural Development Act, 1961 (ARDA), the Fund for Rural Economic Development, 1966 (FRED), and the Small Farm Development Program, 1972 (SFDP). The various programs have unique elements and represent alternative approaches to resolving rural development problems.

However, models of the agricultural development process which permit an analysis of the potential impacts of such programs on jobs, income, the changing structure of agriculture, and the relationship between agricultural and non-agricultural sectors are not available.¹ Such dynamic regional models of agriculture which would provide an explicit linkage between the agricultural development programs and the regional economy (including rural and urban dimensions) are critical for development of a full understanding of regional development and the formulation of future policy.

A. Problematic Situation

The Government of Canada and the Province of Manitoba signed an

¹W.J. Craddock, "Interrelation and Use of the Results Obtained with National and Regional Economic Models," National and Regional Economic Models of Agriculture, ed. Roger K. Eyvindson, Economics Branch Publication No. 72/9 (Ottawa: Canada Department of Agriculture, 1972).