

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 19 June, 1986.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

### CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY — COMMUNITY SERVICES AND CORRECTIONS

**MR. CHAIRMAN, M. Dolin:** We are on Page 32, Resolution 30, Item 2.(b)(1) Residential Care Licensing: Salaries — the Member for River Heights.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This department in Salaries is paying for seven staff years. How many of those staff years are allocated to secretarial services?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Community Services.

**HON. M. SMITH:** One.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Is there an administrator of that department as well?

**HON. M. SMITH:** One director.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** That in fact, Madam Minister, would leave us with five left who are in fact doing these inspections of facilities. I would suggest that they couldn't possibly be visiting 627 facilities two times per day each because there aren't enough days in the year.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Because the inspection of the larger facilities is involved with the physical safety aspects, the health regulations, the fire, the main inspection occurs when a place opens. Bringing it up to par is the initial, how should I say, heavy duty. After that, regular monitoring that the standards are in fact in place, can be done with shorter visits.

This group, in a sense, I guess you could say it worked like an auditor, a sampling of the inspection or the monitoring of program and so on that is done by other agencies, by program agencies, Child and Family and the people who are looking after the aged and the post-mentally ill.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Mr. Chairman, my real concern here is the one that I expressed earlier this afternoon. I'm in full agreement with this government's directions in moving into greater residential care for the post-mentally ill, for the mentally handicapped, in all kinds of areas. But I don't want to see any form of dumping of these people out of institutions and into residential care, if that residential care doesn't meet the very highest of expectations. That is why I have to question why you would remove one of the people from this department and put them in another department when you are constantly adding new facilities, as you should be.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Well, in fact, the way the work is done, the Internal Audit has reviewed it and has said

that we, with the current staff, are complying with the task that is set for them. I repeat that the responsibility of the program review and the case planning and case monitoring is done by program departments, not by this group. In a sense, this is the group that checks in every once in a while to see that the other standards are being adhered to. Its direct responsibility is for the basic fire safety and health standards, health in the sense of cleanliness and sanitariness rather than in the expanded area of mental health.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Mr. Chairman, this bothers me somewhat. When you're including monitoring, and really the basic approach is going to be as to fire safety and health standards, it has been brought to my attention that there are many people of many nations that have come to Manitoba who own group homes. Some of them will own more than one group home. It has been drawn to my attention that in some of these areas the people get to eat what these people grew up with in their own home country. I've been told — (Interjection)

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Want to push the mike a little closer to you please?

**MR. A. BROWN:** I've been told that in some of these group homes that you may have fish and rice 90 percent of the time because that was the diet of that particular family who owned that particular group home, that's what they know how to cook. I am not going to be one who is going to say that is not nutritious, heaven forbid; I'm on a very strict diet myself and fish is one of the foods that I'm supposed to have quite a bit of. But when you get these kinds of accusations, and when you have only a couple of people monitoring all the facilities that we have within this province, and when we are only monitoring fire safety and health standards, then, surely, I feel it must be upon us that we go a little bit deeper and look into the diet and some of the foods that some of these people are fed.

I understand that when family wants to come and visit some of these areas, they are being discouraged and they have to make appointments before they're allowed in to see their family members and, when they do come in, things may be a little bit different than what they are on the ordinary day.

Madam Minister, it's a big concern and I think it's a concern that we ought to address to see whether there is this problem out there. This concern has been brought to me on a number of times not only from one source but from a number of sources.

**HON. M. SMITH:** They are required to file menus and meet basic nutrition standards. That is included in the definition of basic health. Again, if you had a concern, or if any of your friends or neighbours or people who

speak to you have, we would appreciate hearing about it because we would investigate it immediately.

Again, with family visits, if there is any problem being experienced, if you would draw it to our attention. Again, there is no monitoring that can sort of be there 24 hours a day, every day. We set the standards; we check that they are adhered to on our visits and any reasonable tests we can perform; but we also need an alert community. So if there are concerns, we would appreciate being alerted to that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(b)(1) — the Member for Gladstone.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

There has been some concern expressed to me about these guest homes that the department seems to be trying to phase out the smaller guest homes where they may only be able to take care of two, three or four people and the complaint seems to be that they don't get the referrals. Who decides where the referrals go and what sort of a record is kept on how many patients or clients are allocated to each place?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The program responsibility for mentally retarded lies with this department. For the mentally ill or the infirm aged, it is with health. Again, some are self-referrals to some facilities and some are referred by the variety of agencies that are out there, both government and private.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** What is the Minister's thought on the smaller places? Is this a feeling of the department that they should be closed down?

**HON. M. SMITH:** No, the funding is based on level of care and by individual person. There is not any bias to my knowledge in favour of large — certainly in the mental retardation field, we are quite supportive of the smaller more home-like settings.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** And the fees, are they similar in all types of these residents, the fees that are paid to the care givers?

**HON. M. SMITH:** I'm sorry, I didn't catch the question.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Fees, are they similar in all types of services?

**HON. M. SMITH:** No, the fees are not standardized across all disabilities. I think it's probably a worthwhile goal, but because government in a sense has responded to different disability groups over time in different ways, it will take some time before that can be blended. I'd be interested in the ideas of the members as to whether they think that is a good direction to go, a sort of generic needs assessment and some common fee base, but there's quite a few different systems of funding, because it's grown up over time in different departments and in response to different types of need.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** There was in a newspaper awhile ago, a case of a person who had allegedly had died of malnutrition in one of these guest homes. Has that inquest been completed? What was the result?

**HON. M. SMITH:** It was a mental health issue. Again, I think it's an issue that should be raised under the Department of Health. The question of a person who, not that they're not necessarily being offered nutritious food, but that they are self-selecting — choosing not to eat.

Again, I think we should try to develop these early-warning systems. I guess I'd be the first to say that a lot of government funding has been in response to initiatives taken privately and there has not been developed an overall systematic approach to the different disabilities. I think a desirable direction is to go in — what we call a generic direction — where people in need get assessed according to their different needs. Then there's individual planning and then the appropriate residence. But because of history and the different way these systems developed and were funded, it will take a fair bit of time to rationalize those systems.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** The Minister said earlier that there were menus that had to be submitted. Do they have to submit those, say, on a monthly basis? How is that monitored?

**HON. M. SMITH:** They're reviewed semi-annually — by the licensing people.

I just perhaps should correct the number that I gave earlier about 627 facilities. In fact, there are 187 facilities that are licensed. The homes still have to have fire and safety inspections. In a sense the licensing is there to ensure that those take place. The 440 letters of approval make up the difference between the 187 and 627 that I referred to earlier. Of the 187 facilities, we said that we gave two inspections a year. That comes out at 374 reviews. With two a day, 5 staff working at 200 working days, enables them to do 1,000 reviews — or there are 1,000 review days available so we feel that we do have sufficient flexibility with the staff to cover the need.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Item 2.(b)(1) - pass.  
The Member for Rhineland.

**MR. A. BROWN:** I'm not sure whether I understood the Minister correctly. Is the Minister now telling us that there's really only 187 of these residential care units that are being monitored twice yearly, and the other 400-odd which are private residential care, that they are not being checked twice a year?

**HON. M. SMITH:** No, the other 440 are the smaller-scale ones, where there's a maximum of four children or three adults, and they are approved via a letter of approval. The responsibility there is with the placing agency or region, under the signature of either the executive director of the agency or the regional director.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Then how often are these monitored? How often are these checked.

**HON. M. SMITH:** At least annually, but they are also under closer supervision by the placing agency.

**MR. A. BROWN:** I think that the Minister probably is getting the gist of the concern that we are expressing,

that possibly the monitoring is not as close as what we would like to see it to ensure that all the people who are within residential care are receiving the type of care which we would hope that they would be receiving under the funding they were getting.

Can the Minister tell me, what kind of funding is available for, let's say, a residential care home, one of the ones that we talked about lately where we were talking about three or four residents. What kind of funding is available? Is this the problem?

**HON. M. SMITH:** As I said earlier, there's a variety of funding systems, depending on the type of need. The ones that I would be prepared to go into in detail are the ones that come under my jurisdiction, in the mental retardation field and the child and family.

**MR. A. BROWN:** That's fine, if we could have the figures of the funding that is available for those that are in residential care, under the Mental Retardation Program.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(b)(1)—pass — the Member for Rhineland.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm waiting for an answer from the Minister . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Oh, I thought you were . . .

**MR. A. BROWN:** I believe that she is . . .

**HON. M. SMITH:** I'm sorry. My understanding was that when we came to those program areas that I would get that detail.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** It was my understanding, too.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Okay, if the Minister then, when we come to that area, when she's going to tell us what kind of funding is available, that will be fine.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(b)(1)—pass; 2.(b)(2)—pass.

Resolution 30: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,129,600 for Community Services, Registration and Licensing Services, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

Item 3. Community Social Services, Resolution 31, 3.(a) Administration — the Member for Rhineland.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Can the Minister give us a little bit more information as to what this particular area is all about and what we are receiving, which is very briefly in our Estimate Book?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The Welcome Home Program is included here; the closure of the Northgrove residence at the Manitoba Development Centre. There's an increase of per diems for occupational activity centres including a differential rate for the two northern centres. I'm giving you again the highlights. Perhaps I should say the basic program is for the mentally retarded and vocational rehabilitation centres that there's a variety of them for varieties of disability groups.

There has been an implementation of additional care and support rates in all community residences, so this will be the opportunity to discuss those, a full implementation of crisis intervention programs throughout the province. Again, this is primarily related to the mentally retarded who are being placed in the community or those at risk of institutionalization without crisis intervention programming, if it were not in place.

There is the beginning operation of a comprehensive people-power development program for government staff, non-government service providers and volunteer boards in basic training in the mode of service delivery.

There's a complete consolidation of the Psychiatric Nursing Training Program from the Manitoba Developmental Centre to the Brandon and Selkirk Mental Health Centres and continued development of standards in occupational activity centres. We've continued to enhance the staff resident ratio at the Manitoba Development Centre and develop standards for programming within the Centre.

We've begun work on draft legislation to address the needs of the mentally handicapped. There's been a complete comprehensive review of the Respite and Supervised Department Living Programs. We are working jointly with the Department of Labour to find ways under The Employment Standards Act to deal with the unique situation of live-in staff in community residences.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Can the Minister tell me, under (a)(1), how many SY's we have in that item of \$269,100.00?

**HON. M. SMITH:** 7.5.

**MR. A. BROWN:** We're spending \$269,100 and divide that by 7.5, that seems like an inordinately high salary. Can the Minister explain why we're spending that much money if we only have a staff of 7.5?

**HON. M. SMITH:** It averages out in the mid-30 range. We are dealing with the staff who are responsible for planning these programs, coordinating the delivery throughout the province. Remember, a lot of our program is delivered either through groups in the community or through regions, so that the other salaries of people who actually work with the individuals and plan, or actually deliver the day-to-day service, shows up in money spent in the regions and grants to other groups. This is really the central administration and program support for Adult Vocational Rehabilitation and Mental Retardation Programs. There's the relationship with external agencies reviewing monies given to them and the basis for that, and the departmental regional operations and the Manitoba Developmental Centre. So it's sort of a coordinating central group.

**MR. A. BROWN:** We see that there's a decided decrease in Other Expenditures. Can the Minister give us a reason why we have a decrease, and explain to us what the Other Expenditures are?

**HON. M. SMITH:** There's some reduction in the communications required for Welcome Home. There were a lot of pamphlets and so on that were developed in the earlier stage of that program.

**MR. A. BROWN:** What are the Other Expenditures?

**HON. M. SMITH:** General operating costs incurred in carrying out the responsibilities of this division. I have the detail, if you wish: vehicles for employees, 7,300; aircraft for employees, 1,500; telephone, 4,000; courier, messenger, 200; office supplies, 3,100; office equipment, 700; physical assets and furnishing, 500; physical assets and equipment, data processing, 2,500; hotel, 1,600; meals, 1,000; publications, 200; memberships and meetings, 200; communications relating to Welcome Home, 69,000, for a total of 91,800.00.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Under Professional Training, I notice that there is absolutely no increase. We have \$120,100 last year and this year. Has there been a change in the SY's, or did this particular department not receive any increase at all?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The program is being delivered with the same people, but in some cases they involve outside people to assist. The functions being carried out in Professional Training are orientation for volunteer boards; skill instruction to people caring for retarded people in the community; upgrading for government and non-government staff; and implementation support to help recruit and develop new community boards.

**MR. A. BROWN:** So there has been no change in staff in this particular area?

**HON. M. SMITH:** No, not at this level. That doesn't mean that there isn't an involvement of other people in the field in the training programs.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** I used to come from St. Norbert. I'm in Portage now.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Just for an explanation for the newer members is, as your hands go up, I put you on a speaker's list, so you're next.

The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, a question to the Minister, in the annual report, on Page 19, it refers to "infant and child development services to promote stimulation in developmental patterns with mentally-handicapped young children."

If we can't ask a question on it here, could the Minister indicate in which section she would deal with that area?

**HON. M. SMITH:** I think that would show up under the Special Children's Services under Child and Family Services. I'll get the number, 4.(f).

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Why does it show up under Community Social Services in the annual report then?

**HON. M. SMITH:** It's in the process of being transferred over because, as we're building more generic services for all children with special needs, under the Child and Family, for example, the day care and the infant stimulation, work with the Society for Manitobans with

Disabilities, Inc. and so on, we are delivering those programs through the Special Children's Service in Child and Family.

Last year, they were delivered under the — in other words, all the services to the mentally retarded were grouped together. But as we're moving to more generic community service with special supports for children with special needs, we're moving it over into the Child and Family area.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Portage.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** This is in the Welcome Home program. What responsibilities do the Association of the Mentally Retarded have in working with the department? I see the Winnipeg association is well funded. There are staff in there that have quite a large input into the program.

**HON. M. SMITH:** In the provincial implementation team, government staff and representatives of provincial organizations are involved; at the regional level, regional staff and representatives of any advocacy groups that are there. So that would be branches of ACL, but also any other group that is active in the community would be represented there.

In addition, there has been some purchase of service from ACL, some of the board recruitment and training, and they've also been helping us with 24-Hour Planning. That's the device we are using to work out the needs of a mentally-retarded individual when they live in the community, and to ensure that we have the appropriate support services for them in the community before they are placed there.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** Is this the area where the committee discusses whether a resident of the MDC is capable of going into the community or not?

**HON. M. SMITH:** This is certainly the section that would cover that. Now just which sub-heading, I'll have to just check. It won't show up as a specific heading, but under the Manitoba Development Centre would be a good spot to discuss it.

The evaluation of readiness is done by professional people who do the assessment. It's not done by the regional teams. The initial assessments of readiness and identification of people who could move are done at the MDC. In a sense, there's a flow both ways, from the community and to the community, to see if the community of origin is willing and able to accept that person. So, in a sense, the initial screening would be done by the professionals, and then there would be negotiation and discussion at the local level.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** It doesn't come under this area?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Well, you know, I suppose we could discuss it. Because some of the staff are general staff in this area and some are MDC, in a sense, they get together and work together. Probably the most useful place to discuss it would be under 3.(c).

**MR. E. CONNERY:** Why would a person then from the Association of Community Living, in a committee

hearing to discuss whether an individual should go into the community, suggest to the parent or guardian that the care of the Manitoba Developmental Centre will not be maintained?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The design of the program was that the assessment and readiness of people to move out would be cooperative. First, the decision by the professionals is in terms of readiness, and then the determination of willingness to accept and plan for at the community level. Now if there is any, as I said on many occasions before, coercion or anyone getting out of line in terms of following those procedures, I'd like to hear about it, because one of the express principles that we were following was that there must be willingness.

Now the type of situation which might find itself at the provincial committee, which is both staff and representatives of provincial organizations, would be where there is dispute between the legal guardian and the family of origin, who may or may not have any continued relationship.

Now the member and I have briefly discussed one such case, and it is a policy decision yet to be made as to what should be done in this instance. I have asked that as broad a consultation as possible be done before a recommendation be made in the one particular instance that we are discussing.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** The Minister didn't answer the question. Why would somebody from the Association of Community Living make that remark at a committee meeting?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Well there may be some ACL professional staff involved in the assessment teams, but the remark that is being alleged at the local level — again if I could have, you know, sort of an identification of who said what when. At the discussions there is, no doubt, room for different opinion and discussion about an issue, but we have expressly said that there not be coercion, that there be willingness. Now certainly there is no one group that calls the tune on these. They are negotiated decisions, including both the central planning team and the regional.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** I think the Minister is aware of the name, Mrs. George Waterman, and the individual, and I'll name the individual — it was reported to me and she's verified it. A Noreena Robson who works with the Association of Community Living made that statement when they were trying to coerce the people to agree to have their, I think it's, daughter move into the community. The daughter is 39 years old, has lived in the MDC all her life, is comfortable there, and her parents want her to stay there. Now, to me, that is a form of coercion. Why would somebody who is not a member of the government staff, but working for an association, have the right to make a statement like that?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Well I suppose it's still a world of free speech. The role of individuals on these teams is to express their opinion. If someone has gone beyond their role as a member of the team, you know, I'd be prepared to look into it.

But the type of issue that we're coming up to, and again there has been no decision made on it, again I don't particularly like to discuss an individual case, other than how it illustrates the general principle. There are some people who have lived at MDC for some time whose families may have given up legal custody. Now some may have done it because that is the only way they could get care. Others may have done it because they were no longer able to care and felt that was the best place, and may or may not have retained a relationship.

The type of situation that may arise is that the people who live and work with the individual at MDC may determine that person, compared to all the other people who they work with and in their best professional judgment, could have a richer quality of life in a community setting. Now we are aware that occasionally we are going to run into these types of situations.

My instructions to the team were to take time to work it through, make sure that the parent has full opportunity to voice their concerns and their opinion, and perhaps visit around, consult with people, observe and so on.

As I say, I think the success of the program in its initial stages is probably contingent on moving the people where there is mutual agreement. But at some point or other, we are going to run into these legal issues as to who should go and on whose say so. As I say, we're taking our time on this one, because it's one of the first situations where we've encountered this type of difference of opinion.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** The Minister says it's one of the first instances. Maybe it's one of the first instances where people were prepared to come up front and have their name used. But I think also I read from what the Minister said that she is prepared to accept the decision of staff, rather than the opinion of family as to whether that individual should go into the community or not. You're saying the professional staff are more capable and, therefore, they know better.

**HON. M. SMITH:** I don't think I said that at all. I think I said that there may be good grounds for difference of opinion. What is important is that there be dialogue and perhaps some visiting around to observe, and not start with the assumption that either party has the complete truth of the matter.

We are dealing with an historical change, if you like, in the way the mentally retarded are perceived and the potential that is seen in them, and indeed our skill in working with them to enable them to acquire life skills and function in the community.

The other side of the issue, from going along just with the parent's view, is that you may be depriving an individual of a chance for a fuller life. I am not prepared to see that decision made quickly or simplistically. I think it's something we can take a little time on and try to see if we can develop a consensus around what's best.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** The Minister keeps on telling us that it's going to be a free and open decision on the basis of the family, what they feel is right for their child. In many cases, it's not a child anymore, it's somebody who has lived in that residence for a long time. On the

other hand, she says that the staff know better. You can't have it both ways. If it's going to be a free system, if they can convince the family openly that it's in the best interest of that person to be in the community, then it should go. But when that family doesn't want them to go, she's saying that maybe that family's not right.

**HON. M. SMITH:** When we designed the program, we put the best criteria in it we could to make sure that this was a cooperative and mutually acceptable approach. Now this is the case that's come before us where the family's opinion, based on their knowledge and experience living with their daughter in the years that she lived at home, is coming down on one side, and where the professional opinion of people who have worked with and observed this person in the institutional setting for another number of years have a difference of opinion.

Now we did say that we would not move anyone where the family was not willing. In this case, as I say, we are taking our time. We might run the possibility of a legal case, in that the legal guardian is no longer the parents. We would rather not have a resolution to this type of situation in the courts. We would rather take the time to work back and forth.

I understand the fear, the misgiving of a parent who, for whatever reason, made the decision to have someone go to an institution. I can understand their fear that, if they couldn't cope before, why can they now and, if they come out, will they be well cared for. Will I have responsibility that's more than I can bear? I mean, I can imagine all of the human responses to that type of change.

On the other hand, I think it's an issue we have to work with a little in order to see what is best for the individual person, is given due aid as well. Now I've said that there is no decision on that particular case at this point in time.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** The Minister says she's listening to the professional people. Why is the Minister not listening to all segments of the professional people? There are many sectors, many individuals, professionals in the field who say the Minister is absolutely out to lunch in what she's doing. She's got one sector of the people who agree with her philosophy. She rallies them around, and that's the only group she is listening to.

Why won't she listen to the Doug Dorseys, and the Glen Lowthers and other people who are concerned and caring people for these people, who say the program is moving too fast? The infrastructure is not there. The well-being of the individual isn't going to be the best in the program the Minister is outlining. Why is she not listening to all people?

**HON. M. SMITH:** With respect, I think I have bigger ears and a more open mind than the member gives me credit for. What I see is a historical shift or a shift in perspective on how you care for the retarded. I respect both the people who feel that institutional care is the best and only approach, and I also respect the people who say, with what we know and what's been tried elsewhere and what has been demonstrated, increasing numbers of the retarded can live in a qualitative way and a safe way in the community.

Now I have never said that one has all the truth, and the other has all the falsehood. I've said, what we want to build into the Manitoba system is a balance, so that there is more choice. Again, I think, if we said institutions only, we would be committing the other fault of listening only to the people who say institutions only.

Now one of the gentlemen you named, I know, is a new person who is head of the auxiliary at the centre, one of the parents. He's on the central steering committee, a fairly recent addition because the previous representative, unfortunately, died very suddenly. The other gentleman, I know, was one of the leaders in the province in moving people out. Again if anyone, because I think this is a case where we want the community involved and to help, if there are instances of people being moved prematurely, unwisely, without adequate supports, I invite all Manitobans to let us know.

To our knowledge, I guess we can be faulted on one side for going too slowly, because we are trying to take adequate care to plan carefully. I met the New Brunswick Minister while I was in Vancouver. She had a big institution right in her riding and she just closed it, no planning, no time. Now she says that the money was all transferred and used in the community. I don't know if that's true or not. But the approach we are taking is quite a measured one and a careful one. I think again, not to open up to change in philosophy and approach is just as bad as saying that the way people used to do it was all wrong.

I believe that there's room for change, and there's also a lot of room for respecting the fine work and the development over time of programs in the developmental centre. In fact, it's been developments there that have really developed the techniques and so on that enable us to help retarded people gain the life skills, and enable them to learn how to live more satisfyingly in the community. In a way, we're shifting from the medical model to a community-based model.

Mentally retarded people have special health problems, but they're not basically sick or psychiatrically disturbed. They're human beings that have retardation as part of their human condition. They have some special needs which they deserve to have dealt with, but to see them as sick people who live out their life in a hospital with no hope of cure, I think is a limitation on what is really possible for them.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** The 1983 Annual Report of the Community Services Department says under the "Manitoba School": "The Manitoba School provides care and training for its residents to enable them to lead enjoyable, independent and useful lives." Has that changed at the Manitoba School?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Our evaluation of programs that have been developed there is that opportunities are improving there, but there is a new horizon of living in more personal environments, more intimate environments, where there is a wider range of decision-making opportunity. That is how people develop.

Now no one expects that there are going to be enormous leaps on overcoming of retardation. It is a human condition that doesn't fade away. On the other hand, there is a range between the minimum and the optimum that we're working with, and I think it's a

tribute to all the fine work done with the retarded in the past decades that now has broadened our horizon.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** In the House, the Minister has said that she's looking for a balance between the institutional care and the community living. Is this just a goal that is being set, that we're going to put 50 percent in the community and 50 percent will stay in the residences, whatever balance she's talking about, rather than what are the true needs of the individual? Do we have goals without determining what is in the best interests of the individuals? I think the Minister has got some sort of, we're going to be the ones that got rid of institutions and to heck what happens with the individual. There's a real concern. Our concern is with the individual, not goals per se. What is in the best interests of those people, the mentally retarded?

**HON. M. SMITH:** I think if the member thinks that there are only two answers, either everyone in institutions or everyone out of institutions, and he thinks that's the school of thought of which I'm a member or that I'm saying balance and I really mean artificial 50-50, or that I really mean complete institutionalization, I don't think he's paying me the respect of listening to what I have actually been saying. I've been resisting any attempts by either polarized group.

In the fullness of time, maybe the de-institutionalization people will be proven right, but I am not prepared at this time to say that there is a fixed number. We have felt that the goal of 220 down-sizing at MDC is achievable, that we can then reassess and see whether there is any further movement possible. I suspect we will find that it will level off about there but, prior to that time, the major monies have been going into building up the institutional option. There was some development on the community side, but not a very rapid one. Our attempt to get more balance is there, but it's a tentative target.

The best interest of the individual in each case is the way we're going. That's why we haven't said there'll be so many six-bed residences here and so many there and so many somewhere else. We've said, we will work on the individual and, if supervised apartment living is workable for one or two and a small group home for another and a slightly larger one for another group, we will in a sense develop the infrastructure to match the needs of the people. So I'm agreeing with the member that we must all keep to the fore the well-being and potential of the individual.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** Has the Minister considered — I know institutions and the institution at the Manitoba Development Centre, with all of the other things that are going on, is overcrowded and so forth. We'll deal with that when we get to the Manitoba Centre? What is wrong with the Mitchener-type concept where individuals can move into a residential setting on the grounds of the MDC and have all the infrastructure, all the support services, all the recreational things available to them? Why is it that they have to be in the community per se?

You've seen a copy of the Mitchener Centre, I'm sure. Tony Sawyer in Portage, who has a retarded child at the Manitoba Development Centre, offered with some

other people to build a home on the facility where their children could live and have all of the other support services go with it. Has the Minister considered this concept?

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, J. McCrae:** The Honourable Minister.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Well we have looked at it and, again, we felt that the sequencing of things should be that we should get our 220 moved out, better supports for another roughly 220 in the community who might, without more supports, be at risk of institutionalization and reassess.

But there are only so many dollars. We can't do all things at the same time. We feel, if there are going to be real options built in, we're better to build up the community options at this stage and then reassess the other view.

Some people are very much in favour of a cluster of homes around an institutional base. Others see it as not much different from the institutional. There's room for difference of opinion, but we feel that the thrust of building the community option at this stage is our priority.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** What is the position now of the 220 that are supposed to move into the community? We were given the 64 and, after doing the proper mathematics, it was really only 50. Now we're supposed to see 220 in the next eight months. Where are we at as far as reaching that timetable?

**HON. M. SMITH:** I can give the admissions from April 1983 to March 1986, then the population at MDC, then the increase in services to people at risk in the community and, finally, the type of placement in the community as of March 31, 1986. What I don't have at the moment is the planning that is well along for another significant number. Again, the planning stage of this program takes considerably more time than the actual placement, so there's always bound to be a delay and then a bunching, if you like, of the numbers at the later end.

In the April to September 1983, there were 38 admissions; October to March 1984, 29; April 1984 to September 1984, 24; October 1984 to March 31, 1985, 18; April 1985 to September 1985, seven; and October 1985 to March 1986. So we've significantly reduced the numbers who are being admitted.

Now within that, there are some new admissions and some readmissions, but both are showing a significant decline, particularly the readmission. That's a result of the support services being given to the at-risk group in the community. If we don't deal with that part of the total picture, any success we make in moving people out may be counter-productive.

Now, the total population in October 1984 at MDC was 785, and May of this year was 721, with a total reduction of 64. Services to community at-risk individuals, as of March this year, there were 99 people served. In the residential side, alternate residential placement for 37; support to existing residential placement, 57; no alternate or enriched service required to five; day service, alternate day program placement,

10; support to existing day program, 14; and no alternate enriched service required to 75, again with the same total, 99, because we realize that the day service and the residential placement both have to be functioning well for the individual to function in the community.

From the MDC, the total number of individuals placed as of March this year is 70. Now the type of service in the residential side, new residential placement, 46; existing residential placement, 21; information pending on three.

The day service side, new day program space for nine; existing day program space, 14; school program, four; and information pending on 43. The day activity side is coming along, but it's moving — (Interjection) — we now have in place concrete regional plans for 131 adults and 27 children to be moved by the end of December this year. We've had 24 adults placed in the last month. As I say, the planning is starting now to come to where the results are evident.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** How difficult is it for parents to have their child or whatever readmitted?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Well I think it is difficult, and it's probably even more difficult for the individual because there may be a sense of failure. But I think the numbers I gave you which showed the reduction in the readmissions, if I can just run down them, I'll go in six month intervals from April 1983 to March of this year: 24, 21, 17, 12, 6, 4. So what we're doing is, by providing the support service in the community, preventing the readmission.

The new admission column reads: 14, 8, 7, 6, 1, 4, and then the totals that I gave you initially. So we're working at both ends of the flow.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** My concern on the readmissions is maybe to the same degree that there is pressure and bullying and badgering to have them go into the community, is there this same sort of coercion to not let them be readmitted when they really find out it's not working in the community?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The vigilance of all of us will be required. If the member has any evidence that such is the case, I wish he would bring it forward. I have faith in the people working in the field that they will not do that.

One of the needs that was identified fairly soon was that, because there are occasional behavioural responses to the new situations, the old pattern used to be that they're acting up, send them back. Instead, we've put in behavioral management people, crisis support, to spend some time in the setting and with the individual, and the people working with them, to see if they could get at the root of the behavioral disturbance.

I know the story that I remember is the one in Gimli, where one of the young men was getting quite hyperactive and aggressive. When they went in, they found that the problem was that he needed to be much busier, much more active, and when they developed a stronger recreational program for him, they not only found that he benefited from that, but they expanded

the activity for all the others as well, with subsequent improvement in morale and behaviour.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** The Minister said there would be times when the parents were no longer the guardians of their children. Could she explain that, or how that takes place?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Again, there's a process that's been gone through in the past of medical advice that the person was incompetent. The choice, then — the mentally incompetent to manage their own affairs and protect themselves — the choice was then that they would be committed to the Public Trustee, who would take care of their affairs, or a parent could retain guardianship. They might have to go to court to secure that but then they would be responsible, in a sense, for the future care.

I'd just like to clarify a little what that would mean in practice for someone who might be at MDC. This is the area that I'm glad the member has raised, because this is where the legislation, in a sense, is running behind, perhaps, current thinking in the area. Under The Mental Health Act, for a family to get service for their mentally-retarded family member, they would have to give up guardianship. Now, their other choice was that they could be the committee, in other words, be the person responsible for the person and the financial affairs, but they may not be able, then, to get the service required.

In a sense, it was an either/or option for a family and what often happened was that families would struggle along as best they could, until they were exhausted or exasperated, then give up the family member to the institution and the Public Trustee. There was nothing in between.

Now, what we're hoping to have is both support and respite for the family, should they choose to keep their member at home, and a range of options in the community where other people could assist in the support for community living, with the institutional care there as a backup.

These issues will be gone into as The Mental Health Act is revised. I invite the member to be involved in that process and, as we all will, try to get the legislation to match the current reality.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** Is the Minister saying that if somebody puts their child or family relative into government care, then they are a ward of the court?

**HON. M. SMITH:** In the past, a person who was declared mentally incompetent had to have someone responsible for making their decisions. That could be either the family or the Public Trustee. Back some time, it was usually the Public Trustee, because that was the only way of getting services. That's not the case now. Services are given whether or not a person has given up guardianship.

In the Throne Speech, we did refer to the fact we'd be developing a Vulnerable Adults Act, which would try to bring our legal categories, as it were, have them catch up with the current service realities. We are



looking at something like a partial guardianship, or a partial trusteeship, so that in a sense the family can stay involved but not have the full responsibility.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** Is there an age where if a person becomes the age of 18 or whatever, up until then does the family have control and then at age 18, the court has control over that individual? Is there an automatic loss of jurisdiction or control?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The age at which it's been an issue has been the age of 18, when an individual is expected to be responsible for their own actions and decision making. So that was the most usual age at which the transfer of guardianship occurred.

In fact, some families did it for children, but it wasn't required by the state. It's just something that people did, because of changing attitudes, I guess, the feelings — there were a lot of feelings of taboo, feelings about retarded children that weren't always ones that we would be in sympathy with today.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** What percentage of the 700-plus residents of MDC would be wards of the Court?

**HON. M. SMITH:** I don't have the precise number. It's our opinion that most of them are; we could get a definitive number for you.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** Well the Minister says that it's a free — not a pressure system — when they have to go in. But all of a sudden we have people that are saying they've got to go to court to get committee ship over their own family so that the government won't force their child, brother, sister, or whatever it is, into the community. Why should the families have to go to the expense of going to court to get committee ship? If it's a voluntary system, that should not be.

**HON. M. SMITH:** I think we're confusing program standards and criteria with the laws that exist. The laws that exist have these harsh divisions as it were. It is being reviewed and, hopefully, we can bring it to where it is fit for the 1980's and 1990's.

The program side of it, though, is where we set the criteria of noncoercion. It's a mismatch, I guess, between the program thrust and the legislative umbrella.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** I'm not satisfied, Mr. Chairman. The Minister is baffle-gabbing here and giving a whole bunch of things.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Oh, that's not nice.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** Just listen! It's true. Be specific. You know, you're saying that it's not a coercion and they don't have to be forced to go into the community and yet they are wards of the court. I think we've got to be consistent.

**HON. M. SMITH:** The Member, if he was listening earlier, would have heard me say that we've only, to my knowledge, and again if he has other instances I invite him again and again to please draw them to my attention, there is only one instance that I'm aware of

where a family is taking a different point of view than the professionals who are speaking, and where the person is under the wardship or the trusteeship of the Public Trustee.

It's the only case that we know of where the Public Trustee is taking an active role, that is, has an opinion different than the parents. A lot of these issues do get resolved by negotiation and discussion.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** I'm confused with the Minister. I can't follow what's going on. I talked to parents, I talked to all kinds of parents; I talked to employees, people that work; people are not willing to come forward. There's a fear that we better not speak. To me, that is not conducive to good mental retardation health care. The parents should be free and willing to come out and speak and employees should be able to speak and say what they think. That is not happening. Why is that not happening?

**HON. M. SMITH:** I favour free speech and open discussion. I have asked the Member, if he has examples, to bring them to my attention. I can't deal with vague allegation. I will undertake to deal with specifics.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** I did bring the names of two people who were finally willing to have their names used. There are other people who are not willing to have their names used. So I brought specifics.

It's not a case that there is nobody out there and that we're just making up these stories. The specifics are there, you have the names. I think your department talked to them.

**HON. M. SMITH:** I should put on the record that two names and two phone numbers were delivered to me in question period with no indication as to where they had come from, who they were, for what purpose they were being sent. A day or so later, I was trying to deduce where they had come from because I raised the names up in my office to see if anyone knew of these people. We deduced where they had come from, but we phoned one person who said that she had not tried to get in touch with us, or didn't want to, or whatever. One of them is the name of this person where the trustee is taking a different tact than the parents. And I have said that we are not being precipitated in a decision in this case.

The other name — again they were just given to me a couple of days ago — we will look into them. But again, I invite the member to give me any names or concerns that he has. I would appreciate it if he identified himself, though, when he sends me that information.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** I apologize. That was my error.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** I think the Minister is aware, because of her own professional background, as well as being a parent, that there is sometimes a great deal of difficulty in people who are afraid to approach when they feel it is their children that somehow may be adversely affected because of that approach. I'd like to think that my own profession and yours didn't do that. But we all know that unfortunately and tragically it has adversely affected children.

I, too, have had phone calls. Those individuals do not want to identify themselves because they are afraid of what's going on.

I guess my concern is this: we have some 721 residents at the MDC. We are hoping to provide alternative residence in the community for 220. We are also hoping that those individuals come from a broad range of mental retardation, not just the educable or the near-educable, but the severely and profoundly retarded.

Would it not, therefore, be advisable that when an individual runs up against a family situation where they are reluctant, that they would then back off that one and look at an alternative placement? And when the situation is proven to them that it works because 220 are placed in the community and actively living in the community and benefitting from that experience, then you have your proof, once again, for the reluctant parents.

**HON. M. SMITH:** I appreciate the member's constructive comment. I would like people to know that there have been community groups that have been exemplary in their willingness to demonstrate that even the most profoundly retarded can manage in the community.

In the Town of Altona, the local people have, in fact, built a residence for the most profoundly retarded members — what they, I think, call Level 5. They have, in fact, put a great deal of their own effort into that home. The community spirit, I think, and the community caring for its own has a very strong root in Mennonite communities. I think that they're showing the way to the rest of us and certainly the development in that part of Manitoba; Steinbach and so on, has really been excellent. I think partly it's due to a community spirit that was there; also an enlightened view of how you work with people who are different, but who nonetheless have feelings and have potential and can be integrated.

As for the phone calls and the fear, one of the reasons we have tried to go fairly slowly and involve a lot of community education and involve many members of the community in this process is that we understand the fear. The society has for decades, more than that really, put their retarded members into large institutions that are out of sight. They have done that out of the best of motives. They felt the people were protected and safe, but the alternative to that is that many of us have grown up not seeing mentally retarded people, in some cases being frightened of them, and certainly, probably to a person, underrating the potential that they had to live a richer life. So we understand that fear and are prepared to discuss alternatives, take people around to visit.

Again, I ask for your cooperation. If you are aware of people who are uncertain or whatever, get in touch with us. I can't guarantee that every person dealing in the field of mental retardation is going to be 100 percent tactful and compassionate at all times, but I have faith in the people working for the department that they are very hard working, very skillful and that they do very fine work for us.

They, like other human beings, are learning as they go because we are, for this community, really venturing into some fairly new areas. That doesn't mean that we

can't make progress together. But, again, for those people who are picking up concerns — I can give my personal guarantee to the extent that I can carry it out through the entire department that there will not be reprisal taken against individuals, that their concerns will be dealt with with respect and with seriousness.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Mr. Chairman, I think what I really want is the assurance, when we have so many that we can place in community settings, that we will not put undue pressure on those who are reluctant to be placed.

**HON. M. SMITH:** I've given that commitment over and over. I cannot be everywhere, and if there are people who are aware of problems, if they would let us know, we will deal with them as constructively and fairly as we possibly can.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** I think, however, that the Minister is aware that those who are involved in the placements are very excited about what they are doing in the community. I welcome that excitement because I think that many of these people can be and should be placed in the community. Having said that, I don't want their excitement to overshadow their good judgment and I want to assure people that their concerns are going to be addressed and, if they express those concerns strongly, they will be recognized.

**HON. M. SMITH:** I agree.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I was interested when the Minister mentioned the residents in Altona. She mentioned Level 5, and I'm assuming that she was referring to severely retarded.

How many residents would there be, what would the staff ratio be there, and would volunteers be used?

**HON. M. SMITH:** There are six persons in that residence. We don't have the ratio available right now, we could obtain it, but there are also many volunteers involved in the program.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** How many volunteers? Maybe the Minister doesn't have a record of it. But how many volunteers are being used in the Welcome Home Program on a day-to-day basis in the community?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Again it's in the hundreds, but they are being used to enrich the service, not to provide the basic care. The basic care is paid people who are responsible and reliable. Volunteers are brought in to enrich the program and provide extra supports.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Is there any minimum or maximum ratio between staff and residents? Is it one to one? Could there be a two to one?

**HON. M. SMITH:** It varies on the levels of need, the age and activity of the individuals. It's not a formula. It's based on the 24-hour planning, the type of supports required, how much time is spent out in day activity

and so on. So, in a sense, each case is worked through to provide appropriate supports for the individual.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Since the program is certainly fairly new, this may be a little early to ask, but have there been many cases where they have had say a one-to-one ratio that they have been able to move out of that type of care and into something a little less?

**HON. M. SMITH:** There are a few examples, but I don't have that detail with me now. We could get it. There is a fair variety.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** I wonder how many jobs have been found for residents that have been moved out of MDC into the community and if they're long term? What type of jobs have mainly been found? Are they government funded, or is the private sector doing a fair amount as far as hiring of the persons who are mentally retarded?

**HON. M. SMITH:** At this point, I could probably get a breakdown on the people who have moved out, but really we integrate them into the system of occupational centres, day activity centres and prevocational training. So, in a sense, they would get into that system where we're trying to get a higher number who move on into private sector employment or public if that's appropriate but, in a sense, once they would be looked at through the whole vocational stream. There probably are some answers to that specific one but we don't have that detail at the moment.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Are there people actively working in the community, say with the private sector, that are trying to get placements and encouraging business to hire where possible.

**HON. M. SMITH:** There are two main programs that we fund that perform that function, the Premier Personnel that identifies the needs and capacities of the retarded individual and attempts to seek out placement in the private sector. There are work experience programs which are publicly funded, but which have an outreach to real employment or integrated employment settings. Not all of the people, of course, who are moving out of MDC would qualify for placement. They may stay in more of a sheltered workshop but, in the overall workshop settings, we try to have people placed in the least restrictive environment compatible with their particular needs for protection and support.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Earlier on, the Minister was referring to generic services. What exactly, in this area, are you talking about when you're saying generic?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Perhaps the best way to explain it is to give an example. What it isn't is a service based just on the disability. In other words, all physically disabled come under this program and get this service or all the mentally retarded.

We go at it the other way around, and say there is a Special Children's Service Branch in Child and Family Services that deals with the children who require special

supports, perhaps technical aids, perhaps a proctor, perhaps some part-time out of a classroom or in a special classroom in order to be able to develop to their optimum.

Instead of it being developed under the auspices of a labelled program with their disability, mentally retarded, it would be a service available under Children's Services that's variable in terms of the needs of the individual. We try and get away from the labelling and the ghettoization, and more into providing the necessary supports for the individual to develop.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** But it actually is a specialty service, no matter where you have it. Under Special Children's Services, they will be specializing in different areas under that.

Quite frankly, I'm getting a little tired of the word "generic." I feel as though everything's sort of dumped into one pot, and I don't think that's really the intent. At least, I hope that's not the intent.

**HON. M. SMITH:** I think the effort is to try to see the person there, and then see their health needs, their transportation needs, their educational and social needs, rather than put a label. This is MR; this is MH; this is physically disabled, and go from there. It's going at the problem from the other way around.

One result has been in the day care field, the Society for Manitobans with Disabilities Incorporated has run day care for children with disabilities, mainly physical but not only. We are offering, through our day care program, a lot of support in day care, so that a lot of those kids could be mainstreamed. In our negotiating with them, we couldn't quickly arrive at an agreement as to how to give equal or better service in the day care program, so we undertook a little over a year study between them and us to identify the kids' needs and explore how we could identify which ones could be mainstreamed with appropriate supports, and which ones would still need some separate day care setting.

That study is just about completed now, but it's produced a lot of dialogue back and forth between the different disciplines who work with these youngsters. They certainly started from different assumptions but, as they're working together they're building consensus, and then we feel they're best able to give us advice as to how to fund day care services for these groups. It's not something that we're laying on and saying, everyone has to mainstream or no one with a disability can go to a day care.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Could the Minister give us a list of the grants by her department, perhaps section by section? If she could give us a total list of the grants now, it would be helpful.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Just for clarification, are you meaning for the entire department or for this section?

**MR. G. MERCIER:** I'd like it for the entire department. That's been given out before.

**HON. M. SMITH:** I have two pages of grants. Shall I start reading?

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Is it possible to have them copied for members of committees?

**HON. M. SMITH:** We could get a copy for you for tomorrow.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Is that satisfactory? The Minister says she can get a copy for you for tomorrow.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** I'm sure we can get them tonight.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Do you want them tonight?

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Yes.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Okay, the Minister is advised that she'll have this prepared for tomorrow.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Mr. Chairman, just an interjection, would that be for all members of the committee?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We now have an amendment to that suggestion. The answer to the questions is: yes, it will be now; yes, it will be for all members.

The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Could the Minister indicate where — I assume there is a grant for 1010 Sinclair Housing. In what section of this area would that be discussed?

**HON. M. SMITH:** That will appear on your list as one of the grants in Community Social Services. I can give you the amount.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Under what item will it be discussed?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** It looks to me like that would be 3.(d)(4), which is External Agencies. Would you like to hold it for that item?

The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** And St. Amant, would that be the same area?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** That would be 4.(b)(4), it looks like, Child and Family, External Agencies — 4.(f)(4), sorry.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Rhineland.

**MR. A. BROWN:** When we're getting a list of these grants, I wonder, could we have a comparison of the grants that were given to these agencies last year? Could we have it for the two years?

**HON. M. SMITH:** The difficulty we're having is that we have quite a long list of grants, and we have a variety of ways in which we give grants. Some are outright; some are for specific programs that vary from year to year; and some are for specific jobs that are done on our behalf. However, we'll have the 1986-87 list — again, the grants list, because they aren't all given as outright grants, some of them are amounts we have budgeted based on program estimates, and some qualify for their grants when they perform a certain function, whereas

others we just give a grant and then that's one of their sources of funding and they must manage their budgets within. It's the separating of those different modes of granting that is giving us some difficulty here.

If you could accept the list as not being necessarily a fixed grant that's given to everyone in the same way — in some cases, there are figures up to, and our best guesstimates, but there's different ways in which they qualify for the payout and sometimes the service needs vary.

**MR. A. BROWN:** The reason why I'm asking is so we can make some sort of comparison. I hope that we'll be able to make a valid comparison between the grants that were issued last year and the grants that are issued this year, whether there's an increase, whether there's a decrease, mainly so that we can have some kind of valid comparison.

There may be some extenuating circumstances where things have changed, certainly, and we acknowledge that. Really, we would like to just make some kind of comparison.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** Mr. Chairman, would the Minister consider the community mental health program at Red River to be a generic program?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I'm not too sure that falls under the purview of this department. That would be under probably the Minister of Education.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** Well, they're going to be dealing — once they are educated, they're going to be in the mental health program.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The mental health program is under the Department of Health.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** . . . is not dealing with retardates?

**HON. M. SMITH:** No, it's the mentally ill.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** Not at all?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** No. So if you wish to deal with the training program at Red River College, I would suggest that that would be appropriate under the Education Estimates. If you wish to deal with the health aspects of the mental health workers in the field, that would be appropriate under the Estimates of the Department of Health.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** One concern that was brought to my attention, and it was brought to my attention today, the concern was for people who have family in the Manitoba Developmental Centre, would their children, or whatever relationship there is, be put into the community without the next-of-kin being informed? There was a real concern there, that because they're under the Trusteeship, that they could be put into the community.

**HON. M. SMITH:** If we know them, they're informed.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** Is that a guarantee?

**HON. M. SMITH:** If you know of any case where we don't have the record, or aren't able to find it, and you know, please let us know.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** It's just a concern raised because of people that had somebody in that situation.

One last comment. With the people that would be working with the retardates in the community, there is a concern from the professional people that there is a trend to downgrading the calibre of people that will be working with the retardates. The RPN's are concerned that maybe there's going to be some quick-flip training programs and that the service to the retardates will not be what it should be.

**HON. M. SMITH:** I understand the concern because the RPN's have been giving service in a hospital-like setting and they've been looking at standards and training. Their particular training is a training that equips them to work with the mentally ill, older psycho-geriatric cases, and the mentally retarded.

The types of skills that are needed in the community probably will require some people with even more skill than the RPN's might have, and some with less, in other words, a differentiated staffing pattern. There would be specialist care available in the community, on a different basis, but I think to infer that because the pattern of service delivery is changing, the calibre of the people giving the care is downgraded, I don't think is well founded.

I understand it is a fear because I suppose change is always difficult. It's perhaps a little akin to the feeling that some people have that there's no real health care given outside of a hospital. The more we learn about health care, the more we realize that there's a lot that the individual can do, there's a lot that can be done away from a hospital setting, that there's a very important role for the acute care and extended care hospital settings as well.

Again, I assure the member that it's certainly not our intention to have any diminution of service or skill level. The mixture of people delivering the service and the types of training they're getting will have some overlap with what RPN's learned and some different skills.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** How can the Minister be sure that the people going into the community will get the services that they require and are presently getting at the MDC? Physiotherapy, speech therapy, all of these sorts of things, the recreational facilities, all of the things when they're in a home, if they're in Somerset or Alonsa, and these are the areas they're talking about putting residents into and a lot of these retardates are severely physically handicapped, how can we be sure that these services will be provided? And what do you do when you have two weeks of rain and people are in a house where there is not much recreational area? How do these people get physical activity?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Part of the 24-hour planning process is to prevent that very thing happening. Remember, the people are having regular day programming out of the residential place so they'll follow a routine much like you and I. There would be transportation supports, recreational programs; there's things like Special

Olympics and so on that I'm sure some of them will be able to share in. The families participate in the 24-hour planning. Community groups are there to enrich the services available.

The only guarantee, I guess, is in the intent of the government to provide a better service in the community. That's why we're putting resources into it and doing this careful 24-hour planning process and involving community, family and expertise.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** Well, I attended the Special Olympics in Portage for the central region and, had the weather been inclement, they wouldn't have been able to hold them.

I just want to have it on the record that I have a real profound concern that these services are not going to be provided adequately and it'll be the responsibility of the Minister if this happens.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(a)(1)—pass.  
3.(a)(2) — the Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** What were the reductions in expenditures for there?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Some reduction in communication materials because we did prepare quite a lot in the early stages of the Welcome Home.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(a)(2)—pass.  
3.(a)(3) — the Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Can the Minister describe the professional training that takes place here?

**HON. M. SMITH:** This is where the funds for divisional people-power development programs are. In 1986-87, the division will be implementing a comprehensive training program. Components of the program will include orientation for volunteer boards, skill instruction, upgrading for government and non-government staff, and implementation support to help recruit and develop new community boards.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(a)(3)—pass.  
3.(b) Operations — the Member for Rhineland.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
I wonder if the Minister would want to elaborate a little further on the brief explanation that we have on this appropriation.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes, we have 301 people employed here. They provide departmental field resources delivering social services. There's social services, vocational rehabilitation, child and family services and mental retardation services, including the use of public funds by external social service agencies. So this is our network of services in the field.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Could the Minister tell me whether there's been an increase in SY's from last year? I notice that there is a \$600,000 increase in wages. Has there been an increase in SY's?

**HON. M. SMITH:** There was an adjustment to the '85-86 printed vote to reflect a net decrease of 16 staff.

Fifteen went to Child and Family Support and were then seconded to Child and Family Services, West Winnipeg. This was because the West Winnipeg Child and Family was delivered directly by government staff and when we regionalized the Winnipeg area, it didn't have a local CAS or community board. In moving it to the community base, we agreed to this mode of taking basically MGEA staff, putting them in Child and Family Support and then seconding them to Child and Family Services, West Winnipeg. That's to enable them to keep the continuity of their employment benefits and so on. And one person went to Manitoba Health.

**MR. A. BROWN:** So I understand that there are 15 more employees in this particular area.

**HON. M. SMITH:** A decrease of 16. They were transferred out.

**MR. A. BROWN:** A decrease of 16, okay. These 16, what were they employed at; what was their function?

**HON. M. SMITH:** In fact, they are performing the same function. They used to be part of the regional network of service delivery; they are now the staff of the Child and Family Services, West Winnipeg. It's because the way Children's Aid Societies developed. In some parts of the city there was a Children's Aid Society that started as a volunteer, in a sense, a private group, but then came into the government funding circle, and there were other areas of the city where there were no such services and they were delivered directly through the regional services. When we tried to put everyone on a similar basis in the city, this group had to travel a different path, as it were, to get redeployed to the Child and Family Services, West Winnipeg.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Is there no volunteer organization now then in West Winnipeg, that we've done away with all volunteers?

**HON. M. SMITH:** No, they had no volunteer board before. It was a direct service by government. With the reorganization, they now have a community board of volunteers and these people are some of their staff. It was a transfer of staff so that they would continue to work in Child and Family, but we had to shift them out of being in our employ to being in the employ of the community-based agency.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Okay, I read into this, "Including the use of public funds by external and social service agencies." Can the Minister tell me what that amount would be and where this is encompassed is that in the \$9.306 million.

**HON. M. SMITH:** There are 15 staff who make up the agency relations group and they are the ones who deal with all the funding of external agencies. They assess their program, process the accounts and so on and check what the money is being requested for, then the basis on which it's allocated and really handle all that funding.

**MR. A. BROWN:** I notice that we also have vocational rehabilitation under this particular section. Does the

Minister have any way of evaluating, do we have any way of knowing whether we are gaining, are we making any success, are we making any gains or are we running around in circles in this particular area?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Perhaps, if I could just go through the total complement here, we'd have a better grasp of who is doing what. There are 286 staff involved in the delivery of regional services; 98 in mental retardation and voc rehab services; 64 in child and family support; 25 in program support; 15 in family conciliation; 15 in administration management; 11 child day care coordinators; 45 clerical support; 9.5 term; and 3 unallocated from the Manitoba Development Centre; then we have 15 people in the agency relations group. During the year, 1986-87 fiscal year, 18 staff will be reassigned from the Manitoba Development Centre to Regional Operations. They'll be phased in as they are not needed at MDC to deliver the service, some service in the community. The salaries show up in 3(c). There'll be one children's care consultant, four speech therapists, 10 community service workers and three clerical support, totalling 18.

The vocational rehabilitation programs and funds show up in 3.(d).

**MR. A. BROWN:** So I should ask that question under 3.(d).

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Very good.

I have another question on this. On the Recoverable from Canada, I notice that not all the money is recoverable from Canada in this particular item. Can the Minister tell me what item is not recoverable? Which items are not recoverable from Canada under this program?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Basically, Canada Assistance Plan will share salary, wages and travel, no administrative costs, and they only will share the portion that is above what was spent in 1966; in other words, the provincial base when the Canada Assistance Plan came into effect.

**MR. A. BROWN:** So then, essentially, the Minister has not started any new programs which the Federal Government did not go along with. It's just mainly that they are not sharing the true 50 percent of some of the programs.

**HON. M. SMITH:** I did say they didn't share administration costs. There are some service costs that they have put a lid on, such as the residential care rates. They are cost sharing the field staff, though, so that some things are shared and some aren't.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Well, being 10 o'clock, what is your will?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Committee rise.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Committee rise.

## SUPPLY — AGRICULTURE

**MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos:** Committee please come to order. We have been considering the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture, and we are now on Item No. 4.(f)(1), the Marketing Branch, Salaries. The Member for Virden.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** You were answering on buckwheat at the end. I don't know if you were done or not.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I think I was indicating to my honourable friends part of the reason why production in Canada, and in Manitoba in particular, has been so inconsistent. Part of it was acreage yields and production levels in relationship to the cash costs of production.

Our analysis is, as I've indicated, that production in Manitoba tends to be on marginal land where seeding is later than optimum and the crop often does not receive the management inputs of other crops.

Buckwheat does not have the disease problems of, for example, canola. Buckwheat, although, is very highly susceptible to spring and fall frosts, affecting the perspective many producers have of the crop. The yields could be increased significantly if the crop was produced on better land with a higher level of management.

We need to do more work with the producers in view of the concerns that the exporters exporting or the importing nations have in terms of our reliability but, primarily, I think our key advantage is, of course, that our quality is attractive and is superior to our major competitors. However, it has still been a very difficult situation to address. We're hoping, over the next number of years that we can in fact interest Manitoba farmers to make buckwheat an integral part of at least some farmers rotation because we did start off with quite a large number of acreages, but we've really gone backwards since.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** When developing markets and facilitating sales to countries like Mexico, as an example, does the province get involved financially in any way in supporting or helping countries to import from us in terms of subsidies or paying interest or delaying payments or is provincial money involved in that direction in any way?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** No, Mr. Chairman, we're not involved at all. No provinces that I'm aware of are involved in export credit.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** I had a constituent phone me the other day and he claims to have developed a product over the last few months and he believes it's in a position where it's marketable. Now what kind of support can he get from the Marketing Branch to help him in the next step in finding a market or getting the product to a marketable stage?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, the first step would be of course to contact our staff and to make the product known to see what contacts and how far he

has gone with the product and whether it requires further testing or further proving out in terms of its marketability. If it's a food product, for example, testing can be assisted in terms of our food centre.

There's a whole host of measures that we can assist in, both either from our department and from Industry, Trade and Technology, depending what the commodity is, and what experience we've had. We could probably provide some experience over the long term, and whether it can be accommodated in our overall promotion. We'd be pleased to assist. We haven't turned anyone down in terms of at least looking at what is there and providing whatever technical advice we can. We'd be prepared to do that.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** How many such ideas come forward or opportunities to help a private entrepreneur develop a product? How many come forward each year to the department?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, possibly a half a dozen or more would come in. When I say to our department, and of course Industry, Trade and Technology on the food product side would be involved with probably many more than that in terms of their testing or work through the university as far as an actual food processing and food product that could be marketable there. This would be virtually a parallel program, but depending at what stage it comes into government for some advice and assistance.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** In your opening comments today you mentioned an exposition on at Expo for a few days. What kind of cost is set aside or budgeted for that and how many staff will participate in that excursion?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, there is about \$40,000 approximately between the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology and our department and a total of 3 staff will be there during the 5 days Food Ex. in the latter part of August in Vancouver. Two staff from Industry, Trade and Technology and one of our staff will participate along with a number of private exhibitors — ten private exhibitors.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Will you be paying the costs of those 10 private exhibitors or what is the \$40,000 used for? What staff will be there?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, our assistance will be in the display area with assistance of setting up the display, the space and the paraphernalia, as I would call it, that goes with the display. The transportation there for the exhibitors and their products are at their own expense.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** You didn't identify what staff would be going.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, there are 2 staff from Industry, Trade and Technology and 1 from Agriculture. There will be somebody from the Marketing Branch. In fact our director will be there.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** In the same context, can you identify how much money was spent on the New York night

and who all went? — on that promotional tour of last year, I believe it was.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, we help set the promotion up. We spent no money on the food. Either, I'm not sure whether Executive Council or Industry, Trade and Technology would have looked after the actual costs. Our work was in the setting up of the menu and doing the background work on the promotion. No other outlay of dollars, other than staff time and work in the promotion there. There would have been money expended in the ongoing budget, but in terms of purchasing the food and that, we did not put any money in.

**HON. G. FINDLAY:** How many staff would have been there?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** None of our staff would have been there.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 4.(f)(1)—pass; 4.(f)(2)—pass.

Resolution No. 9: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$11,126,200 for Agriculture, Agricultural Development and Marketing Division, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

Item 5.(a)(1) Farm and Rural Development Division, Administration, Salaries.

The Honourable Minister.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I won't go into great detail in the comments. In fact, my colleague, the Member from Lac du Bonnet, when giving a presentation in this House, used a lot of the descriptive terms in the whole area of our thrust in farm and rural development and, as well, I've provided members opposite with a draft copy of my remarks which could, in fact, be incorporated into Hansard. I could provide Hansard with the document, they could incorporate it into Hansard and members can proceed with their comments.

I'd like to introduce, before we go into this whole area, he's coming down right now, in fact, he's here, our Assistant Deputy Minister responsible for Farm and Rural Development Division, Cliff Cranston. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to all members of the House that Cliff has served Agriculture some 37 years in the Province of Manitoba. I'm sure that I would speak on behalf of all members, Cliff is retiring at the end of this month and has served in this capacity over the last number of years as Assistant Deputy Minister. He was the Director of the Soils and Crops Branch for a number of years and I had the honour, during my serving as Minister, to have him as one of my Assistant Deputy Ministers. It's been an honour and I can say here that I have not seen anyone anymore dedicated to helping rural Manitoba and the farmers in this province than one Cliff Cranston. He has served the people well.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Virden.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** I guess I would like the Minister to highlight his information that he had presented by another member the other day, because not everybody was here at that time.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Did we not give you copies?

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Not that we've received yet, I don't believe.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Farm and Rural Development?

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** I haven't got it.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** I'm sorry but I did send. Yes, in fact, the other night, the Member for Portage, I think he — (Interjection) —

Mr. Chairman, I will provide it for the honourable members. I regret but copies were sent over long before we came to this division. In fact, the Member for Portage asked me and we did provide the copies in the whole area.

While members peruse the regional activities of farm and regional activities, farm management, farm financial management, crop production and marketing, livestock production and marketing, soil and water conservation and management, human development, agricultural Crown lands, and the Manitoba Water Services Board, I can provide the members with a full resume, or at least coverage of the whole branch.

In terms of the administration there is two staff persons, the Assistant Deputy Minister and his stenographical support. Mr. Chairman, in the regions, the total staff complement for all the regions, and I may as well give them the regional amounts. I think per region we start with the northwest region, a staff complement of 34, and that relates to farm management, livestock, grassland societies, crops, soil management, engineering, 4-H and youth, home economics and district office administration. Those are the areas in which each region would have their staff complement broken up; 34 in northwest, 43.43 in the southwest, 46.41 in the central, 27.26 in the eastern, 34.03 in the interlake for a total staff complement of 186.09, total budget for staff salaries and other expenditures would be \$7,889,400.00.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** I guess we'll start on the water services area.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Perhaps we could go through the region. The Crown lands and the water services of the two last items in this division and I would be bringing in staff, the director of Crown lands would be coming in and the General Manager of the Water Services Board. We'd also be bringing them in for the discussion because there may be some questions in terms of more specific information that we would not have here. That's what I would propose. But in terms of the administration of the regions I would suggest to honourable members if they have no questions on the regional questions and the technical then of course we could move into the Water Services Board and continue on. I'd ask the members to do it that way.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd ask the minister, where in this division or how certain aspects of this division will find its way into the



government's policy announced on their Rural Development Program. The government has announced through the election they will have one coming forward. There's been a consultant hired to bring forward the delivery I believe of that program in due course. Can the Minister tell us, how that program will dovetail into this particular division or branch of his department?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, that work will be undertaken in consultation with our department. The primary area of our department in terms of rural development fund of course would be the Manitoba Water Services Board and looking at the whole infrastructure in terms of community infrastructure as being one aspect of it. The decisions of course and what is finally decided in terms of the scope of the program has yet to be determined, but the one area I am certain that would be viewed in terms of this area, in terms of rural development and would impact on agriculture directly as a part of the programming that we would look at, we certainly would look at the whole area of sewer and water.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. H. PANKRATZ:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. To the minister, I'd like to ask him a question. Was that not jointly funded by the Federal Government. I'm referring to the Manitoba Water Services Board.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I've asked honourable members that we proceed line-by-line and when we get to the Water Services Board I'll be bringing down the General Manager and staff there so that we can go into as much detail as we can provide for honourable members.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Are we ready to pass Item No. 5.(a)(1)?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Pass.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(a)(1)—pass. 5.(a)(2)—pass.  
5.(b)(1) Northwest Region: Salaries—pass. 5.(b)(2) Northwest Region: Other Expenditures—pass. 5.(c)(1) Southwest Region: Salaries—Pass.  
5.(c)(2) — The Member for Virident

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** You gave us the staff component in each region here. Have there been any changes in the staff over the last two to three years in any of these regions, and if so in what areas have the changes occurred?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, out of a total complement of 186.09 we may be down one or one-and-a-half positions in the total regional area. What we have done for example is we did have a number of assistant ag reps there for a number of years. We did in terms of promotions promote a number of people into ag rep positions but also phased out the assistant ag rep positions and filled them with farm management specialists to highlight the thrust into farm management. We used those assistant ag rep positions into our whole farm management thrust. Those are the kinds of

changes that went on within the regions. I don't have the total complement of the final but we're probably looking at somewhere between one and two staff years less this year out of the 186, and if you ask me where exactly it is, I'm not sure that I'll be able to tell you because there have been some shifts internally in terms of prioritization.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Are all the ag rep offices filled now or are there any vacancies at this time?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, all the offices that we have are — there are no vacancies in ag rep offices. There may be some clerical positions or other positions that may be, either due to pregnancies and other circumstances that they would be in the process of filling or on a term basis. No, but that's the fact of life and that does occur. But the staff complement of our ag rep offices that are in the department at the present time are full.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** How many farm management specialists do we have, and does the specialty areas vary, and what's the complement in each area?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, 11.21 would be the farm management specialists. Now there are other specialists in terms of livestock specialists there are 18; there are 13 crop specialists; crop agronomists - there are 5.43 grassland society technicians; 1 soil management specialist; 6 engineers; 5.17 in 4-H and youth specialists; 17.35 staff years in Home Economics and 66.49 in District Office Administration. That should total the 186.09.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** I often wonder when you got to ag reps why they couldn't be trained to be specialists as well as ag reps. Is there not a duplication here in our ag rep offices?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, they have had upgrading and uptraining in terms of farm financial management and in terms of the assistance to our farm management specialists and they do have, certainly a general knowledge, in most areas. But we do have, at least in most regions, one specialist in terms of crops and livestock so there are specific problem areas and specific relationships with other groups that we use that expertise.

The ag reps, of course, are running the farm business groups sessions and are doing pretty well all the instruction in the farm business groups and of course, do individual counselling as do the farm management specialists. There is a lot of individual counselling, especially on the financial management side, in terms of the pressures that farmers have been under, over the last number of years.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** With the farm management specialists, I would presume there's some accounting of the caseloads that they have and I was wondering, in the last five years, how the number of cases or handling or workload has changed?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, there's no doubt that the workload and the direct contact with producers

has increased immensely in terms of our support to the farm community. We have been heavily involved in discussions, and I would say, indirectly with negotiations and putting forward proposals to financial institutions on behalf of farmers, both as ag reps and farm management specialists.

Mr. Chairman, if the member looks at the Farm Financial Management section, Item 2, he will know that over 1,000 farmers just last year alone received in-depth consultation with regard to financial management on their farms. That's been a combination of both farm management specialists and . . .

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** The next question is, how has the utilization of the ag rep offices evolved over the last number of years? Is it increasing, decreasing, constant?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, in terms of the evolution and increasing workload, increasing workload primarily in the farm financial side, in terms of counselling and advising people, more on assisting them and putting forward cash flow positions, assisting them in at least examining what kind of options they might have in order to survive some of the financial difficulties that people are in. That has been the evolving role of the ag rep offices from more general provision of information to commodity groups and the like.

They're still dealing with them but because of the financial pressures that many producers are in, our role has been basically determined by the demand to assist on individual counselling.

We still provide the technical information in the meetings on an annual basis, but on a day-to-day basis it's become more personal and more one-to-one.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** I don't like to pick on anybody, but I picked up a news release here, May 30, heading "Maximum Profits for Fertilizer Investments", written by a Manitoba agricultural farm management specialist of Teulon. I leaf over the page and — no dispute to what he's saying — but when he gets down to saying, "Let's assume you are producing value worth \$3.00 a bushel," I feel that that's a fairly misleading statement for the farmer of Manitoba. Maybe if you produce malting barley you have a shot at it but that's 10 percent of our production. They based their analysis on nitrogen used on \$3 bushel barley. That's just a little misleading in the context.

Nitrogen - the addition of extra units of nitrogen to justify it economically. I'm not saying that every farmer is going to believe it but it's not a very truthful statement.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I don't think that was — and I think I've seen some of those — that was even meant to verify any of the actual dollars or revenue that a farmer's received. It's in relationship to what the input costs might be and how one would calculate his return on the inputs that he would put into the soil — making assumptions. They may not be in terms of actuals but they do give a guide as to how one would make those calculations.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Certainly there's no doubt that if they used the real value of barley, the return per unit input would be different than what's in the publication. It's just one of those little errors.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. G. CUMMINGS:** In the regions, your salary complement is very close to being the same in each region. Could you give us a little more detail on what the — is there a specialist in each of the areas that you outlined in each region? Is that what I understood from your statement a minute ago?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, it would vary, for example, in the specialist areas. I'll give the honourable member, farm management. There would be, from a low of two to a high of three in each region. In grassland, in livestock specialists, a high of five to a low of two. Grassland technicians - a high of two to a low of .25. Crops from a high of four to a low of one. Soil management, there's one and the others — there would be one soil management technician in the province in the northwest region. Engineering from a high of two to a low of one. 4-H and Youth is basically one across the board. Home Ecs from a low of three to a high of 4.2 staff years. District office administration from a low of 9.26 to a high of 17. It varies, like eastern region in Administration, because of the split in the offices and the like, their administration is 9.26; in the central region it's 17, and it varies in those ranges.

**MR. G. CUMMINGS:** One item of discussion that I've heard out in the regions is that when the ag reps were given the direction from the department to establish the farm business groups that it caused considerable consternation in the ranks; that some of them perhaps had not had previous in-service, if you will, to get on with the job. Was there, in fact, or are there ongoing in-service programs for the ag reps in the areas that they're expected to be responsible?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that there would always be hesitation and uncertainty amongst people who would be starting out in something new. I guess that the unknown is probably the greatest fear that anyone has in terms of starting something new, but there were, in fact, committees set up within the department to develop the programs that we are now delivering. Quite frankly, I would have to say that 99.9 percent of the staff are, I would say, quite comfortable with the process and the program is proving out to be very successful.

There is no doubt that there would have been uncertainty of starting out on something new, as there always is. People don't know how it's going to work, and it does take a fair bit of legwork in terms of developing and getting people interested in, of course, trying to build up people's interest in joining the course and, as well, the work in developing the course.

I can understand that people say, oh no, here's another one, because I've got a whole host of farmers I'm dealing with here. Here's another program that I'm going to have to deliver. But I can tell you that the staff, in the main, has done an excellent job in this area, and the program has really taken off.

**MR. G. CUMMINGS:** I'm not necessarily critical of the fact that they were being asked to implement the program. I was interested in what backup or what in-

service there is to expand the use of the ag reps in the communities where they are situated. Has the ag rep service assumed, I guess, an improved role, or have they assumed an expanded role in delivering services for the department, realizing that in my opinion the ag reps' position has probably changed considerably in the last five years.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that the role has been changed substantially from one of providing general advice and meeting with groups and, I would say, being more group-oriented. They are now more heavily involved, in fact, I would say the bulk of their activity would be involved — mind you, they would still be involved in groups, but in primarily the whole farm financial side of the question in terms of assisting farmers.

In terms of the training that staff receive, they did receive, I believe, several days of in-depth farm management upgrading prior to going into the presentation of the courses, as well as assisted in the preparation of the course material, and as well had instruction in how to present the course material. On an ongoing basis, our central group of people in the farm managements in the region are prepared to assist ag reps, if there are problem areas, in the delivery of those programs. If there are some concerns or some problems that they have, other staff either within the region or within the centre would be always prepared to assist.

**MR. G. CUMMINGS:** Has the department delineated any ag rep positions as being bilingual?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** There are and have been a number of positions in the department which have been, for a number of years, designated as bilingual, Mr. Chairman, I believe the Morris office, St. Pierre, Somerset, Ste. Rose. There may be another one, I'm not certain, in terms of the designation, but those have been the ones that have been there for a number of years.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** In the same vein, Mr. Chairman, have there been any additional or new classifications demanding bilingual positions over the last two years? Have there been any reclassifications in the total complement of farm management people or indeed extension people who have had a reclassification in the last two years?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** No, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. G. CUMMINGS:** How actively is the department pursuing the filling of these positions as designated?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Well, Mr. Chairman, we had an instance in Ste. Rose where the ag rep had been there, hired on, and the previous ag rep was bilingual — (Interjection) — Gus is retired. Gus retired, and Roger Sheldon who is not bilingual, the community liked him so much, he is filling that position, even though the position is a bilingual position. We have to reflect, I think, the relationship within the community, and that's what we're doing.

**MR. G. CUMMINGS:** I'd like to say that I appreciate the Minister's comments, because I think that, if the

uncertainty can be removed around the stability of these positions, it makes for much better conditions for the employees.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, it puts a hoax to that whole phenomena that there was backdoor bilingualism as was put forward by some members in this Chamber.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Mr. Chairman, I rise on that. It was put forward by the Minister's colleague, the new Minister of Urban Affairs when he was the chairman of the Manitoba Employees' Association.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** I am talking about members in this House, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Gladstone.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Could the Minister tell us — it may have been asked while I wasn't present, but do the ag reps make the referrals to the present debt review panels? Do they make those referrals on behalf of the farmers, or who makes that?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, our staff would make farmers aware of the existence of the debt review panels if, in fact, in the process of consultation and assistance to the farmer, there appears a stalemate between the communication between the lender and the farmer. We do make farmers aware.

Now the farmer may ask the ag rep to phone our Technical Services Director, Morris Deveson, who heads up that whole area. It could either be by staff or by the farmer directly. We make them aware. I'm not sure that we would, in fact, be doing the phoning but, if we were requested, I'm sure that we would.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Now that we're into debt review panels, I guess we would like some idea. They were formed, if I'm not mistaken, in 1983 to begin with. Can he give us some idea of the number of cases referred to the panels, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, so we can get some comparative idea as to whether there's high demand for them?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, we should have, I guess, gotten into that whole area under Technical Services. There were somewhere between 20 and 25, somewhere in that neighbourhood, panels held in those years. There were nine held last year that were . . . 22, I said to the honourable member 25 — 22 panels have been held. Of these, 10 have been able to continue farming, only 10, while the remainder have ceased farming operations, most having moved off the farm.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Is it true, then, that you have one panel, one case, and therefore there's only been 22 cases referred over the last three years?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Only 22 cases that have been heard by panels; that is correct — 22. One would be per farm panel.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** In the case of the 10 that continued farming, were there any more than 10 that were

recommended some kind of arrangement that wasn't achievable, or was every recommended allowance or arrangement achieved?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** In those 10 which are continuing to farm, and I don't know the specifics of each case, but I would venture to say that there would have been some accommodation likely on both sides, likely a scaling down of the farming operation, a selling off of assets and maybe some portion of that farm still left in the hands of the owner.

Of the others, there would have been maybe some accommodation or attempt at accommodation but, in the main, not the kind of accommodation that would have, in fact, put that farm family back into the position of being able to repay a certain existing debt from the cash flow of those operations. Obviously, they were gone too far. These are the ones that only came forward as a result of negotiations that were not prepared to either accept a quick claim or accept prior to the foreclosure state or who were being foreclosed on. There would have been many others, of course, who would not avail themselves and just said the heck with it, we're pulling out.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Can you give us some idea as to whether they were clients in trouble with MACC, or are they clients in trouble with banks, in total? Any idea of what the breakdown of their problems are relative to institution?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I believe I gave the honourable member, when we discussed MACC in the last number of years, one current foreclosure that is in process. I believe there were two in the last three or four years. I think the figure I gave was 12, since 1959, foreclosures by MACC. The one that is in process had gone through a panel; basically, that instance I know was a combination of production problems for a number of years and basically falling behind. This was, in fact, a dairy operation that I speak of. There were major production problems both in herd health and in production and the panel looked over the entire number of years' circumstances.

I might add that notwithstanding the panel's recommendation, there is a dispute still between the corporation and the farm family. That's ongoing in terms of that one.

I can't tell the honourable member whether any of those other 22 were in fact MACC-related cases.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Can we then assume, from what you've said, that at least nine cases involved either credit unions or banks and successful arrangements were achieved through the negotiation process?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Yes, some form of settlement was achieved, yes. The nine, it may very well be that one or two of those could have been MACC or maybe none of those 10. So it could have been even all 10 from the private lending institutions, both credit unions and banks. I'm sorry, I don't have that information.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Considering the fact that the utilization of the panels, up to this point in history, has

usually been in cases of desperation when almost there's nothing salvageable when they arrive at the doorstep of the panel for help because they really didn't come soon enough. We're talking here of pretty well a 50 percent success rate in negotiating a settlement. It seems to have been workable, and I would consider that a very highly successful process; would you not?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, it depends on what you consider highly successful and the final results of the settlement. If, in fact, you've had to sell off the major portion of your farm unit and are basically left with maybe the home quarter, you're still in operation. The question is: what's the longevity of that operation?

One would have to examine each case on its own merits as one would have to do in terms of the process that we're highlighting by legislation. That's one of the reasons I've indicated that we are bringing in legislation, to indicate that there is a legislative review to highlight this process so people in fact would come forward sooner before they would reach what I would say the desperation state. That's not saying that they would not be in desperate terms before they would come forward but before it's too late.

The consistency of the approach is one that the voluntary process cannot achieve. For some, the lenders may be prepared to set aside, may be prepared to write down, may be prepared to do a number of things; but the approach, given the circumstances of each operation, the difficulty if in fact it was not farm management, for example, production records were good and they were prepared to do it in one case, set aside and stop the clock on interest rates in return for guarantees, one can't determine that they're prepared to do it in another case. That's the other reason for the legislation in terms of trying to get a consistent approach to people in difficulty.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** In your answer, Mr. Minister, you are presupposing conditions that you aren't sure were true or that I have no idea whether they were true when you were saying a major portion of the farm had to be sold off to arrive at an arrangement. We don't know the facts; I don't believe you know the facts. So to say that it's successful or not, or say it's not successful in terms of 9 out of 20, maybe you're prejudging the situation in a negative sense.

I guess I'd like to ask your department if you have any idea as to how many voluntary arrangements were successfully achieved between lending institutions and farmers without the utilization of these panels in terms of one-on-one negotiations or bringing in an independent third party to arrive at settlements, and I'm talking about credit unions and banks. We have a very small number here and I suppose the number that I'm talking about is sizably bigger.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I would hope, given the circumstances that the banks have indicated only 5 percent of their clients would be in some financial difficulty that, in fact, that might be the case, that they would be prepared to basically make those private arrangements. It certainly would be my hope that would be the case, that the vast majority of cases would continue to be resolved between the lender and the

farmer, given the scenario of the statistics that the banks have put on. It's only those in terms of consistent overview that are in serious financial difficulty, are the only ones that the legislation is aimed at.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** In your discussions you indicate that you have had with the credit unions and banks, did you not get that figure from them as to how many voluntary arrangements they made to keep a producer on the land when technically he was financially bankrupt? Did you not get that figure from them in your discussions?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I allow my friend to meet with them and meet with those institutions and let them tell you the numbers that they say they have in fact settled because of financial difficulties. We're involved in many presentations and assistance in presenting projections for farmers in terms of loans. I'm sure that those settlements would occur. They may be just either a misunderstanding or some range in between, having a lot of equity and no equity.

So one has to then gauge the seriousness of the situation to say, well, they have settled 2,000. Look, there are over 20,000 farmers, commercial farmers, in the Province of Manitoba. Obviously, there are about 50 percent of them we consider that have little or no debt. We would assume that those farmers, there is absolutely no difficulty in terms of the relationships between them and their financial institutions. They may be borrowing operating credit, but virtually no debt to speak of. Of course, then we go from there to the various stages of financial difficulty. As each stage, the equity goes down and the debt load and the ratio of debt goes higher, the circumstances become more acute.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Based on the figure you just gave, then approximately 50 percent of 22,000 farmers, we've got 11,000 farmers borrowing money to some degree and 22 involved at the panels, half of them are successfully settled. I think it's terribly negligent if you don't know what the figure is that the banks have worked with in the same fashion before drafting legislation of the nature you're bringing forward — (Interjection) — okay, to what degree in trouble?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, the Farm Credit Corporation survey said that there are 3,600 farmers in the Province of Manitoba with equity ratios of 25 percent or less. In fact, Mr. Chairman, if farm credit decides to lift their moratorium and couple it with the whole issue of transition assistance, I would say you're really putting the grease to the skids to those 3,600 farmers, any number of those who are FCC clients.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** We're not trying to grease the skids on anybody, but we want to get down to the real crunch of what the real statistics are and the significance, because there are a lot of people in that 11,000 group there that are now very nervous about what the impact of the legislation might have on them. You have to understand their position. If we're talking about saving 50 and sacrificing 5,000, that's quite a significant situation to get into.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I would expect that we will see through the panel process, when the legislation is passed, anywhere between 150 and 200 farmers a year.

**MR. H. PANKRATZ:** My question to the Minister would be: you indicated the other night that a percentage of farmers would not be able to be salvageable, what percentage do you feel is that?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, I didn't indicate a percentage. I said that legislation may not be able to save all farmers. You would have to look at each case as it comes up to be able to determine what all the circumstances were for that farm family who would get into financial difficulty. Examining those circumstances, one then could be able to determine whether or not, from both an ongoing ability to continue farming, would be able to see whether or not the production has been reasonable over the years in comparison to production in that area; whether or not the relationship between the financial institution and the farmer were such that there was a reasonable attempt to repay the debts; what were the major causes of financial difficulty. Were they production measures? Were they weather? Were they prices combination? If the production ability of that farm unit is reasonable and relates to everyone else in the community fairly well, then I say that those reasons, that the strictest reasons of just the financial matters of causing difficulty have to be re-examined in light of everyone else in the community.

**MR. L. DERKACH:** Mr. Minister, I'd like to come back to the ag reps and their role in terms of the financial management aspect of it. May I?

I think you made the statement that ag reps were offering farmers farm financial management techniques and advice as well. Is that correct?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, the ag reps are, in fact, carrying on the farm business group courses — the two year courses. They are presenting them. They are, as well, assisting farmers in the processing and production of cash flow statements and the like when farmers come in to see them, yes.

**MR. L. DERKACH:** Mr. Minister, could you give us some idea as to the training of the ag reps in terms of the farm financial management programs?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, if the member reads the record, we basically provided that information to his colleagues.

**MR. L. DERKACH:** From what I gathered, Mr. Minister, you made a statement that said something to the effect that these people get a six or seven-day program. Based on that kind of a program, how can they be expected to give farmers any financial advice when we've got chartered accountants who have spent years in training and are finding difficulty in giving farmers proper advice, farmers who in many instances operate farms that are beyond even the understanding scope of some of the ag reps we have out there, and I don't mean to slam the ag reps, but I'm just talking about their field of training.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** If the honourable member has any specifics, rather than the generalities that he's putting on the record, let him put them on the record. I believe that, in terms of advice and in terms of provision of options that a farmer . . . The ag reps are not there to make farmers' decisions for them. They are there to provide technical information and options in order that financial decisions can be at least considered by the farmer. Whether the farmer accepts that advice or doesn't, or puts it into practice is really the farmer's decision. They can't say, you should be doing this and this. I would expect that the information and advice that staff would give would say, here's an option, here's an option. Maybe none of these are any good and there may not be any options in terms of you being able to get your financial affairs in place. The staff in the department are in fact professional people with training and on an ongoing basis in terms of getting closer involved in the farm financial area, they have been involved in that area now for about five years. I would expect that the majority of our staff would have what I would say a decent working knowledge of the farm financial area. They work through the Interest Rate Relief Programs where they were basically put in the position of assisting farmers to put together financial figures on cash flows and projections. They're involved in those areas and I would expect that they do that on an ongoing basis.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Mr. Chairman, I would ask the minister whether he has canvassed his farm management specialist with respect to the content of Bill No. 4, whether they did have any input to the drafting of that bill, to the basic principles behind it, given that by the sheet given to us by the Minister they've been intimately involved with financial counselling of a thousand farmers during the past fiscal year.

It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that the government's farm management specialists would be in an ideal position having worked on a day-to-day basis very closely with some of the problems, indeed being responsible for directing no doubt all of the nine cases in this past fiscal year to the farm debt review panel. Can the Minister tell us whether or not the farm management specialists, and I forget what the total number is within the province, had any input into the development or the drafting of Bill No. 4 and if not can he tell us why not?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, in terms of the actual drafting of the legislation, no they would not have had an involvement in it. But insofar as our ongoing discussions with the process that we've been involved in over the past two years on how we can make it better and how we can get people coming forward sooner before the Receiver is at the door, to that extent and in terms of our discussions with financial institutions and negotiations with the financial institutions and the difficulties that we are having in the field, to that extent, yes, there was extensive consultation and involvement of our farm management people. But certainly not in the drafting of the legislation, but in terms of where we have come and how we've arrived at this point, it would have been as a result of discussions and feedback from our field staff, and farm management staff would have been involved in that.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** My reason for posing the question, Mr. Chairman, is based on maybe a very limited experience but over the last two years having been involved very closely with people that I've known in the past or have just come to know, who have been pushed into the beginning stages of foreclosure or who have found themselves — maybe they weren't pushed, maybe through circumstances have found themselves there. In every one of the cases that I've been involved in the sense of being party to the information and knowledge, I have had occasion to talk directly to the farm management specialist, who in every one of those cases was intimately involved in some of the details associated with the case. And almost, well in every case was told by the farm management specialist that the farmer in question really should leave agriculture.

I wasn't troubled with the comment made by the specialist because many of them have been trained formally in a fashion I guess not an awful lot different than I was, but who saw the operation first hand, who probably made recommendations or gave advice, certainly input into the review panel, who saw the operation on a first-hand basis. And yet I couldn't help but believe that there probably is not the support for the government's program within his own department, on behalf of his own professionals, the type of program that he's bringing in. That was the purpose of my question, Mr. Chairman, and I guess then I would ask the Minister, since the bill has been printed and laid on the Table, presented to members of the public, whether he's had an opportunity to review it in detail with his farm management specialist and take them through the process and again, he could see from them some commentary as to how they see the process working.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, in terms of the specific makeup and the procedures that in fact will be involved, that process is ongoing. In terms of whether or not someone in the department may say that every farmer that I've dealt with was in financial difficulty should go out of business in terms of the recommendations, obviously that may occur. Our role in the department is to assist the farm community, make as good an assessment of the farming operation we can, and if there is a hope given normal circumstances if we can save that farm unit we should attempt to do that. That doesn't mean that we're going to go out and say that every farm unit in fact could be saved.

But I want to tell my honourable friend that the vast majority of the farm community, those who are in financial difficulty today are our future generation, and are generally the younger producers who have gotten into difficulty and the question goes far deeper than those in the industry today because the average age of farmers of those who are not in financial difficulty is rising. And it is the younger generation, the new generation are the ones that unless they are assisted, they have generally been the good producers, the ones that in terms of very poor managers in fact have not lasted, have basically been weeded out in the last 2 to 3 years and have gone.

Now that is not to say there aren't a few of those still around, that have hung on through sheer tenacity and maybe even off-farm income, that are hanging in

there. But the vast majority of farmers of course that are in difficulty, 3,600 or more, many of whom would be considered pretty good producers in terms of production, may not be the best financial managers but certainly can be shown as fairly reasonable producers.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to begin to debate Bill 4 at this time other than to say to the Minister, we too on this side just as badly want to see maintained those farms that can — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, I'm being challenged into debate by the Minister of Agriculture. I don't want to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't want to leave on the record that we, too, don't want to see maintained those individuals who have a proven record of production capability, who deserve to not be pushed off the farm. But I think maybe we're coming from different positions. It's incumbent upon the minister, in my view, particularly as stated under No. 2 on the sheet provided that his farm management specialists have had a thousand in-depth consultations with regard to financial management of farms. I think nobody in the field can be in a better position to recommend some certain courses of action. Yet, Mr. Chairman, I can tell you those same farm management specialists, in a lot of cases, have advised farmers to take write-downs of debt from lending institutions which were far above ultimately what the lending institution was prepared to offer in write-down of debt.

I've seen cases where they've recommended to the farmer that he accept readily the first offer by the lending institution write-down debt of some 10 percent. Yet, through perseverance of that individual and after again meeting those officials of those same lending institutions, that debt was written down in some cases to 50 percent. So, I guess all I'm trying to get at, Mr. Chairman, is that I think the Minister has a wealth of information right in his back yard with respect to this problem. I think if he had sought it in a most objective form, that maybe Bill 4, as it now exists, may be in a little different form.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, if anything, I would tell my honourable friend the situation is probably more serious than even many of us would want to admit.

**MR. L. DERKACH:** Mr. Chairman, to the Minister. Of those cases that have been saved or been allowed to continue to farm, seeing that the farm management specialists are, in fact, specialists and do have expertise in the area of farm management, is there going to be or is there a policy whereby these farm management specialists are going to be allowed or, in fact, expected to continue to consult with those farmers who have been allowed to continue so that, in fact, their farm management practices will carry on and provide them to get out of debt eventually?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, absolutely. If we can assist on an ongoing basis, that's really our role. In fact, it would be my hope as well that many of those operators would, in fact, avail themselves of the ongoing business groups to really get some, what I would call basic knowledge in financial management, decision

making, record keeping. Those main features were refined that the production on the farm may be good, but the knowledge of where the expenditures are, in relation to the income that is produced, is kept in a shoe box. That's basically what's out there and the farmer basically knows how to maintain equipment; knows how to look after his livestock and his crop production but, when it comes to records and where the money went that is a totally different question. The vast majority of cases that we find in difficulty are exactly that. Maybe a good operator but sure isn't aware of where the whole financial package fits in terms of where his expenditures are and where his money went, basically.

**MR. L. DERKACH:** Just a suggestion or comment with respect to farm financial management. Within our area I know there have been some programs put on with respect to financial management of farms, and they've been put on at times of the year when presumably things are slow, where there isn't a great deal of activity on the farm. However, we've noticed that in the last couple of years, unfortunately, some of the programs have been scheduled right in times when it's either calving season when farmers really can't afford the time to come out and participate.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, the courses have generally been in the winter months and, of course, I would think that our staff, in terms of people who do sign up, maybe one approach might be to put out the notice earlier to individuals and then have an initial meeting to see how quick the course might be started. That may be an approach that we might do. If people hold back and don't apply until the actual date of the course, of course, that may keep some people away.

**MR. H. PANKRATZ:** Mr. Chairman, a question to the Minister. In regard to these different regions. Is there any way of being able to calculate what the acres are under cultivation, or the different amount of production, or anything in that respect in regard to the different regions?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, it may be in our Annual Report in terms of cultivated acreages. We may have some statistical data there. I don't know whether we have the complete breakdown. We may have some regional profiles that we'll attempt to get for my honourable friend on the regional basis as to livestock, crops and what kind of crops. We'll try and provide that for my honourable friend in terms of some written advice, not in terms of the Estimates, but we'll try and get it for him.

**MR. H. PANKRATZ:** To the Minister, the question I have basically is the eastern region has 27 staff people, and personally I guess, I believe it would be one of the most diversified areas in the province. I might be wrong on that, but I think I'm right with that. I'm just wondering why it would have basically the least number of staff, and it's unfortunate that the Member for Lac du Bonnet isn't here to possibly support me.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Generally, Madam Speaker, it would reflect the number of farms in a region.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(c)(1) — the Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. H. PANKRATZ:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to go back and a question to the same regions if I may.

To the Minister, would you be able to also provide me with the information in regard to the different kinds; for instance, let's say number of dairy farmers, broilers, a breakdown in each region?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** I can tell him that the vast majority of chicken, broiler and turkey operations would likely be in his region, and some dairy.

**MR. H. PANKRATZ:** Another question to the Minister. What number of those farmers are in financial difficulty?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, if there are — and I say if — it is strictly, I would say, the main reason for financial difficulty would be management.

**MR. H. PANKRATZ:** I'd like to get back to my previous question. Will you be able to give me a breakdown of the number in each region?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Of farmers in difficulty? Mr. Chairman, with the nod of my head we'll . . . in terms of the regional profile we will try and give him everything; the type of operations and as much information we'll try and provide him on a regional basis.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (5.(c)(1) to 5.(f)(2) were each read and passed.)

5.(g)(1) Manitoba Water Services Board, Salaries — the Member for Virden.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Are you prepared to give us some documentation or breakdown as to the services rendered in this area?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, for the information of honourable members, I should provide them the entire cash flow forecast of the Manitoba Water Services Board as of April 1, 1986 for their information.

As well, I should indicate to the honourable members that the staff complement in the Water Services Board is 39.28: 13.28, Branch Administration; Water Resource Services, 2; Design and Development, 9; Field Services, 5; Construction, 5; Maintenance, 5; for the total of 39.28 in terms of staff complement in the division.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to inform honourable members of the House the gentleman that's joining us at the present time is the general manager of the Manitoba Water Services Board, Erv Griffin.

I should also note that Mr. Cranston does chair the board, which is composed primarily of civil servants and one municipal representative, I believe, from the southwest corner of the province, who also sits on the board, but the staff of the board are primarily staff from Agriculture, Municipal Affairs, from the Budget and Finance Branch, Environment in terms of the environmental aspects, and Water Resources Branch. Those would be the four staff people.

Mr. Chairman, I am advised by staff that — and I will read — it's come to my attention that there has

been an error in the collating and binding of some copies of the Manitoba Water Services Board's annual report which I tabled in the House. Since the error is sometimes difficult to detect, I am asking members to return their copy to my office, and I'll have it checked and returned and replaced with a corrected copy.

I frankly don't know what the error is, and if you'd like to have those copies returned, we'll have them checked. It's something about pages are duplicated. So if members want it checked, we'll have it checked over if there's any questions, but I apologize for any inconvenience and error on our part.

**MR. H. PANKRATZ:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman; to the Minister of Agriculture.

This Manitoba Water Services Board, is there not a funding also from the Federal Government, or was there not a funding also from the Federal Government in place?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, yes, there is funding from the Federal Government through PFRA, provided on an ongoing basis for financial assistance shared. There is a formula in terms of sharing, but for eligibility for federal assistance joined with the province would be only for communities with populations under 300.

There was what was called the Agricultural Services Centre Agreement which expired in 1982 whereby the Federal Government, through PFRA, cost-shared projects for larger communities, and I would say Steinbach would have been one of those communities that could have been, depending on the financial circumstances of the community, eligible under that program. When that program ended, we were unable to negotiate an agreement up until this time with the Federal Government for either an extension or a new program.

The only province in this country that was able to negotiate a similar agreement to what we had in 1982 has been Saskatchewan and no other province as yet. We are attempting to see whether, in fact, we still can, possibly through the ERDA Agreement, get into that type of an arrangement with the Federal Government. We're going to make some further internal submissions and see whether or not we can get it on track again, but up until this point, we've tried I think twice in terms of that approach.

Basically, because of the financial situation, the Federal Government was not prepared to enter into those agreements. We're still hopeful that we can because there's no doubt that the demand for the services in terms of Water Services Board exceeds the amount of money that we're able to put into the program provincially.

**MR. H. PANKRATZ:** Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, under what agreement would you receive that funding or did you in the past receive that funding? What was the name of that agreement?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** The old agreement was the Agricultural Services Centres Agreement. That's what it was called; that was the name. It expired in 1982.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister has given us a handout here showing the cash flow forecasts



for the Manitoba Water Services Board, 1986-87, and a forecast is made for 1987 and beyond which, at this point, totals roughly, combining loan and grant, I believe it's \$8 million. I think it's right.

Can the Minister tell me how long the queue is for those communities and districts wanting services, water, sewage? What would be the total accumulated requests today of all the communities within this area? Obviously, that number exists, Mr. Chairman, because for 1987 and beyond, the department has already indicated — (Interjection) — no, no, one's actual by way of official applications to the department.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, what is shown on the table that is presented to my honourable friends, those are the actual requests which have received prioritization of the board, I'm advised.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** The Minister uses the word "prioritization." Can any one of these be, say, bounced out of this priority list if another community made application during the next year?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, it may be possible that in terms of environmental issues and health issues would receive a higher priority than a straight application for expansion. That may, in fact, from time to time shift one's priority in terms of lists. Those communities with those kinds of difficulties, of course, would receive a higher priority than anyone who's queued up just for the regular extension process and the like.

The board has about three or four different categories in which they try and rate the communities. On that basis, they start doing what I would call the juggling in terms of the money that they have and trying to assess the priorities. Of course, if something occurs during the year that has to be met, then maybe some projects which may have been let may have to be slowed down a little bit and those kinds of things do occur from time to time.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** I'd ask the Minister what the policy is with respect to those districts which basically have paid off the capital plan, having been in existence maybe for a period of 10 or 15 years. Either through increased consumption or for whatever reason, the cost has more or less been paid off with a capital plan. Do any of these communities receive then a freezing of their water rates? Are they tied into a basic scale, a basic rate schedule applicable to all regardless whether they have indebtedness or not?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, is the member speaking of works that are operated by the Water Services Board or operated by the community?

**MR. C. MANNESS:** The Water Services Board.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, there is a formula in which the Water Services Board establishes a rate on an annual basis. If, in fact, the costs in that community exceed that over the amortization period, there is a subsidy that is paid to those communities. Those communities whose actual costs of operating their system fall below or at or below the going rate pay that actual rate.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** I guess I'd like to just talk for a couple of minutes on the sewage treatment lagoon situation. I guess the first question would be: is the Department of the Environment responsible for lagoons that are spilling, leaking or faulty, or is it Agriculture that's responsible?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, there are regulations that are basically enforced by my colleague, the Minister responsible for the Environment. No doubt, there are times when, in fact, that there are lagoons or problems in the sewer system. We do attempt to try and rectify those. Some of those problems may have been design problems; some of those may be over capacity problems in terms of the load, that the system was not designed, and then we try and see what kind of remedial measures need to be done.

On some occasions, it may have to be either a new lagoon or an additional cell to be put into handle the effluent. Each case really has to be examined on its own merits. For example, we had a difficulty in Stonewall where several years after we laid the piping, we found cracks in the pipe and ended up by using an x-ray type of investigation. We found that it was an installation problem in terms of installation and there were negotiations to try and settle off the costs and the damages there.

Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that regulations were toughened up about six years ago to solve the seepage from new lagoons or at least to identify them and to bring about stricter measures of control in terms of the seepage from lagoons.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Those lagoons that were built some years ago that experienced those problems, who is responsible for the cost of preventing or stopping the problem or upgrading them?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, the responsibility lies with the local government, but we would be prepared to receive representations and to see whether or not what kind of assistance would be required and whether they meet the program qualifications in terms of funding. If they meet those, they would be considered.

There would be, of course, what would have to be determined as to the type of load within a community, who uses it. For example, if there was one major industrial user that really the lagoon would have been okay for all the residential development in the community, but one major commercial venture may be using the bulk of the lagoon. Then all that would have to be assessed in terms of how much support would the community be eligible. We would try and assist them in trying to apportion future agreements with the commercial entity or whatever. We'd have to look at it and our staff would be prepared to assist.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** When a lagoon encounters a leak that ends up in a spill that does some damage to, usually neighbouring crops or something like that, who is responsible?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, there's no doubt that whoever would own the lagoon would no doubt be held accountable and responsible if it could be shown that

the damage has occurred from the lagoon in that particular municipality or that particular town or village, whoever it would be.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Is there any system or procedure by which a farmer that's got a grievance in this area can address it swiftly and quickly, or is he entirely on his own to sue his local government?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Well, I think, if I can offer some advice, the farmer in question should, of course, raise it with the council. Most councils do either have engineering firms that advise them or they could ask for assistance from us; either of those.

That kind of request really should go to local government and they should be prepared to respond to it. Whether or not they're prepared to settle an actual claim is another matter, but I would think that if it was drawn to local government, local government would want to check their legal advice and their engineering advice and see what measures would have to be undertaken to deal with the complaint.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** An individual who talked to me recently has had that problem and he's had nothing but annoyance in terms of trying to settle with the local community and there's certain hassles that can happen in the local community when that occurs; but that community is now negotiating with him for more property to build another cell. His request is, okay if I'm going to sell you property, I want written in the agreement assurance that any future spills or damage to his adjoining property will be settled forthwith by some mechanism that doesn't give him a tremendous hassle because he'd just as soon the darn lagoon was 100 miles away right now. Right now he's been told that no, they will not negotiate that into the contract of sale. He says, how do I have protection? If I'm selling them something, let's have to have something in return.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Our staff is aware of that matter and we're attempting to get legal advice on the request to be able to advise accordingly. We will have to get some legal advice since we are acting in conjunction, by an application from the Community Water Services Board, so that whole area we will be examining and trying to respond and advise the community whether in fact that can be done, if it can, or what other means are at the farmer's disposal. We're checking it out and that's about as much as we can say at the present time.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** As Minister of Agriculture in seeking legal advice to determine how to proceed in this area, are you there to represent the best interests of the farmer, or the best interests of the community?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, we want to have both the taxpayers of the province protected, but yet that justice be done in the process; that if the farmer has been jockeyed around — I don't want the farmer to be jockeyed around in terms of the long term. But I am not certain at this point in time what the legal advice will be in terms of putting into some type of an agreement that kind of consideration. But it may very

well be that there would be no difficulty of doing that and that's the purpose of us seeking legal advice. In fact, I would suggest that I think our board is going over and above normal practice in this area, because normally that really should be a responsibility of the community in those areas. But there is no doubt that our staff and our board goes over and above that we would normally have as a relationship between the Water Services Board and the community. We try and accommodate all sides in an issue.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Just one last comment in that area. My own personal feeling is that his request is relatively common sense and that the engineers employed by the department should, by this point in time with the amount of experience they have had, be able to design lagoons that don't leak. Is it not a common sense request? I don't ask you to answer it any further, but we would hope that you proceed in an appropriate direction here.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(g)(1) — the Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, under the present standards, we are reasonably confident that they will not leak, but that's not to — (Interjection) — well, when I say not 100 percent, we've had a case in the community where the lagoon was constructed well, but in the intervening two or three years, a commercial establishment came in and is using 85 percent of the lagoon which the community wouldn't have needed a lagoon for the next 10 or 20 years. Because of the commercial establishment, the lagoon is overfilled and is now leaking. Mr. Chairman, the member would get up a year or two down the road if that happened in his community and say: "You assured me that the lagoon wouldn't leak." And I'd have to get up here and say, "But there wasn't this kind of an operation there." So I can't give him that iron clad assurance.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** The Minister knows as well as I know there is no commercial establishment involved in the lagoon in question.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Are we on the same wave length that we're talking about Hamiota?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Yes.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Okay. Go ahead.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(g)(1) — the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Chairman, I had the opportunity to be up in Arborg in the Interlake last week, and there was a concern up there, in Fisher Branch, in that they have a sewage system that has just been put in and they have no lagoon.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** They don't have a sewage system

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Well, maybe I got it mixed up. I don't happen to be in that constituency, but they knew

it would be brought up if they spoke to a city MLA, their own hasn't brought it up. They are waiting for an okay for a lagoon in their system and they have not been getting much satisfaction regarding answers as to when they'll be able to move ahead. I wonder if the Minister could enlighten us as to where that stands in Fisher Branch.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, the honourable member should be aware that the sewer system is tendered. We expect that construction of the actual sewer will take place this summer. The lift stations are in. We installed the lift stations this winter, so we are expecting to do the construction this summer.

The process of the lagoon is still going before the Clean Environment Commission and we're hoping to have a final decision once that process is through. If, in fact, it's all through and there are no hitches, it may be possible that the lagoon will be constructed this year. I have not been able to give, and I've had calls as well, an iron-clad decision that definitely it will be in place. But the construction is scheduled to begin very shortly and if the other processes are through, we may, in fact, have all the construction completed this year. But it has to take its natural course.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 5.(g)(1) — the Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, can the Minister of Agriculture indicate whether all communities currently qualify for funding under the Water Services Board capital funding for expansion say to lagoon, sewage systems, that sort of thing? Are there some communities that don't qualify under your financial criteria?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, there would be some communities that may not qualify, depending on the project they would be requesting for. If in fact their debt load is such that the expansion that they would want to undertake does not give them the kind of debt that they would be required to qualify for funding, then they won't qualify. That's really the criteria. I don't believe that there is any community that we actually exclude. It really depends on the debt load at the present time and what the expansion or the addition might take, and how many mills that would take to bring that about.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Presumably, in the Minister's answer, and if I'm interpreting it incorrectly, he will no doubt straighten me out. But presumably, communities that have a high debt load, hence the expansion to the lagoon system, if it were made, would impact on the ratepayers adversely; if they have a high debt load already, they would qualify, less highly leveraged communities may not. Is that what the Minister is saying?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, yes, if in fact they are below 8 mills in their present levy on sewer, they would have to reach the 8 mill levy before the formula would trigger for them to qualify for assistance. On water, I'm advised that it's 12 mills. That's the general format.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, I want to make a plea on behalf of at least two communities that I know

of to the Minister who find themselves in that anomaly of a position wherein their past stewardship of capital expansion, where they did it prudently, they did it at possibly lower cost than other communities did, they end up without meeting this magic debt load that Water Services Board requires to have in place before funding will be shared by this program, by this Department of Agriculture program. One of the communities is Morden and the other community, to my knowledge, is Melita. There may well be others.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think the case can be made pretty strongly that those communities are taxpayers to the Province of Manitoba like anybody else and have quite possibly been less of a burden because they haven't qualified for funding in the past. They are excluded because they don't have this magic debt load that other communities who qualify currently have.

Now the town I know has been talking to the board and I think it's fair to say — and I'm speaking of the Town of Morden here — has been quite confused in how they can bring themselves about to qualify for some of the funding.

What I would like the Minister to do is to take a look at those kinds of criteria because it's sort of like the school division situation where they get on the new enriched formula. The former Minister of Education a year ago was telling school divisions like Brandon that the way they can get out and qualify for the new funding formula is to go and spend a whole bunch of money which is rather an imprudent piece of advice.

In the case of Morden, what you're doing to the town of Morden, according to discussions I've had with them, is they are excluded from qualification under this program because they have been too good a manager in past expansions.

The Minister is shaking his head, and I would be interested in hearing why they aren't able to qualify to the extent that other communities are.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** I'll tell the honourable member that Morden received 100 percent funding from the Federal and Provincial Governments for the majority of the major construction of their sewer and water works, for the water supply works, in their community, Mr. Chairman, paid for by the Federal and Provincial Governments.

Mr. Chairman, is the honourable member saying to the other communities that they are poor managers in terms of the debt load that they have for sewer and water? Is he suggesting that we should go around and say, well, you guys who are poor managers in every other community who have a debt load, you're not running your communities very well? — (Interjection) — I'm not suggesting. Morden received financing for their water works, provincially and federally paid for, 100 percent. Of course, as a result of that, their debt load is low; there is no doubt about it.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, I'm well aware, because we were government when we raised the dam at Morden and the new water facility went in. That was to supply water to the town of Morden; that was to supply water to a number of farm communities on a pipeline north of town; and that was done with the deliberate intent of providing an assured water supply until the year 2,000 — 2,005, I believe it was.

Mr. Chairman, the question I asked the Minister was on sewer expansion, on the expansion of the lagoons. If that town grows any more, they're going to have to undertake a major expansion of their lagoon system. Under the Minister's current funding formula, because they haven't qualified on lagoon expansion before, and they've done it prudently within their own resources, they don't qualify under the Minister's financing formula.

I simply make the point to the Minister. Will he not at least instruct his staff to sit down with Morden and investigate whether future expansions of their lagoon system would qualify under the Water Services Board program so that they would receive some of the assistance equivalent to other communities in the area that receive that like assistance for lagoon and sewer expansion?

Morden is in the position where they're going to have to do that within the next several years if their rate of growth continues, and I expect it will.

Will the Minister simply not have his staff sit down and talk to them and find out whether there's an accommodation that can be made under the formula so that they qualify for some assistance in the next lagoon expansion for sewer services?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, we're prepared to meet and speak with any community. I have no difficulty of a staff meeting. They may have already met with them and provided the information, but if we have not and there's a request to meet, we certainly have no difficulty.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** That's the open revolving-door policy this government has had for years for communities in southern Manitoba. I realize the staff will certainly meet and talk with them.

I'm asking the Minister that if there's difficulty with his formula, is the formula flexible enough to accommodate a community like Morden that'll be faced with a significant burden on a future lagoon expansion that they could — (Interjection) — well, put it on the record, if you want. Don't talk from your seat; put it on the record. If that's what you're saying, that there's no sense of the town of Morden meeting with your people because you've already closed your mind because you believe they don't have enough debt, I say to you that is a very, very interesting position for this Minister to be taking, to exclude a community because they happen to have no debt.

I simply want to ask the Minister, in the meeting, if there is enough flexibility within the department and,

if there isn't, if there's the ministerial flexibility to allow a community like Morden to qualify for future lagoon expansion?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, we made major changes in the formula a number of years ago. We would have to have a look at the formula in terms of whether or not the community qualifies.

At the present time there is no intent on my part to change the basic formula that we changed a couple of years ago primarily because we are unable to even meet all the requests that we're having right now from other communities who meet the criteria. We are unable to fund all the requests that we've got. The cash flow that I distributed to honourable members shows the amount of requests.

I have indicated to my honourable friend that if there are circumstances that we should review within the present formula — I have at this point not heard of a case made for me to alter the existing formula based on the current requests that we have on the table — if the honourable member asks us to meet with the community, whether or not there may be some alternatives within the formula, I think we can have a look at it. But I don't want to say to my honourable friend, yes, we'll accommodate it when I have three times as many requests as we have funding to be put into place under the regular formula.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Chairman, committee rise.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Is it the wish of the committee to have the committee rise? (Agreed)

Committee rise.

Call in the Speaker.

## IN SESSION

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, D. Scott:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden, that this House do now adjourn.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The hour being 10:00 p.m., the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until tomorrow morning at 10:00 a.m. (Friday).