

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 24 June, 1986.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - COMMUNITY SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN, M. Dolin: Committee will come to order. We are on Page 33, Item 3.(d), Programs.
The Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, I'd just like to distribute the items in Financial Assistance, 3.(d)(3), the comparative figures for 1985-86 and 1986-87 in the basic program areas — community residence, additional care and support, supervised apartment living, respite service, crisis intervention, vocational, pre-vocational, day activity and transportation.

Another page of information I'd like to table is the residences by region with their capacity, the per diems which have an element for capital, a base amount and the total.

I draw the attention to the members of the fact that this is just the community residence element, that there are the other functions that I mentioned. There is additional support available on the basis of need.

So I'll have those distributed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We've just received this information, and I would like to have an opportunity to take a look at the various expenditures within this particular community residences for the mentally handicapped.

I would just like to ask one question. The supervised apartment living, I wonder if the Minister could elaborate. How is this program working out? Is she satisfied with the program or is she running into some difficulties?

HON. M. SMITH: The supervised apartment living is one of the options other than support in the family home or group living. There is individualized training and skill development for handicapped persons capable of living in a semi-independent setting. That could be one, two, or three individuals in an apartment with a support person that could range all the way from a live-in person to someone who's available during the days or on an as-needed basis. They're very much based on the individual readiness and 24-hour planning that's available for those people.

MR. A. BROWN: When we're talking about a live-in person, I suppose that this person would be receiving remuneration for, let's say, living in with two of these mentally retarded in an apartment. Is that right?

HON. M. SMITH: Most of them function as itinerant supports who visit the individuals on a certain pattern depending on the need. They would be paid a salary

for that type of support role. They might help with managing their money or deal with some of the more complex tasks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River East.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

On this sheet that was just passed out — the community residences for the mentally handicapped — can you tell me why SPIKE House isn't on this or is that something different — SPIKE House in North Kildonan?

HON. M. SMITH: It is a residence that would be on the new list — one that's in the final processes of final agreement.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: After April 1, 1986, because SPIKE was approved after that date — is that why it's not on this list — is that what you're telling me?

HON. M. SMITH: It's not operational yet. The cut-off year that we're dealing with here is March 31, 1986.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Mr. Chairman, I understand that approval then has been given since this date for six beds for the mentally and physically handicapped at SPIKE House. Am I correct?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, approval has been given for the six.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Mr. Chairman, the facility I know was constructed to accommodate eight beds but only six were approved which apparently conforms to provincial guidelines. I do notice on this sheet here that there are several other facilities that do have more than six beds. Can you explain that to me?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, they were in existence prior to the Welcome Home planning process. The size of the residence has been on the recommendation of the provincial coordinating team in consultation with the regional teams. They're recommending that we not go above the six.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Mr. Chairman, when was that recommendation made?

HON. M. SMITH: Two years ago.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Can you tell me then whether any of the other residences on this sheet that are above the six bed limit have been constructed or approved within the last two years?

HON. M. SMITH: We have two that are listed at eight in the Parklands area. One was, in fact, a renovation of a program that did have eight before. The other one was approved at eight as a special arrangement by the

provincial committee after reviewing the geography and the need in that particular area and the distances between towns.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister give me the names of those few residences that were approved and the number of beds?

HON. M. SMITH: The Parklands one of eight, one was a renovation of an existing eight; the other one was approved at the 8 level by the regional committee. That's like their proposal.

In the case of SPIKE, the regional committee approved six and the provincial steering committee approved six. Then there was an appeal process set up composed of nongovernmental people to review their proposal and they, too, came in recommending six, but said that the other six beds could be rented out, say, to students. There is a possible negotiation that can still occur but that's the current state of the negotiations with SPIKE.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Mr. Chairman, I understand that it was quite a frustrating time for the people of SPIKE during negotiations. I know that there are eight beds sitting there able to be utilized. With a cry for beds in the community and the need to have people placed through the Welcome Home Program, I find it kind of hard to understand why those two beds that are sitting there ready to be used cannot be approved. Can you give me some explanation?

HON. M. SMITH: Well, I guess there are two answers to that. One is that the thrust is an attempt to give people a more personalized better quality life. The other is that the communities can take initiatives but they do require public monies to operate.

We did assign to the provincial steering committee and the regional teams the responsibility for setting the criteria. We haven't been too eager to step in and interfere with that process, having set it up in good faith with an appeal process.

That's been the situation to date. The appeal committee was made up of parent-to-parent representatives from the Manitoba Developmental Centre Auxiliary, ACL Manitoba and the Residential Coalition.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: I have a letter here that back in 1984 the Minister did say that a major thrust would be undertaken across Manitoba to strengthen community-based services for mentally handicapped citizens and to reduce the resident population at the Manitoba Developmental Centre. She also recognized that these new ventures require the dedication and cooperation of both community individuals and the public sector if these goals are to be reached.

I would say that these community individuals at SPIKE House have put every effort forward to accommodate the mentally and physically handicapped. I know it's a very well-accepted program in our community. I just cannot understand why the beds are sitting there empty when they could be utilized.

HON. M. SMITH: Well, I can understand that feeling from the community level but unfortunately the

combination of public funding and community initiative must have some guidelines. We can't support any and all initiatives or high-priced initiatives in one area and lower-quality ones in the other. We also have the interests of equity and responsible spending of scarce public money. So there are guidelines for the financial support.

Now, the issue of numbers in a residence, or location of a residence, may not seem a big issue to many of us, but to people closely involved with the care of the mentally disabled, many of them feel very strongly that the smaller, more intimate setting is the one where the individuals do get the sense of personal attention.

The groups that are advising us, it's not an instance where government sets the standard and is imposing it; the standards themselves and the process for approval are carried out by regional teams and by the provincial steering committee with majority representation, really, by community groups. So it's been that process that we have been following in this instance.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: I think that if I can just tell you, the goals of SPIKE are to provide a home-like residence for mentally and/or limited physically handicapped people in the community. They have an excellent program, a very intimate program, if you'd like to call it that. They have a day program where currently those in residence go to WASO or ARM workshops and they use the public transit system. It's a very accessible location to the public transit system.

The non-working activities include swimming lessons at the East Kildonan Y or the downtown YMCA. They have a Friday night social club. They have bowling on Saturdays. They attend local church services. They have frequent outings to restaurants. They have very close family ties. It's a very well-run home, well-accepted, well-supported by the community.

I wonder if the Minister might look into why the beds can't be used.

HON. M. SMITH: Well, there was a process of appeal set up and there was, I think, an acceptable compromise arrived at.

Again, as I say, there are the overall objectives that don't always appear evident to the people in an area. Communities and individuals do have autonomy, but when it's the case of how the public monies are to be spent, there have to be some guidelines. In this case, as I say, I think we're tried to provide as good and, in a sense, unbiased an appeal as we could on the particular issue.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Mr. Chairman, maybe something could be clarified for me. As far as the public monies go, can you tell me; is there a difference in per diem rates from one institution to another? I'm sorry, I don't understand. I need that clarified or explained.

HON. M. SMITH: The per diem rates are based on level of care plus a contribution to capital. In this case, the group went ahead and built without getting approval of the plans, and it is somewhat beyond our guidelines. Now, we said we'll run it through the committees and the appeal process, and if the consensus is that there should be an exception here, we'll abide by that.

Again, there was one other community that moved ahead with a more elaborate building than we had funding for and we were able to reach a negotiated settlement with them whereby the community took up the extra expense and agreed to cover it and we applied a per diem that was based on the level of care required.

As I say, we've tried to be somewhat flexible, particularly in the phasing-in period, but there is a point where if a group goes ahead without approval and constructs something and then expects the public to fund it according to their guidelines, that we run into these difficulties.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Mr. Chairman, maybe the Minister could explain to me what happened in the other instance where there was special approval given to the eight-bed residence. I didn't get the name of the residence that was approved.

HON. M. SMITH: In the case of the Parklands one, the regional committee reviewed the plan and recommended that they have six permanent and two respite and recommended it to the provincial committee which approved it. It fit into the regional plan. In the case of the SPIKE residence, that was not the case. They went ahead and built prior to approval and without the approval of the regional committee.

Now, again, we have a lot of people who are putting in a lot of work in these regional committees and the provincial steering committee, so we've, apart from trying to build in appeal procedures and so on, we're loath to leap in and say that their decision is inappropriate.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Is the Minister saying that there still is an appeal process that these people can use to attempt to get the per diem rates for the two beds that are sitting there unused?

HON. M. SMITH: Again I repeat, the Winnipeg regional team did turn down the plan. The appeal process approved that six beds could operate and that they would be funded. They said that the other two beds could be occupied, but not by handicapped people. In other words, they could be rented out to students or staff if the funding of the place required that extra revenue; but the issue is the numbers being put in together and, as I say, in this case the group had gone ahead and built the building prior to approval, was one of the difficulties.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister then telling me that the Winnipeg Regional Division is penalizing the people from SPIKE House for building the building ahead of time, but the other region that did approve an eight-bed residence was not . . .

What you have said to me, in respect, is that SPIKE House was penalized because the eight beds weren't built and the Winnipeg region didn't approve those. Is that what you're telling me?

HON. M. SMITH: No, I think I said that SPIKE went ahead with the building prior to getting funding approval, and the regional team wanted to reject it. They had some other concerns. The appeal looked it

over and said, well, the other concerns are there but they aren't so serious and that we think a reasonable compromise would be to approve the use of it for six people and allow them to use the other two rooms for non-handicapped.

There were some concerns about it being next to another institutional-type residence when the desire has been to spot these residences around a neighbourhood, not have them cheek-by-jowl; but they felt that they could bend on that one.

I think the two buildings actually have separate driveways and they were going to put some kind of landscaping between them so that it wouldn't be building another sort of mini institution in that part of town. I think the appeal committee felt that they had listened to the arguments and the concerns and recommended what they thought was a reasonable compromise.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Mr. Chairman, does the appeal committee consult in any way with the area residents or the people in the area to find out whether it's feasible to have a certain size, or not a certain size, or whether an extra couple of beds is really going to make any difference?

HON. M. SMITH: I guess in the past things came in from whatever group wanted to plan something and they were or were not accepted by government.

In this case, we set up a planning process that involved the provincially recognized groups who'd been interested and involved in issues relating to the mentally handicapped. The regional teams were set up on the same basis. I presume if there was any broader consultation to be done in terms of location and so on, that would be done at the city level in the zoning process; but the guidelines that were developed, within which funding was to be approved, as I say, the Winnipeg team didn't want to vary them, the appeal committee said, yes, let's approve it, but for six only.

In terms of the accountability for the expenditure, it's the provincial level that raises the money and funds these residences; so, in a sense, it's our responsibility, working through our planning teams to set those criteria. We don't guarantee that everything initiated by a community can be fully funded.

The consultative process usually eliminates anyone making an expenditure or building a building prematurely. Most groups get their plan approved and their funding established before they go ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the member have a further question?

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Not right at this moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I'll pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: In the list of payments to external agencies, the first one under Community Social Services is the Canadian Association for Community Living.

Is there also a Manitoba Association for Community Living, or when we talk about ACL, is this the agency that in fact we're talking about?

HON. M. SMITH: It's the Manitoba division of CACL. If I can anticipate your question, the reduction in the grant was because they had done a special project for us last year. It was a once only project.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you for your anticipation. My next question however is, where would I find, for example, the grants to the Association for Community Living for the nine new residences which they anticipate opening in the next six to eight months?

HON. M. SMITH: In the paper we distributed, called Breakdown of Items in Financial Assistance 9.(3)(d)(3), the first item, Community Residences would contain monies for that, but they're not paid by way of grants . . . Sorry, and the Additional Care and Support. Those two together are what provide the care and residential coverage, but they're not done on a straight grant to the residents. They're done on a per diem, plus a capital, plus an additional care support, from a range based on the need of the individual.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Similar to the sheet that we got, Community Residences for the Mentally Handicapped. Mr. Chairman, can the Minister explain to me, if it's possible — and it may be an impossible breakdown and I understand that — how much of the money that is being devoted to programs is going to the physically as opposed to the mentally disabled, and I recognize it's difficult because some of them are both?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, I'll go down the list and identify the ones that are going to people with a variety of physical disabilities primarily: Independent Interpreter Referral Service; the CNIB; Society for Manitobans with Disabilities; Employment Preparation Centre; Canadian Paraplegic Association; Ten-Ten Sinclair; Kiwanis Centre of the Deaf; Canadian Council of the Blind; Independent Living Resource Centre; and Manitoba League of the Physically Handicapped. The others focus primarily on the mentally retarded, although we occasionally have crossover.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister explain why ARM Industries has had its budget cut so dramatically this year?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, a year or two ago ARM Industries had a community board that ran into debt, and the members requested that we take it over. They were fearful of being individually responsible for the debt.

We took it over, retired the debt on a phased basis, stabilized it, and will in time return it to a community board.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Mr. Chairman, in that the Kiwanis Centre of the Deaf has obviously undergone some internal problems recently, and there seems to be some morale problems there because of the board decision, can the Minister enlighten us as to any involvement that her department has had there and any

reconciliation which is perhaps taking place among the staff?

HON. M. SMITH: The Kiwanis Centre of the Deaf when it was established had funding — well it has a management agreement — the board operates that facility on behalf of the Department of Housing. There is a unit of personal care home service in that building.

There was no funding from Community Services until a year or two ago when they had some cutbacks in the funding they had from CMHC. It seemed to stem from tighter auditing at that end to remove non-mortgage related costs. I think some of the social support programs were, in fact, coming through that route.

We provided them with some short-term funding to give them a little extra social support service, and then as the problems there evolved, although our department was not the lead department in relating to them, nonetheless we funded through our department an external evaluation of the problems. It's a very large and complex operation, over 200 residents, of whom only about 130 are deaf or hard of hearing.

We asked the social planning council to come in with the agreement of the board of the Kiwanis Centre to review their history and current problems and make recommendations as to not what to decide but a process that the board could go through to address the problems. That report was tabled with them, Phase I, and the board has been dealing with it. I guess the decisions are being made by the board which is a representative group. There's four Kiwanians, four people elected by the tenants, and four who represent the Winnipeg Community Centre of the Deaf.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you for the information, but I guess my question is still with regard to the firing of the present director and the concern expressed certainly through the media by the staff. Has the Minister taken a direct interest in resolving this issue or has she decided that the court is the best place for this thing to be solved?

HON. M. SMITH: Well, the Centre is in my own constituency, so I have been considered I guess a person who is interested and involved to a degree. I have separated my personal interest in what's going on with people from my ministerial role in government when we have several departments that relate to a community organization. We try to keep very clear the lines as to who is the lead ministry. In this case, it is the Department of Housing. As I say, I'm aware. I could probably reproduce some of the arguments from all 10 sides.

I think it's a case of a complex building trying to meet many needs and perhaps it may have an additional problem that, unlike Ten-Ten Sinclair when it was established, there was a social support component built in. In this case, there wasn't perhaps as much anticipation of the types of problems that were to be met, and over time some of the problems weren't dealt with in a satisfactory way so they grew and grew.

One of the key elements, I think, has also been the growing self-consciousness of the deaf and hard-of-hearing community in that they increasingly want to influence their own affairs. But there's one reason we

put in the social planning council as a community body that would focus on the process decision-making authority issues in a way that would enable the board to deal with the issues.

I guess government insofar as we relate to a lot of community groups, we much prefer the community group to be able to work through its problems. It's only in, I suppose, as a last resort that we would consider moving in and taking over. There certainly have been some people who thought we should. I would say that a lot of the people have never understood how the executive director was responsible to the board and that's one of the issues that's been involved.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: This question might be more appropriate to the First Minister than to the Minister of Community Services, but perhaps she can explain to me what happens in an institution like the Kiwanis Centre which, in fact, receives grants, as do many others, from three or four or five ministries? In this case, it's Health and it's Housing and it's Community Services. Is there any method within these governments of saying, this Minister or that Minister takes priority on decision making for this particular institution?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know whether it's strictly within 4.(d), but if the Minister wants to respond — the Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Well, I think it was a question asked in good faith. There is a Social Resource Committee that does try to resolve any interdepartmental issues. There has been an interdepartmental committee, but when we set up those committees we do designate a lead Minister and there it's usually based on who has the weightiest involvement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the member have any further questions?

3.(d)(1)—pass — the Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I'm just looking at the breakdown of items in Financial Assistance, under 3.(d)(3), with respect to community residences. Did I understand correctly that there are nine new residences proposed in Manitoba this year?

HON. M. SMITH: There's planned for 210 beds. The material was handed out yesterday. Some of those will be in residences and some of them will be supervised apartments. There's a variety of arrangements.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, under Additional Care and Support, are we talking about how many personnel, or additional personnel would be required? I'm going by the figures that are on the paper and there appear to be fairly significant increases year over year. I just wonder how many new people on staff will be required for the additional care and support.

HON. M. SMITH: There's nothing in this item that is a direct payment of staff in our department. It all goes to purchase service for individuals, based on the assessment of their individual need.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, under Supervised Apartment Living — I'm just trying to get a handle,

Sir, on what these numbers mean. When we increase from 190,000 to 396,000 in one year, I wonder how many more people are being served or how many people are being moved from other types of care into supervised apartment living.

HON. M. SMITH: The numbers represent a total of hourly wages. The type of support service and training that is given has been at about seven hours per week, on average, and we hope to increase that to the 10 to 12 hour per week range. There are 128 people living in supervised apartment situations.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, there are 128, or there will be 128?

HON. M. SMITH: I'm sorry, I appreciate the . . . We were 128 as of December 31, 1985 and there will be more by the end of this year. We don't have an accurate prediction of that at the moment.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, it's fairly clear that there will be more because the budget for Supervised Apartment Living is, I think, almost doubled year over year. One wonders, if it's 128 this year, does that mean it will be 256 by this time next year?

HON. M. SMITH: No, we are almost doubling, not quite, the hours per week, from seven to 10 to 12. There's also some increase in the rates charged. So there won't be a dramatic increase in this but there will be some. Again, a lot of the people moving out of MDC would not be eligible for this. We'd be more likely to find people who have perhaps been living at home and could move into this situation, people at risk in the community. It is a substantial number in the total picture.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder where I can look in these Estimates to find a corresponding decrease — if the people are spending more hours in supervised apartment living, then does that mean they're spending less hours somewhere else? Maybe the Minister could explain that to me.

HON. M. SMITH: That would vary, since in the Welcome Home thrust, in addition to moving 220 out of MDC over the period of the program, we're also picking up 220 people at risk in the community. Some of those might be people who are being cared for by aging caregivers, and who might qualify for this type of living, with supports.

The other group that normally moves into this category would be the young people who have grown up in the community and achieved the age of 18 to 21, or so, and who — perhaps their family is no longer able to care for them and yet they're not quite ready for completely independent living, and this provides a halfway measure.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I'm just looking at the bottom line here and I wonder if the Minister could give us more information about this breakdown. Yes, it's broken down but, really, I wonder if we couldn't have some more information, perhaps in written form, tomorrow or something like that, so we can be a little better educated as to where all this money is going.

We know that the needs are increasing in our province and the people need better services and they've come to expect better services and they deserve better services. We need to know, I think, a little more about where all these big numbers, how they add up and what services are being offered? How many more people are being served? What better services are being offered to them and made available to them? What kind of training is going into providing care-givers with the knowledge they need to look after the people who are part of these programs?

I wonder if the Minister would undertake to give us more information about this tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We missed the last part.

MR. J. McCRAE: I say I wonder if the Minister would undertake to give us more of the kind of information I've been asking for if not tomorrow then whenever it's convenient for her.

HON. M. SMITH: I could give a general description of each service. Then if you had specific questions, we could undertake it.

The respite service, we've increased it by 182,800, or 158,800 is to provide respite in accordance with new service guidelines and additional funding required to support Community Respite Service Inc. on an annualized basis. That was a short-term multi-disability respite service that was developed on a short-term basis.

We have been giving respite to families of the mentally retarded, and what we've tried to do is blend the two programs as best we can — 24,000 to provide respite to persons placed in natural or foster settings during Year Two of Welcome Home.

Again, I can go through the crisis intervention and the pre-vocational day activity, but I could provide a written summary for you tomorrow if that would be satisfactory.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, that would be satisfactory to me unless other honourable members would like to hear it now, but I don't mind reading Hansard a few days from now. I'd just like to have a little more detail on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(d)(1)—pass; 3.(d)(2)—pass; 3.(d)(3)—pass.
3.(d)(4) - the Member for River East.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister whether she could provide for us some information on what community residences for the mentally handicapped have been approved since April 1, 1986 and the per diems for those?

HON. M. SMITH: We did distribute yesterday two papers: one that listed housing applications for mortgage approval for 137; we also handed out a list that had a larger number which gave the numbers of approvals by region.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Can I get copies of those? This then is a list of residences that have been approved since April 1st?

HON. M. SMITH: Again, there were two sheets. The one that is entitled Financing of Community Residences, that has 137. They are ones who actually have houses that are in the process of getting their mortgage approval. The longer list identifies people whose plans have been approved but who are in the process of finding housing.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: All right. On the ones that have been approved on this sheet, am I missing it or is there a per diem rate on this sheet?

HON. M. SMITH: The per diem appeared on the long sheet you have, plus I did read into the record earlier the levels of care and the associated per diems.

The pattern of per diems is \$23.63 as a base rate up to \$7.72 per day for the capital, in other words, to pay the mortgage cost; and a range from \$8.00 to \$33.56 for special care and assistance, again that's based on level of need.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister tell me what the per diem on the capital is for SPIKE House?

HON. M. SMITH: I think you'll find it's at the upper end at the \$7.72 per person per day.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Riel.

MR. G. DUCHARME: On 3.(d)(4) on the \$8,905,000, the total aggregate amount recoverable from Canada, does the Federal Government specify what programs they use it to go towards their particular grant?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, the two plans that provide us some support are the Canada Assistance Plan and the VRDP, Vocational Rehabilitation Development Program. This is for disabled persons. They do specify what is cost-shareable; not all the services we provide are.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Mr. Chairman, the Shalom residence, can the Minister indicate to me whether they're paid on a basis of six individuals or eight individuals in that residence?

HON. M. SMITH: On the second page of the list we handed out, Community Residences for Mentally Handicapped as at April 1, 1986, there are two Shalom residences, both for a capacity of six.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: They have a capacity of six, Mr. Chairman, but are they being paid a per diem rate for six individuals?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, the per diem is listed there. The capital rates vary because some of the houses in the past have been — the mortgage hasn't been as substantial. The per diems are listed. What isn't listed there is the possible additional amount, special additional care and support, based on individual need. That doesn't appear there and that's tailored to the needs of the individuals.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I had some information. I wonder whether the Minister could verify whether it is correct or not. The Shalom Home was guaranteed a per diem rate for eight individuals, if they reduced their actual number to six. Could you tell me whether this is fact or not?

HON. M. SMITH: Many of the pre-existing residences before the Welcome Home had different ways of being paid. We are moving into these standardized rates and most of them have been somewhat improved, so a lot of past anomalies have in fact been eliminated. This is the current relationship with them and we, in fact, can't pay out more than we have approval for. We have criteria by which we pay out monies and we must satisfy Treasury that we are observing the criteria.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister then telling me that they are not being paid a per diem rate for eight individuals at this home?

HON. M. SMITH: This is the current pattern of payment. There may have been some variations in the past, because in so much of this area there were not set per diems or a standard way of assessing need and there was quite a variation of modes of payment. Our attempt has been to standardize them, based on some formula that has some integrity across the system.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Mr. Chairman, seeing the Minister hasn't really answered my question, do you think that she could find out for us whether the Shalom Home, in fact, is being paid a per diem rate for eight individuals with only the actual number of six?

HON. M. SMITH: Well, if the member is saying that the information we have there is incorrect, I'm not comfortable with that; however, I am never averse to double-checking on something. The purpose for having these standards identified and the rates clarified is so we can be fair across the system. We don't think it right that, in a sense, the squeaky-wheel facility gets a lot and the quieter ones get none, or get very much less.

We're trying to standardize according to some real measure of the needs of the individual and what is required to maintain a standard of care. I will double-check for the member. Again, if you have particular information, if you would write a memo to me, that would assist, but I will double-check for my own satisfaction.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(d)(4) — the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Could the Minister indicate if the department is planning make Winnipeg into three regions?

HON. M. SMITH: The Health and Community Services that have been delivered on a regional basis, the Winnipeg delivery has been restructured. The Health Department is the lead Minister there and instead of

six areas, it has been restructured to have three regions with regional directors, and they will be directly accountable to an executive director for Winnipeg, who will be accountable to both Health and Community Services.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I wonder if the Minister would explain. There were six areas, now there are three regions with one executive director. Who is heading the three regions in the regions?

HON. M. SMITH: The Civil Service has advertised for applicants to fill those positions.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: What will the criteria be for heading up these agencies? What are they looking for as far as degrees?

HON. M. SMITH: I can obtain the bulletin for tomorrow, if the member would like. Again, the areas were accountable to both departments and the regional structure with direct accountability to an executive director, who then would be accountable to both departments was considered to be a more effective way to organize.

When the two departments were split, some of these organizational crossovers were not perhaps dealt with as thoughtfully or effectively as they might have been. In the passage of time, we found it difficult to have the smaller areas accountable to two departments, their administrative reporting and so on, and they ended up having to duplicate and follow somewhat different guidelines from the different departments. So we had a full review of the system and the recommendation was that we go to this structure.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: The regions then are just being set up, I gather. How is that going to affect now the six areas?

HON. M. SMITH: The plan is to get the three regional directors and have them constitute a planning team and then they will review the areas and recommend a regional breakdown. I'm sure that one of the things they will look at will be the different regional lines of all their associated departments, because they deliver a lot of health programs as well as community services.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Now you have three regions, you had six areas, you'll have one executive director and three directors. How does that compare to the structure of the six areas as far as senior level staff?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was just wondering whether or not — this item had been passed. This is Item 3.(b) which is Ops. We are now on 3.(d)(4). We're getting — I think we can be somewhat reasonable but I think . . .

HON. M. SMITH: I don't mind answering that one question . . .

MRS. G. HAMMOND: If I may, I apologize. I wasn't here for the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, I think we can be lenient, but I mean . . .

MRS. G. HAMMOND: . . . I thought maybe that would come under External Agencies at the same time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We could look at it that way, I guess.

HON. M. SMITH: Again, I don't mind straying a little far afield but I think it's not too helpful if we go too far.

The structure has been under Health. Health is the lead Minister, with the six area directors, but there has been a double accountability to the two departments because of some Community Services functions and some Health functions.

The new structure will have the three regions with all the Health and Community Services workers under them. Those three will report to an executive director. We have an Executive Director for Winnipeg, who will report both to Community Services and Health, but will be lodged in Health, and we have an Executive Director, rural, in charge of MDC, who will report, again, to both departments, but whose staff year is in Community Services.

So, in a sense, we've removed the double reporting at the lower end and coordinated it at the upper end of the organizational structure.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I think I'm still in Operations. The Agency Relations Branch, is that the group that interfaced with the community groups as far as getting funding was concerned?

HON. M. SMITH: If the member has strayed, let me stray and then I hope we can get back on that line.

Agency Relations in Community Services used to deal with a great many external agencies, who delivered a great variety of service. In fact, there was no program responsibility, a coordinated program responsibility at the Community Services end. Progressively, we're trying to move those agencies out of just a catch-all category called Agency Relations, and move them in under a program responsibility so we can, in a sense, get advice as to whether we need to increase the service in this area, hold it in the line in the other area, or reduce it. It's treating them in a more coordinated program based way.

So there has been a shift in the way, what was a straight grant system to External Agencies, is being handled. Some of them still are in the miscellaneous category but we're trying to move them over to a program area.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: How will the community groups then — who do they go to now to find out about funding, so that there's not a duplication of services, in other words?

HON. M. SMITH: If they access our department, we would determine what program area they're in and send them to that program person. Again, it would depend what service they were delivering.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Is this a similar circumstance happening here as to the four home economists who did the programming for all the field . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would suggest the member is a little more than a little astray on that one. You are now

dealing with two other departments. You're dealing with Agriculture and Health. Do you have another question relating at least to this department?

HON. M. SMITH: Save it for Larry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Health is perfectly prepared to answer that question at his earliest opportunity.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I believe that the Minister, if I may, knows what I'm referring to. I'm using it as an example, Mr. Chairman, for the Minister, so that she would understand what I'm talking about as far as community groups, for funding going to the department, that the new structure will be as efficient as the previous structure has been, as far as liaising with the community groups.

HON. M. SMITH: There are 999 varieties of community groups. Some of them fit nicely into a particular responsibility area in a particular department; others don't. Some straddle several responsibility areas in one department and some straddle responsibility centres in several departments. Increasingly, we're trying to sort that out but, again, if they come to any of our departments, we will coordinate who should deal with them. We can do that in our Social Resource Committee, or just through direct telephone communication with the relevant department, and we do a lot of that. We do everything we can to set groups on the right path. But they do come in a myriad of shapes, sizes, and mandates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, looking at the list of per diems for community residences, it would appear that it is an exception to the rule where there has been any increase in the per diem over last year.

Can the Minister indicate whether the per diem rate last year increased over 1984-85?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, the rate that's listed under the 1985-86 was phased in towards the end of the year. But the major increase for the homes doesn't show up in the straight residence, the per diem and capital. It shows up in the Special Care and Assistance, and those other support services like respite, crisis intervention, and so on.

In the Additional Care and Support, we've moved from just under \$1 million to almost \$3 million, in that area, so there's quite a range of extra support available. We've developed levels of care, assessments to identify the level of care of individuals. That's to ensure that we have sufficient flexibility to meet the extremely varied needs that are out there.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister have some other statistics, then, that would show the total amount received by each residence, to be received in 1986-87, as versus the total amount received in 1985-86?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, J. McCrae: The Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, it's because we've added the Special Care and Assistance element that it doesn't show in these. It's because they are given on an individual basis. We don't give a set grant to any residence. We give them a grant based on the individuals they have in care and when they came into care. They qualify then for the capital, the per diem, and then the special care and assistance ranges from — just a minute now — \$8 per day to \$33.56, so we don't have for you a total amount that has gone to an agency. I guess we would be able to run those figures up at the end of our fiscal year, but because it's not the basis on which we're funding, we think that these figures are more helpful to you.

MR. G. MERCIER: The Minister then is saying that special grants go to the residences for additional care and support, respite services and crisis intervention?

HON. M. SMITH: No, it's the first two items that go by way of per diems. The community residence figure flows on the basis of a capital amount and a per diem. The additional care and support goes as an additional amount ranging on a per diem base, from \$8 to \$33.56.

The other services are provided to the system. They're available on need from a central dispenser of services or a regional dispenser of services. So the residences draw their money from the first two items.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the amount allocated for additional care and support then, that goes to a residence because they have to have additional people on staff to help take care of the people in residence?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, it usually expresses itself in staff. There may be some extra service that they require. If I could give an example; if you had a Mr. X and he went to the Altona residence, they would get 2.97 plus 23.63 base rate and then, because Mr. X is assessed at Level 3 need, Altona would get an extra \$24 a day for him and that would be arrived at, after looking at an individual, a 24-hour plan of that person's needs. They may require more help in toileting, dressing, cleaning and so on.

MR. G. MERCIER: But the residence would have to hire someone else and pay out that extra \$24 per day to help take care of Mr. X; is that not right?

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, in a sense we identify the need of the individual and then we, in a sense, contract with the residence to meet that need. Now the way they do it, of course, requires staff.

MR. G. MERCIER: My point is, when you don't raise the per diem from one year to the other, which is the amount required to operate the residence, I don't really think you can take into consideration the money that goes for additional care and support, because that's money that has to be paid out to additional people to help look after the residents of the home.

It's the capital plus the per diem, is it not, that has to be used for the general operations and maintenance of the home? And if you're not increasing that and if inflation is going up 3- 4- 5 percent a year, and if taxes

are going up on the home per year, and the cost of living is going up; then are not your standards in the residences going down or the remuneration to the people operating the homes has in fact been reduced?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Community Services.

MR. G. MERCIER: Wait for me to finish, Mr. Chairman.

HON. M. SMITH: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. G. MERCIER: Is not the service in the home going down or the remuneration of the people operating the home going down, in view of inflationary costs?

HON. M. SMITH: One of the problems is that we xeroxed a sheet for you at your request. It was a sheet prepared for our use, but we know what we mean by it.

The 1985-86 is the total that was given them last year, but it was based on a very ad hoc type of system. This year we are building the funding with three levels. You don't see any of the third level reflected here, but the capital plus the per diem, plus the care and assistance, in all cases is a significant advance over what they had last year. So there has been a significant increase over what they were funded last year.

The final column of figures that you're looking at didn't include — there was no extra care and assistance grant last year — so in a sense we've introduced a whole new variable type of grant based on need.

MR. G. MERCIER: But again, that additional care and support has to be paid out to extra people who are required to look after the residents of the home. That's already, I thought, been acknowledged by the Minister.

HON. M. SMITH: Again, we seem to be having a miscommunication here. There's a certain number of people in the home and each one may have a different level of need. Now the money that the home gets to meet their needs is based on this three-tier assessment; their mortgage or capital element; the basic per diem; and the additional, depending on their need.

Now the sum total of all those for the 365 days, or however many days they are there, is the budget that that home has to operate on and within that, they must have a pattern of staffing that can meet the needs of the people. Now these figures haven't been pulled out of the air. They've been worked out by working with the homes and knowing what it does cost to provide adequate staff.

There is a base level. If they were all Level I, they could function. If there was no special needs, they could function with whatever the variable capital is because the houses are at different stages of paying off the mortgage, plus the per diem, and then we add for the higher levels of care.

MR. G. MERCIER: Would the Minister not acknowledge though that if you don't increase the basic per diem from one year to the next and you have inflation of 3- 4- 5 percent . . .

HON. M. SMITH: But we have increased it. What makes you think we haven't?

MR. G. MERCIER: . . . the money available is lesser because of inflation and something has to suffer? The costs are going up but the basic per diem is not going up.

HON. M. SMITH: The member is making a inference that he has in front of him a per diem that has stayed the same for two years, and that therefore there's been no increase. We are looking at the same sheet, I take it? The final column is what was being paid then, but it wasn't being paid on the same basis last year. They only had that amount.

We've shifted this year to the three-tier system and everyone has been getting quite an increase, so in a sense, you don't have available any per diem from last year by which to compare, or total amount per person.

As I say, the final figure is not helpful in this discussion because it's on a different base and it doesn't include that variable care and assistance amount.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, would this clarify it? For example, that Altona residence, the first one, 1985-86, it says they received 26.60. This year they received 26.60 plus, you say, additional monies for additional care and support and they weren't receiving any of those monies in 1985-86?

HON. M. SMITH: That's correct.

MR. G. MERCIER: Maybe next year it would be helpful if there were some sort of comparison between '86, '87 and maybe if you even projected '87, '88 or something like that, that would indicate what the increase is in total dollars, I guess, for each home.

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, our department is scheduled for the fuller data release for Estimates next year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River East.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want some clarification on these sheets. I don't know, do you pronounce it DASH or is it D-A-S-C-H, whatever. The sheet we received tonight indicating the community residences up to April 1 has DASCH Incorporated, 353 Carpathia, 54 Picardy Place, with six beds. Those aren't the same addresses. Where are the six beds? Are they at 353 Carpathia or 54 Picardy Place?

HON. M. SMITH: That organization has incorporated two facilities that operate in a sense, their books and all operate as one. One of them is in fact a one-bed facility and the other, five; but it's incorporated jointly.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: A one-bed facility?

HON. M. SMITH: One is a supervised apartment and the other is a home.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: One is a . . .

HON. M. SMITH: Supervised apartment. My Program Director, Dr. Larry Hardy, will try to get the specifics on that, but that's the pattern we think is there.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: So you're telling me then that there's a one-bed unit. Where? At which address?

HON. M. SMITH: We'll have the detail in a moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River East, do you have any further questions while we're holding on this item?

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: I don't think I can pursue my line of questioning, Mr. Chairman, until I have the information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions on 3.(d)(4)? Any other honourable members have any questions on 3.(d)(4)?

The Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you.

Under this sheet that we received, the Payments to External Agencies, there is no place over here where I can identify any agency that would be dealing fairly well specifically with the Native population.

Can the Minister tell me which one of these agencies would be dealing with the Natives?

HON. M. SMITH: We don't operate on the reserves. There aren't mental retardation services on the reserves. Off-reserve services are not segregated by Native groups. If you're thinking of Native Child and Family — sorry, Native Metis Friendship Centres, they will appear — they're not in this vote; they appear in another area, in the General Purpose Grants, in 3.(e).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Minister advise the Member for River East?

The Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: In the meantime, while we're waiting for the Member for River East, I notice that the Independent Living Resource Centre and the Manitoba League for the Physically Handicapped received no grants last year. Is this the first time that they are receiving grants under this appropriation?

HON. M. SMITH: Both of them did receive grants mid-year. I don't know how active they were for last year's budget, so they did in fact receive a grant last year and the amount this year is the same amount.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we should defer 3.(d)(4) until the Member for River East gets back and move on to 3.(e) General Purpose Grants. It seems the Member for Rhineland had some questions in that area.

The Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you.

In 1985, under this particular appropriation, we had \$1,381,000.00. This year we have a considerable reduction, \$1,136,800 — about a \$200,000 reduction. Are we cutting back on the grants to the various agencies or what is the situation?

HON. M. SMITH: Again, the figures that the member is using are not the adjusted figures.

At the moment I don't have the reconciliation but the figures that we're dealing with of \$1,093,400 for '85-'86 has been increased to \$1,136,800 for this year.

MR. A. BROWN: By the same token, if we go back a couple of years and so on, there has been a decrease — (Interjection) — in the grant . . .

HON. M. SMITH: I think this raises the issue that I spoke to before. We've had these general purpose grants. Increasingly, we've been trying to take programs and move them to where there is a program responsibility so that we get an assessment of what role they play in the total scheme of programs.

Again, you're referring to adjustments that were made prior to '85-'86 and I think they've been dealt with in earlier years. What I can give you is the year-over-year change this year and in fact there's an increase.

I suspect what's happened is that as the grants have gotten moved over to another program area that there's not been any reduction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

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

If one compares the figures of '85-'86 to '86-'87, there is only one group, the Indian Metis Friendship Centre, which has in fact received a grant increase. That's only been at 4.3 percent.

Can the Minister give us an overall rationale or basis for why, in a budget where there are large increases, that these citizen advisory groups and whatever have not been getting any additional funding from the government.

HON. M. SMITH: The only service grant in this grouping is the Indian Metis Friendship Centre. They have received an increase of \$43,200.00. The others are where we give a sort of basic grant. They have many funders and activities. It's more of a sustaining grant rather than a service grant.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: How do these organizations go about applying for grants? Do they just ask for the grant that they got the previous year or do they lay out a strategy and then ask for additional funding which may or may not be granted?

HON. M. SMITH: That varies.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Let's take a specific route, then, the Brandon Citizen Advocacy. Can the Minister tell me what it is they do and why it is that they didn't feel the need for any additional funding?

HON. M. SMITH: Groups such as this tend to be small volunteer organizations. In this case, they recruit, train and match volunteers to assist primarily mentally handicapped people in day-to-day living. It serves the area of Brandon and surrounding districts. Our money would probably help them a little with secretarial help or a small office but most of the service is done by volunteers. We feel, it's, perhaps not the highest priority service in the total continuum of services, nonetheless for a small sustaining grant like this there's quite a

multiplication of enrichment available to citizens. We believe in community input and involvement so these are really just small sustaining grants to assist them.

Some of them do approach us trying to get expansion but it's been our determination that, in this period of tight monies, our first priority is to the service development for which we're directly responsible. With these groups we feel that the same sustaining grant is reasonable.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: I gather from the Minister's comments that most of these groups that fall under this are in fact heavily involved in volunteerism. Therefore I would wonder how they can continue that volunteer work without additional funding in that, if Brandon Citizen Advocacy is in fact helping to adjust or work with the mentally handicapped, I would think that their role would become more significant as we welcome more mentally handicapped back into the community.

HON. M. SMITH: It's not the only group that's involved in volunteers. In some cases, these are groups that have popped up in the past and managed to get public funding.

Our policy has been not to — so far anyway — has been not to drop them but nor to give them any feeling that they are permanent fixtures. The groups that I've already named in the volunteer sector have been, in a sense, providing most of the volunteers for the Welcome Home Program. It's an interesting service and probably in the fullness of time it may command more public funds but it's one of those that's been a lower priority for us this year.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: My final question: does anyone actually evaluate the strength of the services offered by these particular groups?

HON. M. SMITH: There is some but our reason for shifting most of these over to program areas is so that evaluation can be done more in context of other similar programs. This is, I guess, the remainder of our miscellaneous list.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(e) — pass.

We'll return to 3.(d)(4) - the Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: I have the information on the DASCH dual residence. DASCH proposed a five-bed facility on Carpathia with a satellite or annex bed at Picardy (it's an apartment) for a client with special needs. The funding provided by government is within existing rates with additional costs for a proctor at the apartment being covered by DASCH through other resources.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, so you're telling me then, that the DASCH facility at 353 Carpathia then has approval for five beds and the one bed is at 54 Picardy Place which is an apartment? The per diems then, are what — the same for that one bed?

HON. M. SMITH: We're providing the same per diem. The DASCH service people wanted a proctor for the

person at the apartment but they're paying that themselves. A lot of these groups do have independent means of raising some funds. It doesn't come under our program so they were willing to pay it and we were willing to pick up the basic per diem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(d)(4)—pass.

Resolution 91: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$55,876,900 for Community Services for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

Item 4. Child and Family Services, Resolution 32, 4.(a) Administration — the Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: I wonder if the Minister would be willing to call it ten o'clock. This is a big item that we're starting off on and we're not going to get very far tonight anyhow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, if it is agreeable to the committee, we will call it ten o'clock. Is it agreed? (Agreed)

Committee rise.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee, please come to order. This section of the Committee of Supply has been considering the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture. We are now on Item 6.(f) Agricultural Research Grant (University of Manitoba) — the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: When we were discussing this earlier, I'm not sure that I understood what the relationship is with the funds in the federal-provincial agreements. Are some of those funds directed directly into the university programs, or are the people from the university hired into the programs off campus? Do the funds go directly into the university? That's basically my question.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, there would be, I guess, a bit of both. In terms of research projects, there would be some at the university, or at Glenlea Research Station. There would be projects likely using some of the funding there, as well, of course, under the Agri-Food, there would be the crop adaptation trials, which would be all around the Province of Manitoba.

In terms of funding, there would be monies both used on the university, as well as in cooperation with the university for work outside, off the campus.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: The reason that I asked the question was because of the reference that you made to the fact that although the grants had not changed significantly that there was more money going towards research in connection with the university.

The programs that are done, or are operated at the university, can you give me some feeling for the percentage of that money that would be directly spent in conjunction with the university?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, really, I guess in terms of the amount of money that is provided to the university,

and I think maybe I didn't understand the honourable member's question, but there are really two sets of programs. There is the regular grant, as the member points out, that has been increased modestly over the last number of years, that we are dealing with now, and there are the projects under Agri-Food which would be almost matching, or almost close to matching, of what the provincial grant is in terms of specific projects with the university, so there are really two sets of programming that funnels money into research at the university. Some of the projects, in fact, it's possible that some of the work being done under regular university research of which it's possible that direct provincial monies would have gone there could be supplemented by Agri-Food monies as well, because while we have some specific projects that we, in fact, fund in general terms we try in our meetings with the university, correlate their research with our own policy objectives and areas that we feel are a priority for the province in a general sense and try and work that way in their whole program rather than say we'll fund this, no we won't fund that. We try and have the element of research in basic research through the university complement some of the thrusts that we wish to make in technology and agriculture information.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I apologize for not being too knowledgeable in this area. My question is regarding who would make the decision on these Agri-Food Agreement funds? Is this the executive policy group that you've referred to previously that would be meeting with the people and helping to arrive this at a decision regarding these expenditures?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the actual review of the projects submitted would be the Agri-Food Approving Committee which would be a federal-provincial committee that would deal with the projects with final approval of either the province or the Federal Government in terms of the actual expenditure of funding. If the province is funding that aspect of the agreement, the province would give the approval, but the coordinating committee is a federal-provincial committee that does the recommendations on all the projects. It's not specifically the executive group of the department. There's a federal-provincial committee that then comes to the executive group and if the province pays, then it's sent to Treasury Board of the province and the province approves the funding. If it is a federal project, that request from the committee goes to the Federal Treasury Board, they approve it and make the payment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(f) — the Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Where does MASCC fit into this process?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the role of MASCC really is in an advisory capacity in terms of the overall needs of research. There's no doubt that the implementation committee of the federal-provincial committee and in the liaison with the university and some of the projects, their recommendations would be some of those that would be considered, or all of those

would be considered, in light of the overall needs of research. It's very possible that suggestions made by MASCC, in the advisory capacity, would in fact and those recommendations could have been embodied in some of the specific funding that ends up at the university or some of the projects that the province may be undertaking in field trials or whatever areas of technology transfer; that's a possibility. But they're not involved in the implementation side; they're involved in the side of providing ideas, thrusts and advice.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Certainly I believe that one of the ways to work our way out of the economic crisis in agriculture is through research directed in the proper directions. I guess in that connection I would like to know what kind of research fund request is coming from the Faculty of Agriculture. I'm sure it was higher than the \$875,500.00. What are they really looking for and how do you arrive at this figure?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, there's no doubt that in terms of requests, they would be requesting in the \$1 million range that would come in. Of course, when asking for funding you would raise the amount to make sure that you would at least get the amount that you received in the previous year.

There are, I would say, a fairly generous practice of building in their ongoing expenses within the funding formula for research, as to their ongoing costs, so in terms of their request they're receiving fairly close to what their requests were in terms of the provincial support.

But there's no doubt that we are but one source of funds. I don't know what their total research money would be and funding would be from other sources. There is the other aspect of individual professors, as I understand it, doing direct and personal research for other groups and that becomes another source of revenue, not for the university, but I think professional salary increase for those professors who are prepared to undertake additional research. There may be a chargeback if there's a use of university facilities and support help from the university. I don't know what relationships are there, but those would be in addition to work that is funded publicly.

MR. G. FINDLAY: I guess you said you didn't know, but maybe your staff knows, just how have the universities been able to maintain their other sources of funds from the various Federal Government sources and the Western Grains Research Foundation, which they can also apply to now for funds.

I guess another question that often comes up with research professors at the university is you see them getting hired every once in a while to do consultative work here and there. Are they on a double taxpayers' payroll in those situations?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that the university does make use of the Western Crops research funding and canola funding and, as well, funding under NSERC, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council, and the monies that we provide, in terms of the stability of monies on an ongoing basis, does assist them in trying to lever other sources

of money and continuum of projects so that they can in fact combine their resources and add to the research programs.

Now the question that the member raises, I'm not certain that I can specifically answer that question, but I believe that individual research projects conducted by professors of whatever branch of the university, unless they were specifically working on behalf of the university, most research projects would be individual research projects conducted by those professors and that would be income that in fact would supplement their income as professors.

One other bit of information that I should share with my honourable friend is that there is also additional monies going to the universities from Ag-Canada in addition to the regular research monies that go to the research stations through the Agri-Food Agreement presently. Ag-Canada does support with research funds to the university as well as the Province of Manitoba. So there is the Ag-Canada money; I'm not sure that we have the information as to the specifics of some of their funding.

The most recent one that might be of interest to honourable members is the Saul Sinclair Management Foundation of which we had a number of discussions over a year ago within our own department as to the whole development process of computer software to be applied for use within agriculture, and the need of having some type of foundation that some of the research work, and in fact some of the developmental work which may have been done even within the province could be used by this foundation as a storehouse of knowledge and information for use within the agricultural industry. This foundation is certainly an offshoot from those discussions that we've been having within our own department. Maybe it's been longer than that; maybe it's several years already.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Just to talk about that computer software first. When I look at the agricultural industry, there are some more basic problems out there than developing software, because I'm not just clear in my own mind how the agricultural community, at the farm level, is going to utilize that information in the short term. New varieties in crop that are rust resistant, as an example, might in my mind have a lot more precedence to developing computer software at this point in time.

I don't dispute the fact that there is some value to your department for the development of that, but is it going to be of imminent value to the farm community at this point in time?

I guess while I'm up here, I'll ask one other area. When the Government of Manitoba is putting \$850,500 into the university and you want a study done for the Milk Board, or some analysis done, do you always pay additional per diems for that work, or is it considered part of the effort you expect in return for the money put in? That's where I'm getting at the double salary business.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, any policy studies that we would want to have undertaken, any reviews that we would want to have undertaken that would be contracted out in addition to the research monies that we would have.

I might add, in the comments that the honourable member made, as an example, that maybe priorities should be channeled in another direction, the whole area, for example, of software and the use of this institution, for example, some of the development undertaken in farm financial management programs of basically shortcutting, and I would call it shortcutting the long and tedious process of doing cash flows and analysis of financial analysis in various farming operations, whether it be livestock or crops or, in fact, cash flows in putting in a particular crop so they can be accessed and calculations be made and some projections made in a fairly efficient manner, with a number of options provided to farmers, which would normally take someone in the field several hours to maybe do one projection at a minimum. It could be done within five to ten minutes if there was the type of software computer that staff could access with their mini-computers and assist many more farmers in the one day in the whole area of farm financial management, as one example.

That application is in my mind very current with today's needs in dealing with a greater number of farmers who need that kind of advice, need to sharpen their pencil to get through the difficult times and be able to have some options, if there are any options, of making final decisions on crop plantations or whatever in terms of the projections that they might input based on certain cost factors and inputs that they wish to put in with the crop, and that'll give them some idea in a very efficient and quick manner.

The question, of course, in the longer term is how quick can the turnaround time be and how many farmers can, in fact, access that information, but clearly of direct application to their today needs more than ever.

MR. G. FINDLAY: I've had a little bit of experience in making those comparisons with a computer and you punch in various figures and get an analysis of what this will do to the cash flow and that will do the cash flow. My question is your farm management specialists are the ones that probably should have this at their disposal. Do they have a computer that's mobile that they can go from farmer to farmer, or does the farmer have to come to say Brandon or Winnipeg or wherever to utilize the resource that's available to the farm management specialists?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, yes, we have one or two that are portable for teaching purposes in our farm business groups, so that people attending the Business Group Program would, in fact, be aware of what services are offered, but there is a computer network now in every ag rep office in the province, and so the service would be provided at the office, but we would not going out on farm. Certainly, anyone coming into the office and the ag rep could, in fact, schedule a number of appointments in any given day and say all right let's do 3 or 4 where normally he may have to spend half a day with one individual, he might be able to handle 3 or 4 people and assist them in whatever endeavours of projections they may want to look at as an example.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Are these resources available to MACC staff and all government staff in those ag rep offices?

HON. B. URUSKI: The equipment that we have primarily is, of course, used by farm management specialists and our ag reps, but where our offices would be compatible in terms of the same building, I am certain that whether it be MACC or our engineering section and there would be programs within our computer bank or software programs that would be available for their use, we would share that equipment.

As an ongoing analysis, I'm not aware of sort of any direct programming that MACC has of its own, but they certainly could use some of the programming that we've got and I may be hesitant in saying yes that goes on. It really depends on the busy-ness of the office and the use in the office and the liaison and the proximity of both offices and staff in the same area.

MR. G. FINDLAY: I would gather that the drive behind setting up the Farm Management Institute is to serve that need that exists through the specialist, through MACC. I'd like to know how much financial contribution the province has in that institute in terms of initial outlay and ongoing costs that we're committed to?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the initial start-up grant was federally funded in terms of overhead. These discussions took place between our officials and federal officials, I guess, over a year or more in terms of discussing the concept.

We will be funding ongoing and specific projects in terms of programming development that will be occurring there. We have not funded any project directly out of the centre at this point in time.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Is the intention in the future, then, that the funding for it come out of the university allocation?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, it's possible that somewhere down the road there might be some minor use of the funding out of the basic grant, but it's not generally envisaged that there would be.

What we see happening is the province and the Federal Government still doing some basic core funding in the initial stages and doing some developmental work on specific projects coming forward. Out of that, we also see the possibility of private funding coming in and making use of some of the developmental work that is possible by this centre. So it would be a combination of both private and public as the centre gets mobile in terms of some of the developmental costs that would be needed in terms of programming and the services they could provide to both the public sector and the private sector.

MR. G. FINDLAY: How do they intend to attract private investment, and in the event that they don't attract private investment, are we committed to any degree of funding in the next few years?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, there has been already a lot of interest from the private sector. We are not committed to any ongoing funding of the centre.

I think it's understood from Day One that it is, what I would say a developmental centre, and we would not go full blown and grandiose into a large overhead

operation in its initial stages. There would be a basic core funding, some starting-off support and working through some assessment of needs and possibilities for both the Provincial and Federal Governments, and some ongoing seed money in a direct application to programming that might be developed as well as, in the process, development and research work as to how programming could be developed that could be applicable to, say, grain companies and machine companies and the like that could work out of this institute.

MR. G. FINDLAY: I guess another area that I have concern with is the number of demonstrations that are put on around the province. There's nothing wrong with doing it and I believe it serves a valuable need for the farm community. But when you go into a farmer's yard and set up a feedlot, is he benefiting from that? Who's paying the cost? Is there a contract signed where he knows that you'll be there for three or four years. And when you leave there, does he have a benefit because you were there just in terms of capital that you put into there and then it's just given to him?

I guess the next question that flows from that is, is there any opportunity for different producers to bid for that opportunity, or is it just a select site?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I think pretty well all the project sites that have been and are being used for demonstrations would have been agreed to by not the individual farmer but through a group whether it be a grasslands society or others. It would be the group who would, in fact, recommend the choice of the site within their region as to where the site would be chosen.

From the total amount of dollars that are put into a project, I would say that there is very little, if any, direct benefit to the producer who indicates or who agrees to use his farm site as the base site for the demonstration project.

The amount of money that is put into, let's say it would be capital works, most capital works that are constructed — let's say it's in the cattle site — the cost would be those kinds of costs which any producer who would be in the business would normally have. There would not be any grandiose design. It would be functional construction that any farmer could, in fact, afford and would normally be put up anyway.

In exchange for the time that we use his facilities and the hassle of groups and people and meetings and everything that goes along over the three or four year period that the project is there, I would say we'd pretty well break even in terms of how much wear and tear we use on the individual's yard and site and have people there through demonstration projects and the like, as the money that we, in fact, put in that is left behind after the project is completed.

So I would say that from the projects that I've seen, whether it be under Agri-Food or Agri-Man, I would say that the participating farmers, while they gain from the direct experience and not having to drive very far in terms of the project and sightseeing, they certainly put out an awful lot in terms of their family, of having people come to their yards, using their facilities and basically the hassle with all the information gathering and people there on the project, so there would be, I

would say very little, if any, personal gain from those projects.

MR. G. FINDLAY: The other day in the House you announced the appointment or the hiring of Pat Mooney in the area of plant breeders' rights, and I would like to have you give us some idea of why he's hired, what his objective is, and where the funds for that hiring appear in Estimates.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, just one comment on the previous comments dealing with the demonstration projects.

We have not had farmers saying I want the project on my yard. That will give you some indication as to whether or not there's such a great bonus from these demonstration programs that people think, gee, there's lots to gain from them. We have not had sort of a rush through the door from all the groups and more than one farmer competing about the demonstration sites. That has not been a difficulty at all in the administration of the project.

Dealing with the contract that we have recently signed with Pat Mooney, the funding would come out of the Policy Studies, under 1.(b)(3), where the funding would have come out. I think it's a \$20,000 contract for the next six months, whereby Mr. Mooney will be assisting in putting together and doing analysis work for us on the proposed federal legislation, as well as meeting with farm groups, consumer groups and community groups around the province to raise the issue and the implications of the issue and the impact of it on the farm community and also the consumer community, as to what the possible outcome of those areas, and of course assist the province in finalizing its position to the Federal Government whenever the legislation is in fact to be presented to the House of Commons.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Was the position advertised?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, was the position . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Was the position advertised?

HON. B. URUSKI: No, Mr. Chairman, the position, as to position, was not advertised. In fact, during the winter months, during my meetings throughout the Province of Manitoba, at a meeting in Brandon I had occasion to, and the province did recognize Pat Mooney as a leading spokesperson out of Manitoba and his dedication to the world of seeds, the world of seed development and his work in international organizations. The Province of Manitoba recognized Mr. Mooney by presenting him with the Order of the Buffalo for his outstanding work in those areas.

In fact, during the meeting that I had, I asked Mr. Mooney whether he would be interested, seeing that his background was in the world and the field of genetics and genetic breeding and the research work that he had done around the world, I asked him whether he would be interested in doing some work for the province in research, in view of the impending legislation federally.

He indicated to me that he would be and had done a fair bit of work on plant patent legislation and its functions in other countries and indicated he would be interested.

As a result of that conversation, Mr. Chairman, I asked my staff to follow up with him, in a way that we could, in fact, benefit from his knowledge and some of his previous research and have some direct application to the Canadian scene and if he would be prepared to do some work. As a result of those discussions, we recently signed a contract with him over the next six months.

MR. G. FINDLAY: In my mind, the message that he will purvey is very well known. I don't think you have any doubt about which direction he's going to push and I don't have any doubt about which direction he's going to push. When you went around and analyzed the federal Tripartite Beef Plan, you had an unbiased individual presenting both sides of the argument, which I thought was fair, and I don't believe that principle is even being applied in this case.

I believe there were many people at the University of Manitoba who could have done a study or an analysis to analyze the federal legislation as to how it would impact not only in Manitoba, but all of Canada, or whatever jurisdiction he wanted to have the study done on. So I don't see why his qualifications are any better than the people who are presently available through the people you're funding through the University of Manitoba research grant.

A MEMBER: He's a world expert.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Okay, if he's a world expert, is he a member of the Manitoba Institute of Agrologists? Is he a licensed agrologist? — (Interjection) — It matters to me because we have an act that went through this Legislature not very long ago to determine if a licensed agrologist, or anybody practising agrology in this province can be licenced, and I want to know if this member is?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Mooney's credentials have from time to time been debated at the University of Brandon, being that he has been a lecturer at the university and there's no doubt that certain professionals in the field may not be that happy because the individual may not be a graduate or a graduate of agrology. But there is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Chairman, of the wealth of knowledge and experience that this individual holds in the world of plant breeding, in the world of genetics, in the world of concentration of corporate power in the whole question of plant and genetic material, and he's widely renowned, Mr. Chairman.

Whether or not an individual has a title that is recognized by our own universities, I quite frankly have not taken that as being the only credential that one should have, in terms of determining whether one is capable or not.

His knowledge, I think, speaks for itself and his recognition worldwide speaks for itself, by other countries. Mr. Chairman, the university has done a study on plant breeders' rights, the University of Manitoba, and I guess — as best as one can interpret — they come on both . . .

Mr. Chairman, they do indicate, as part of their synopsis, that an in-depth study of the seed industry

is needed, both to determine the role played and the market share controlled by some of the larger corporation which have recently entered the seed industry.

Part of the work that Mr. Mooney will be doing will be precisely that kind of work which has been recommended by the university. His knowledge of the international firms in the seed and chemical industry and the combination of their impact on both the development of seeds and the development of chemicals worldwide, whether it be any of the multinational corporations, I don't think there is anyone in the Province of Manitoba who is more qualified in this area than Mr. Mooney.

MR. G. FINDLAY: If you already have a report in front of you, why do we need to spend \$20,000 to get another statement of policy support for the direction you want to go? The job for an academic is to be unbiased and give an analysis from both sides, as your member of your department did on the tripartite plan.

HON. B. URUSKI: Since when?

MR. G. FINDLAY: Neil Hamilton, as we talked about earlier, did a very unbiased analysis of a plan put in by the Federal Government. Further to that, we talked about a freight rate study that should be done for the Province of Manitoba and you won't acknowledge there's any need to do it. It's a Wheat Board policy that's coming into play. If it applies on one hand, it applies on the other. Let's be consistent with our policies from one issue to the next.

What is wrong with his qualifications? — (Interjection) — You're calling them biased. — (Interjection) — I ask the member again, is he a licensed agrologist in the Province of Manitoba? Has he held consultations with the Canadian Seed Growers' Association to determine if he's an acceptable individual to analyze this industry?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I want to tell my honourable friends that there is a fundamental difference between doing an analysis of an already set out program by the Federal Government which was not reported by the media and putting it out. In fact, it should have been the Federal Government who had gone out to promote their own program and have producers analyze it and then tell them themselves. They didn't do it, Mr. Chairman, so we had to do it for them. Now they're shaking their heads, why didn't they do it? Why didn't they go out and tell producers this is what the tripartite program is all about? This is the program we would want you to join, precisely what they wanted to do.

In the area of plant breeders' rights, we know that the Federal Government, whether it's Liberal or Conservative, have taken a fairly — (Interjection) — well partisan — they've taken their policy positions very clear to both parties, that they're going to . . .

MR. G. FINDLAY: Maybe they're right.

HON. B. URUSKI: . . . they're going to proceed with Plant Breeders' Rights legislation. Mr. Chairman, the Member for Virden says, "Maybe they're right." Mr.

Chairman, I accept their position and they've had four years of public outpouring from their government saying why they are right.

Mr. Chairman, I want to examine those statements and that's why we have hired Mr. Mooney to examine those statements which have been made by two administrations — one Liberal, one Conservative — in support of that legislation and they've been out there for four years, because that legislation has been on the books and has been before Parliament on a number of occasions. They're now coming up with it again, Mr. Chairman.

No one in this country has really said, "Let's look at it unbiased. Let's take the other side of the question," because they've had one side of the question put forward for four years now. Let's take the other side of the question and let's examine it and let's examine who the actors are in the industry, who the commercial players are in the industry, who stands to gain. Mr. Chairman, that's the fundamental question.

We are debating that very question now in the whole chemical industry, Mr. Chairman, as to who wants the protection and why. The members agreed today when we were debating the issue of product specific registration and the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been siphoned off from the farmers of this country and their request for a review committee dealing with farm input costs.

The implications on the farm community, in terms of chemicals, is just as great from the issue of plant patent rights and the cost of food, not only cost of seed to farmers, but it will impact on the cost of food and the type of food that consumers will eat in the future. Let's have that side of that question examined and see what these implications are. That's worse.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I said it was four years, but actually it's now going to be six years — in fact right now it's six years when that bill was first introduced in the House of Commons — they have had six years of promoting their legislation and saying it's good.

Mr. Chairman, because Chrysler or Ford or General Motors says that it's good or whether it's the Gene Wheland of the Liberals or John Wise of the Conservatives says it's good, I don't have to accept that it's good, Mr. Chairman. I don't intend to accept that, Mr. Chairman.

So we intend to clearly examine those issues and the implications on the farm community. The seed growers will be spoken to, Mr. Chairman, and in fact the seed growers — I want to say — I believe that they have been conspicuously silent on this one major issue. They have been conspicuously silent and not wanting to take a position on this issue, Mr. Chairman, and maybe they have some reasons to be so.

But we will speak to as many groups as we can and we will analyze the information and try and present the implications of it. I don't want to say that the information will in fact be unbiased, because anyone you undertake to do research for you has his or her opinion. It's as if, Mr. Chairman, I would hire John McCallum, the Director of Business Administration at the university, to give advice to an NDP government, when he's been the Conservative adviser for years in economic policy. Mr. Chairman, he has his own views.

So, Mr. Chairman, I don't want the Member for Virden saying, is he unbiased because he happens to be an

academic at the university. I say baloney! Every academic has his own biases, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. FINDLAY: Let him speak if he knows so much about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(f) — the Member for Inkster wants to speak?

MR. D. SCOTT: Sure, you bet I want to speak. Mr. Chairman, I find it quite interesting that the members opposite are questioning the eligibility and the qualifications of one Pat Mooney to do the studies for the Province of Manitoba, in the definement of Manitoba's position for the Government of Canada's Plant Breeders' Rights Bill and legislation. This gentleman is unfortunately poorly recognized in his own home province, but he's recognized worldwide and received an award last year in Stockholm, which is comparable — (Interjection) — You can pick it up? Well, why didn't you pick it up? Why didn't you pick up an award from that organization?

From what I can understand, what I learned of the organization last year that is presenting it, it is not that much different except it's much less remunerative, but in the scientific community it is recognized on the same parallel with the Nobel prize. It is a very, very highly — (Interjection) — and members opposite say, "Oh, come on." I don't why because a person that is self-educated to a very large extent, has risen himself from a rural Manitoba community to be in a class of his own in plant breeders' rights, worldwide — (Interjection) — yeah, worldwide and the members opposite laugh — when this person — (Interjection) — Yes, he's a self-made man. He's a very good teacher, somewhat a little bit different than some other people here who haven't necessarily had good teachers and are certainly not self-made men. But he was representing, I would suggest, the interest of the ordinary citizen, not only of this province but of the world, to preserve a genetic feedstock from which all the varieties that we now grow, came from.

A MEMBER: Do you believe that?

MR. D. SCOTT: Do I believe that? You're darn right I believe that. How many different grains and whatnot started off as the original species, from which all the varieties we now have derived from? How many varieties have we derived over the past 60, 70 years, that have ended up being susceptible to some disease that comes along and even with those resistances, where did they get the resistances from? Did they go out and buy the resistance? No, they bred those resistances from the original feedstocks and going back to get some of the characteristics that were in the original feedstocks, otherwise they wouldn't have had those original grains to even start with, because they would have been wiped out themselves, they were all susceptible to a common rust or various types of diseases.

You had, in every species, not only of plant and animal, characteristics built into those, so that some of the species at least will survive all different conditions. I

think Mr. Mooney has shown very clearly in the work that he has done and the international recognition he's received for it, that it is in our interest not to give up the licensing of any particular variety to a particular company so that they can design a plant to grow in tune with the chemicals, or whatever that they want to offer, for the highest yield of a particular variety.

So if you want to buy their seed, you then have to buy their chemicals to go along with their seed, and if something happens to that and you get yourself growing all of one variety — we've even got some potato producers here — how many varieties of potatoes are you growing? Are you growing one variety or are you growing two or three varieties? Are you growing, as I heard not too long ago, if I remember — (Interjection) — No, Mr. Chairman, a person has 30 minutes to address here and I don't intend to take as near 30 minutes, but you're not going to cut me off in this debate. Excuse me.

There's a gentleman down near Windsor, Ontario which is one of the primary producers — because of climatic conditions — of a great variety of vegetables and there is one individual there in particular who still grows — the number of varieties astonished me when I heard it but it was in the dozens of varieties of tubers — so that at no time is his crop wiped out.

He is always guaranteed a certain yield on his crop because he has various resistances brought in because of all the different varieties that he grows. Now they may not all be your perfect potatoes for making french fries out of, so he covers himself with reds, he covers himself with other varieties as well.

MR. G. FINDLAY: On a point of order, we're here to debate the Estimates of Agriculture not get a speech about the holier than Thou, somebody he doesn't even know about.

MR. D. SCOTT: That unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, is the idea and the attitude of too damn many academics in the agricultural field. That is why we have the United States, 20 some different states in the U.S. that now have contaminated groundwaters from nitrate poisoning because of the practices that the farmers have been told year-in and year-out to pour more fertilizers onto the land. They've now got . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. A point of order being raised. What is the point of order?

MR. G. FINDLAY: . . . the Minister of Agriculture — is he now the Minister of Agriculture?

MR. CHAIRMAN: —(Interjection) — That is not a point of order.

The Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: On the same point of order . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order!

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

How much R and D in this country are you going to preserve with going ahead with a blind acceptance of the federal initiative on plant breeders' rights, how much

R and D is there taking place in Canada and who's done the R and D in Canada? How much has been done by done by Agriculture Canada? How much has been done by the various provinces and universities? How much has been done — (Interjection) — no, there's been an awful lot of it done by universities. I have to count on my own members from time to time, too.

But how much has been done by the private sector? How much has been done by Shell? How much has been done by your agro-chemical industries in this country?

I would suggest that a small fraction of the amount of work that is developed and given us our varieties that have been so successful today, have been done by them. The bulk of it has been done by government-assisted and government-appointed researchers. That hasn't been done for licensing purposes alone. It hasn't been done singly with the initiative and with the desire to try and design a species of a variety so that your growers have to come to you to buy that particular seed.

It has been done for the benefit of the farm community. In doing that it's been done out of benefit for the whole Canadian community.

International communities have benefited greatly from it as well from the triticale in the highlands of Africa and so many other parts of the world where developments that they have made in Canada with government assistance — not with Shell, not with Fyser (phonetic) or your other major chemical firms who are wanting now to be able to design a particular crop that if you want to go and buy seed, you're going to have pay them a premium price for it.

How many varieties are you going to have? How many varieties and how many firms in England — and I'm running off of memory here — but in England a few years ago, before they brought in plant breeders' rights in England, there was a couple of hundred small seed firms. The last I heard they were down to less than a dozen or around a dozen firms. That is some kind of economic development and of interest to the rural community of Manitoba and for the small industry base in developing.

What would — a friend of mine . . . Skinner up with a drop more nursery. Most of that has been developed and the varieties were developed by his dad, Dr. Skinner. A tremendous amount.

Another self-taught man, Dr. Skinner, how many degrees did Dr. Skinner earn through various universities? He didn't earn any. He earned them through laudatory degrees, through honorary degrees, but he was probably one of the greatest plant breeders that this province and that this country has ever seen in developing varieties that could withstand — and certainly we have all benefited tremendously with our gardens and many farm yards as well across the province to develop varieties that could sustain our climate.

I really cannot understand the will and the desire and blind faith that the member's opposite have in plant breeders' rights. If they're going to turn this whole thing over to multinational firms — and it won't be any Canadian firms, believe me — there will be no major Canadian firms involved in developing and licensing of worldwide crop varieties.

It will be done by multinational firms. Some of the research may be done here; they may purchase some

Tuesday, 24 June, 1986

research time, as I'm sure they will at our various universities. I would hope they would purchase some as I'm sure they purchase some right now.

The interest that we in this province must protect is the seed stock that we have right now and the varieties that we have of building greater resistances, of building not just peak crops for your so-called green revolution, but crops that are going to be able to sustain changes in climatic conditions and also the invasions of various rusts and other diseases that come into the province. For us to accept the position that some of the members opposite are that plant breeders' rights are going to be the cat's meow for all of them, I think they're dead wrong. Dead wrong.

Unfortunately there's not going to be just them that's dead. It could have far greater ramifications, especially in Third World countries because they're not going to be able to afford the other ingredients that have to go along with the designed seeds. They're not going to be able to afford the equipment and whatever that has to be used for the application of it as well. That's been proven time and time again.

Given Third World nations, many of them, trying to turn them into using western agricultural techniques has failed miserably. Probably one of the greatest examples of that is the growth in the Sahill (phonetic) regions of Africa partially due to trying to transfer inappropriate agricultural techniques onto that continent using methodology that we have here. We're even paying some of the prices for it here although we still refuse to acknowledge it. Our agronomists, unfortunately, refuse to acknowledge it as well.

I resent — and the reason I was driven to rise today to enter this debate is because of what I feel are attacks on a Manitoban who has distinguished himself internationally and I feel there is not a person in this province who could represent the Province of Manitoba's position and to enhance our position as well as Patrick Mooney can to present our position to the government of Ottawa.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I remind all the members that what we are considering now is an item called Agricultural Research Grants. Therefore members' remarks should be strictly relevant. If it is good for the goose, it is good for the gander.

The Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hope the last 15 minutes will be struck from the record.

I would now ask the Minister of Agriculture if he'll consult with his Minister of Labour behind him, and ask him if he agrees that unions are important for the Province of Manitoba. We have an Agrologist Act where if anybody is going to practise agrology in the Province of Manitoba, they must be licensed of that Act, and I ask you if the person you have hired qualifies in that context?

I go further and ask you when a job or a position is available from the Province of Manitoba, is it the policy to not tender that job, just to hire the person that comes along?

I go further and say, all you have to do is give the member who just spoke a pen and pencil and he'll write exactly what you want to have written.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Agriculture has the floor.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, there is no prohibition of hiring someone other than having an agrologist position. In fact, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member would be wise to even check with his federal colleagues. Several federal Deputy Ministers of Agriculture do not have degrees in agrology and yet they are in fact Deputy Ministers running the Department of Agriculture in this country. No one seems to have been undermined or done less or served less because they have had or did not have a degree as an agrologist, Mr. Chairman.

I'm sure that if anyone is practising agrology, as the member suggests, that is beyond his professional scope or ability that there would be through the professional bill that the member speaks of. There would no doubt be a complaint and individuals would, in fact, be dealt with in the manner that the professional bill sets out. There are procedures by which people who might be practising something, or at least putting forward recommendations of which, not even recommendations showing that they are something when they are really not that. That act, in fact, would deal with that question.

Mr. Chairman, I want to advise my honourable friend, we were just looking at the debate that has gone on and the report that was done by the university, and I quote from the report that was done by a professor there. "There's been a great deal of debate about the effects of the legislation, but the arguments have been made largely without any serious analysis or documentation despite the long gestation period prior to introducing the bill and despite the six years of committee discussions, lobbying and discussion in the media."

Mr. Chairman, we may not totally succeed in trying to highlight some of the effects of the legislation, but we certainly will try and put a perspective so that there is a great deal of debate on this issue in the countryside, and we hope that will generate the interest that this matter deserves, not only in Manitoba, but across this country whenever the study and the issues and the meetings take place and, in fact, are released.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Who did the study at the University of Manitoba?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, R.M.A. Loyns.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Have you had any discussions with the Canadian Seed Growers' Association in this area in the province?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I have not had discussions directly with the Canadian Seed Growers, but certainly they are one of the groups that we will want to be consulting with in this whole area.

MR. G. FINDLAY: An analysis of the Plant Breeders' Rights issue without coming down on either side.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(f) — the Member for Morris.

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

I apologize for missing much of this spine-tingling debate that's occurred here this evening. I feel, though, that I must rise as a select seed grower, as a member of the Canadian Seed Growers, and somebody who doesn't certainly claim to know all the answers with respect to this issue, but one. But I feel I have to rise in rebuttal to some of the comments made by the renowned plant scientist, the Member for Inkster. — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, I was here long enough to hear the comments from the Member for Inkster in response to the comment hurled across the floor by the Minister of the Environment.

What I find particularly interesting — and I've been following this discussion now for three or four years, as a matter of fact, I have a Brandon Sun article which I'll use a little bit later on, Mr. Chairman — is that I haven't seen Dr. Barry Campbell, who has developed probably six or eight major Marquis type varieties of wheat in Western Canada, probably nobody more renowned in the last generation with respect to the plant breeding of top quality Marquis type yields. I've never heard him come to the defence of one Mr. Pat Mooney. I've never heard Dave Leisle, one of the great breeders of Durham wheat that has been used across the prairies for the last 15 years, I've never heard him come to the defence of Mr. Mooney. I've never heard Dr. Johnson, the barley breeder out of the Brandon station, I've never heard him rush to the defence of Mr. Mooney. I've never heard Dr. Baldur Stefansson who, with the cooperation of Dr. Downey, created that great Cinderella crop which basically in a cash sense kept most of the farmers in Western Canada in business over the last 20 years.

I've never heard any one of these men speak out in support of the argument put forward by one Pat Mooney. Mr. Chairman — (Interjection) — Well, I have the Minister of Northern Affairs saying have they talked against it. Mr. Chairman, that's the point I'm making. I haven't heard them talk against it, and I can tell you that members within the Seed Trade Association and within the Seed Growers Association would go to those types of individuals for an argument, or at least for resource help to help them make up their minds whether to be in favour or in opposition to the position put forward.

Mr. Chairman, three years ago, I came very close to putting into the House a resolution with respect to this. As a matter of fact, I may do so now. I had a resolution prepared on the issue. I can tell you when the subject first came up, I wanted to listen a little bit more carefully to the arguments put forward by Mr. Mooney. I wanted to know a little bit more about the principle that he was espousing.

Mr. Chairman, if there's any legitimacy to that argument, any legitimacy at all, then I think it's incumbent upon members opposite and indeed all players within the game of agriculture within Western Canada, those who are either seed growers, those who are farmers who go to seed growers, people in the seed trade to source their seed stock, that they make sure that there's cooperative test procedures in place. So then, indeed, nobody can bring forward a variety. I don't care who it is. Whether it's the public institutions, the universities, or whether it's the public institutions of Agriculture Canada, that nobody can bring forward a variety, however they want to call it, however they

want to name it, unless it's gone through the proper cooperative tests, the zonaton trials, and has met the test.

Mr. Chairman, that's our safeguard. We've got that system in place in this country and it's fortunate we do. Unless the members are envisaging a plant breeders' rights system, whereby those individuals who breed grain varieties in this country can escape that system, then, Mr. Chairman, they are doing a disservice and this government's doing a disservice by bringing forward this type of activity and sponsoring it. Because that's our safeguard. That's the safeguard for the Government of Canada and, indeed, for the Province of Manitoba, if they push the Federal Government to make sure that every variety that is licensed within the nation, whether it's for royalty, profit or not, goes through those cooperative tests. If they don't make the market, Mr. Chairman, before the expert committees, then they do not receive their licence.

The solution is simple. We have in place a trial system to make sure that no inferior varieties are foisted upon us. Because people in the past will tell us about the American varieties that 30 years ago used to come into Canada when we didn't have the restrictions in place, and they were called things like Bonanza. They had this real interesting name associated with them. I mean, you just wanted to grow them. You wanted to plant them in snow almost. You could hardly wait to see them ripening and mature.

We've gone through that stage, and yet that's what the members opposite are afraid of. They're afraid some huckster is going to come along and show phony results, given a glorified name like "Big Producer" or "Big Red" and next thing you know, they're going to have everybody buying it at \$12 or \$15 a bushel with expectations we're going to hit 80 bushels an acre for wheat, Mr. Chairman.

So, that's what we have in place. We have the cooperative trial system in place to prevent that from occurring. Now the Minister says well what about the unlicensed varieties, the semi-dwarfs that have come in? Well, Mr. Chairman, they have come in the last couple of years, and a few farmers have been burnt on them, not burnt in yield, but maybe burnt more so in quality. Let the buyer beware, Mr. Chairman. It doesn't go on for very long. It doesn't go on for very long at all.

HON. B. URUSKI: Why do you want your study of pricing when you say let the buyer beware?

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, first of all, those varieties in a lot of cases came in illegally — the Minister knows that — but there was no way they could be stamped out. So consequently some farmers grew them and were caught in a down market and I dare say the demand that I've seen for them this year has dropped significantly.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to digress, but today we have in place within this nation a cooperative test system which, if used, and if the Federal Government ensured that all varieties, before they received a licence, whether they were public or private, went through that system, that would represent the safeguards of those of us who grow crops.

Mr. Chairman, what is the motive for the Member for Inkster rising on this? And I probably shouldn't ask that question, but I couldn't help but bring out of my records the Brandon Sun, Monday, February 27, 1984, and it says, "MLA urges conservationists to consider recycling project."

I understand that there was a meeting, a conservator action group meeting held that weekend in Brandon. And who was speaking at that meeting? Mr. Scott, Mr. Gramble — who would he be? — and Mr. Mooney, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, that tells me why the Member for Inkster has such a desire and such a keen interest in this. I mean he must; he went to a weekend conference in Brandon and he happened to hear Mr. Mooney speak and all of a sudden he's a resident expert for that side on the whole area of plant breeders' rights.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I daresay I'll take the word of Dr. Barry Campbell, Dr. Dave Leisle, Dr. Baldur Stefansson, and formerly Dr. Johnson, long before any member that the government wants to bring forward into their government to try and sell us a bill of goods that really is questionable in the extreme.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the government maybe will bring forward a resolution on this. I'd love to debate it in greater detail.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I venture to say that some of the names that the honourable member spoke about certainly have been public breeders and are public breeders in the Canadian context, some of whom have been and still may be employees of Agriculture Canada.

Mr. Chairman, let's just understand what has been happening in this whole area. The very system that the honourable member speaks of that is the cooperative system of testing in Canada is where the dollars have, in fact, been slipping where in fact in terms of national commitment to research, where in fact scientists have had to do much of their own leg work, their own work in the plots, where in fact the monies that were there for technicians and technical help and basically people who would assist the scientists, have dried up.

Mr. Chairman, for the last number of years, there was a growing concern from the public breeding areas and people connected fairly closely with Ag Canada. But, Mr. Chairman, you know what's happened? And I can understand the political arm saying this: If you want to complain and want to take a different policy direction from the government and you get your money from the government, let's part company. Let's part company. You can have your freedom to criticize a public position of the government, you're very free to do that, but you do it on your own time.

I can tell you the voice of concern has suddenly died out, Mr. Chairman, and I can understand the political masters saying that; that if I'm paying someone's tune, I'm paying the salary, I expect them to follow the policy directives of the government. If they wish to publicly come out and say I am criticizing government policy, then clearly they know which road to take, Mr. Chairman. Quite frankly, that's what has occurred. Mr. Chairman, that is what in effect has happened in this country in terms of the concerns that have been raised regarding the public breeding system.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell my honourable friends, and I will use the university study again, the very area that the member says there's enough information on, and I quote from Mr. Loyns' study, finally, and I read the last paragraph: "Since the current evidence indicates that there is neither a strong need nor great benefit to be derived, it is recommended that plant breeders' rights be implemented only if benefits to Canada can be demonstrated clearly. The authors have not been able to produce such evidence in the course of the present study."

Mr. Chairman, hardly a situation that should not be considered and, in fact, we hope that some of the work that we do may bring out people who can assist in the provision, who will want to be heard in terms of the work that we are doing. Maybe there is some further evidence and we may have to reconsider our position in light of the evidence. Obviously, up to this point, that's not been the case. — (Interjection) — Pardon me? Mr. Chairman, there is no such thing. The Honourable Member for Virden speaks from his seat and says get an unbiased report.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell my honourable friend that there is no one that is clearly unbiased. Everyone who is around has his or her opinions. There is no one around and if they are in fact, as the member suggests, totally unbiased, Mr. Chairman, then I would not want to hire them because then they have no opinions. They have no opinions on anything, Mr. Chairman. They really don't know. They would be considered, in my mind, mush, Mr. Chairman, because they're not prepared to stand up for anything.

Mr. Chairman, the legal profession is probably the best profession that I would put into that category because they will take both sides of the argument. The Member for Fort Garry knows of what I speak. If the issue is black, he will argue white because he'll be paid for it. There is the greatest incentive for putting one's opinion on the market. How much are you prepared to pay? That's probably where the issue of so-called unbiased and the ability to present either side of the case, the legal profession is very good in that respect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would just like to offer a teaching position as head of the Law School at the University of Manitoba for the Minister of Agriculture because I think he could teach the legal profession a few lessons on talking from both sides of his mouth.

MR. G. FINDLAY: I guess we should maybe get out of this area, but I would like to give the Minister one last opportunity.

You have just read from a study there done at the University of Manitoba. We're talking about plant breeding and plant breeding rights.

I would ask the Minister if the person who wrote that study is a plant scientist?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Loyns, if I'm not mistaken, is an agricultural economist.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Not a plant scientist, right. It seems that when you want a report done, you hire the guy that's going to write it the way you want it done.

I would ask the Minister one more time, is he prepared to withdraw that appointment, advertise the position and hire an unbiased individual to write a report? And he has to be a qualified agrologist.

Are you prepared to withdraw that appointment and advertise the position and hire a qualified agrologist?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I have not heard a suggestion of this nature before. The qualifications, and I'll just state that again, the qualifications of Mr. Mooney in the area of plant breeding, genetics and . . .

MR. G. FINDLAY: Hey, we didn't go through the process to be kicked out.

HON. B. URUSKI: . . . (inaudible) in the development of seed, I believe is unmatched by anyone in the Province of Manitoba. I believe that that clearly is the case. Mr. Chairman, a preposterous suggestion by the Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: I would just like to say to the Minister, I disagree with him wholeheartedly.

MR. E. CONNERY: Mr. Chairman, it grieves me to hear these loud voices, it disturbs me.

When we talked about the Ag Canada funding at the University of Manitoba, what is their funding in a given year?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I can't answer that question. I'm sure that the member, if he phoned Mr. McGuinness, I'm sure Mr. McGuinness would be able to provide him with that information.

MR. E. CONNERY: Does the Minister know if it's gone up or down in the last few years?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe, and we were just discussing this, that there is any what could be called sort of ongoing COR funding to the university from Ag Canada. There would be an opportunity for the university to obtain specific contracts from Ag Canada if there would be research dollars available. Of course, the funding through Agri-Food from Ag Canada, would be new money and would be additional money that they would receive, but those would be specific projects that would be funded by Ag Canada.

We don't have the list of the projects that Ag Canada funds at the university, other than the example that we gave your colleague, the Member for Virden, dealing with the Saul Sinclair Research Centre.

MR. E. CONNERY: Mr. Chairman, there are two areas I think in Agriculture that are very crucial, especially when times are tough and we're finding such a glut of grain in our hands, is marketing and research. This government has been very, very loud in their criticism of the Federal Government in their criticism because they didn't fund the technical facility here in Winnipeg, and I would almost tend to agree that I think the technology research of all kinds, is very crucial to — is somebody going to shoot him . . . ?

A MEMBER: Well, if you're going to look for all of them.

MR. E. CONNERY: There's a couple of goof balls up there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The member should speak on the item under discussion — Agricultural Research Grant.

MR. E. CONNERY: When I look back at 1982, the funding to the University of Manitoba was \$850,000, and now we have it up to \$875,000 over four years, or an increase of about 1 percent a year. Is the Minister satisfied that this is an appropriate funding for research which is very, very fundamental to agriculture? As you know, research done elsewhere doesn't necessarily apply to Manitoba, so research really has to be done in the area where that research is going to be used.

How can this Minister say, when they've been so critical of other jurisdictions in the funding for research, to come up with a 1 percent a year funding increase themselves?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, while our funding may not have kept up with increased costs as much as we would like, we have not reduced our amount, as has been one by Ag Canada in the tens of positions right across Western Canada, and the member knows of what I speak.

Many organizations have documented. In fact, members of their own staff have raised those concerns but, quite frankly, they have had to go underground in terms of those concerns because they were basically given their marching orders. If they want to criticize they can do it outside the service, so they basically have had to button up in this whole process. But there's over 40 positions in the research end that have been, in fact, done away with in Western Canada alone, Mr. Chairman, over the last number of years.

MR. E. CONNERY: Well, it is very obvious when we're finishing this one we're going to be moving into No. 7, but research with this government is not a priority at all; in fact they're prepared to reduce research overall to a very large significant amount. I think it should be put on the record that this government is not a research government and is not interested in progress in agriculture, that it is only through research will progress take place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(f)—the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. CUMMINGS: I would like to ask the Minister one question in regard to his comments about the employees of the Federal Government not being in a position to complain about circumstances and policies under which they're working. Does that mean that he will welcome, without any disciplinary problems, criticisms from within his own department that go public?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I have said to colleagues, when I indicated what has happened federally, that I can understand the Minister of Agriculture doing that. He who pays the piper calls the tune.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken the position, and have never backed away from it. Anyone who wishes to say

I totally disagree with you, and I want to fight you publicly, Mr. Chairman, has the right to do so on his or her own time. There is no doubt, in terms of the situation, in terms of discussions, and Mr. Chairman, that's the situation here.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Portage la Prairie talks about the lack of research. Mr. Chairman, in terms of the provincial input, in terms of the research dollars going to the university, we've basically looked at going back 25 years, as to the amount of money that the province has put into the University of Manitoba, and there's been very modest increases in each of the 25 years, or they have been held fairly constant. It's gone up from about .5 million in 1960-61 to the present, just about \$900,000, those are the actual provincial dollars. But there is in the last few years, because of Agri-Food Agreement, we are now up over approximately \$1.3 million which, in fact, when you look at the historical input of provincial dollars to the university.

Mr. Chairman, the member does not have the figures that I have. For example, in 1960-61 we were looking at \$500,000 approximately, and we're at \$900,000, we're looking over a 25-year period regardless of which administration was there, yours was there for the decade of the Sixties and we were there for half of the Seventies; and then you're into the late Seventies and early Eighties.

The funding has been fairly consistent throughout the 25 years of provincial expenditures, it hasn't deviated a heck of a lot. But what has happened in the last couple of years with the Agri-Food Agreement, where there has been supplemental funding to the university, we in fact have put in a greater share into research in terms of provincial dollars because we've exceeded the \$1 million mark. In fact, I don't know how the member can make the statements that he has from what has been the historical facts in terms of public funding.

MR. E. CONNERY: The Minister said that the research funding was up to \$3 million. I can only see \$2 million in here, where am I not seeing the other million?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I said \$1.3 million, not \$3 million. Mr. Chairman, we're at 875 and the difference between 875 and 1.3 is the additional provincial funding through the Agri-Food Agreement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: In regard to this Agricultural Research Grant, Mr. Minister, is that totally agriculture, or is that also livestock?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, it is totally agriculture, which would include livestock, all the aspects, entomology, weeds, the various aspects of areas which would impact on agricultural production.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(f)—the Member for La Verendrye.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Would the Minister please repeat that, I didn't get it. Did you say it was also livestock?

HON. B. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it would be.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Then I have another question. Is there any kind of a checkoff in regard to any kind of milk board, or broiler, or turkey for that matter, any one of them, that there's a checkoff which goes to this kind of research or is that totally absorbed by the province?

HON. B. URUSKI: No, Mr. Chairman, any funding that might come from commodity groups, for example, they in fact would have their own direct contract, if they would, with the university or I know there have been commodity groups who have supported, for example, the Vedo (phonetic) Research facility out of Saskatoon; there have been checkoffs provided for that private facility and there's been some good work done there as well in the area of, specifically, calf scours, the development in some swine diseases and in fact, I think, some work in the turkey industry on, I think it's rhinitis disease, so any groups that would have any checkoffs, they would have nothing to do with the money we have here.

They would have either direct contracts with either the university or with private institutions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(f) — the Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Through the course of our discussion this evening, I would perceive that the Minister favours research and is prepared to support research and all that can be done and the more that can be done the better for the agricultural industry.

We have in Western Canada, the Western Grains Research Foundation which started with some \$9 million here about two or three years ago, and it's administered by representatives of the various commodity boards. I know it's been attempted in the past and I don't doubt that it will be attempted in the future, that a checkoff be put in place for the six or seven major grains grown in Western Canada.

I would ask the Minister if he would support such a checkoff so that there can be more funds channeled to research to have new and better crops for growth in Western Canada?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, certainly I would support that move on the condition that there is widespread support from producers. It basically is a producer decision and I would have no difficulty in lending our support to that; but basically, as a producer, I would support it.

A MEMBER: Take the lead, as the government.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, that decision has to be made by producer groups through their associations, and we certainly would be cooperative in that respect in any way that we might be able to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister a few minutes ago had a sheet in front of him that showed the Agricultural Research Grants. Could the Minister indicate what this line, Agricultural Research Grant to the University of Manitoba was in 1980?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the chart that I had, that I gave to the honourable members, the sort of the long-term, included the direct monies that the province gives in research grant and policy studies and contracts that the department may have had with the university in those years.

We will endeavour to — in fact, a question of that nature was raised with us to get the exact funding of the research grant alone, to the university. In 1980, if my memory serves me, it would have been in the area of either \$825,000, somewhere in that range.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that's the point I guess that my colleagues were making, is that you've professed a support of agricultural research out there, but you haven't put your money where your professions are.

That sort of demonstrates clearly, to many in the agricultural community, why it is not necessarily a good thing to support the New Democratic Party, because they haven't supported agriculture and research in agriculture in meaningful ways, such as the research grant at the University of Manitoba.

If the Minister doesn't know, he should know that money gets very, very effectively spent throughout the Province of Manitoba in research projects throughout all the agricultural region in Manitoba. It employs many summer students and gives them their summer job, whereby they can return to university and pay tuition fees, etc., etc. That's the best Jobs Fund you can get; and this Minister, of course, hasn't seen fit over a five-year period to do anything but modestly bring it up.

Of course, that shows as one of the failings that this Minister has given to the agricultural community during his first five years as Minister of Agriculture and I hope he sees fit over the next several years to increase this significantly, to get that money to the University of Manitoba, the Faculty of Agriculture, where it serves dual purpose, creates jobs for summer students and provides us with the kind of research that we need to keep our agricultural community and our agricultural industry on the forefront of change.

Just simply saying that they support research, etc., etc., and not put the money there is not good enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6.(f)—pass.

Resolution No. 11: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,074,100 for Agriculture, Policy and Economic Division, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

Item No. 7.(a) Federal-Provincial Agreements, Value-Added Crops Production Agreement — with no amount; Item No. 7.(b) Agri-Food Agreement — the Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: I guess the first thing we'll ask the Minister to explain the movement of money between lines (a) and (b), between '86 and '87 and what is moving in and what is moving out in terms of the Agri-Food Agreements here.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, if the member recalls, during some of our earlier discussions in the department, I in fact went to the Federal-Provincial Agreement and he will find on record the total

breakdown of the agreement and the amount of money of each contributor in those areas and in fact the book dealing with all the projects as of late, as of February '86 that I presented to honourable members is in fact the compendium of everything that is contained in this provision.

The Value-Added Crops Production Agreement was of course the finalization of the Agro-Man Agreement, the previous five-year agreement, and that's why there is no funding now shown in that line for '86, '87, if he looks at Resolution 7 and the Agri-Food Agreement is now the beginning of the new agreement with the money and all the information that I have provided earlier for honourable members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7.(b)—pass.

Resolution No. 12: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,096,200 for Agriculture, Federal-Provincial Agreements, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

Item No. 8.(a) Income Insurance Fund, Beef Stabilization Fund — the Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: I guess being the hour of the night and if we can cover the whole Stabilization in one go tomorrow, it would probably be the appropriate thing to do, if the Minister would agree.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can start. The Member for Virden.

MR. G. FINDLAY: I guess the first area then obviously is Beef Stabilization Plan.

The premiums have increased somewhat since the inception of the plan in '82 and the target dates for changing of premiums have been January 1 and July 1. I have had several people mention to me that the July 1 change of premiums is a rather poorly chosen date because it tends to hit the marketing, in July 1, 1986, hits the marketing of the 1985 calf crop right in the middle. So you've got half of the calf crop going at whatever stabilization plan and price premium that's in place right now and the change will occur on July 1 and there'll be a different contribution, a different support level based on the formula and the suggestions were made to me — and I agree that they're reasonable — that they move it forward and back three months, so that the whole calf crop is marketed in the same pricing six-month period. Has the commission given any thought to that proposal?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I believe that while I'm sure it has had an impact on individual farmers in terms of the decision-making, overall the decision-making of marketing of animals should not be on the basis of stabilization and support. It should be on the basis of market signals as members have often said in this House. The market really should be the signal and the ability of those animals that are ready for market; whether they're finished or not should be the signal to individual farmers.

I guess, in terms of the setting of the dates, we did set the dates initially to have the review of the cost of production formula twice a year. So we did pick two six-month time frames and it happened to be January 1 and July 1 in terms of the time frame for calculation of changes in support and/or premiums.

Generally premiums, of course, could in fact be set at anytime by the board, but the changes in the formula for support occur twice a year and at six-month intervals in terms of the level of support. The board could in fact change premiums generally at anytime of the year in terms of how they view the program operating. So if there is any overwhelming reason to change the dates of support, we certainly could consider it, but at the present time that's not been a major factor of consideration by the commission.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Based on the Minister's comments then, can we perceive that they're planning to change the premiums at more than once every six months in the future? And further to that, can the Minister give us the cost of production formula that is used and the various components that go into that formula?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the formula is outlined in the contract. There are 12 component parts to the formula and the formula has stayed consistently. There has been no change in the formula and there's no intended change in the formula that we have within the contract in terms of the support price. So that's part of every producer's contract as to how the cost of production is arrived at.

If the honourable member wants a sample contract, we can certainly provide him with a sample contract.

MR. G. FINDLAY: What we don't have is the weightings of the various factors to know what percentage each of those components contributes to the pricing mechanism.

HON. B. URUSKI: We will endeavour to provide that information for the honourable member. We don't have that information here as to how the calculations are done in terms of those 12 criteria. Staff would be doing the analysis. The Economics Branch would be doing the analysis for the Beef Commission as to how those factors are weighted.

MR. G. FINDLAY: The Minister mentioned in his previous comments that the producers should be marketing based on market signals; and market signals mean net return that he can anticipate when he markets his animal, and certainly achieving top grade is one good market signal. But each year when we get into late May and June, there's always a rush in the country, thinking, hey, the formula is going to change to my detriment on July 1 and there's a rush of animals.

Any figures I've seen in terms of the number of animals handled by the Beef Commission in June of this year and last year, they increase sharply, because producers aren't trusting the commission in terms of their approach to the formula on July 1.

I asked the Minister some time ago for what the grades were in the last month before the price change and he gave me the figures for May, which is two months before. I would like, if he has the percentage A-1's and A-2's in June of the last three years, so we can determine if there is a rush of animals to the market, the number of animals that are unfinished, and is the commission sorting these animals if there are more unfinished animals coming to market that shouldn't be

coming to market? Certainly he can't dispute the fact that this rush to market in June does interfere with the auction market, the live market price drops — it certainly has dropped this year — and this disruption in the marketing of beef because of high numbers and I suspect some unfinished animals coming to market that shouldn't be coming, how is the commission going to approach this problem in the future?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, while I don't have the figures for this year's finished animals. I think the big factor in determining how many unfinished animals would enter the marketplace in any particular time would of course be the grading and the percent that gave Grade A's. In fact the Beef Commission, in terms of the marketability of animals, has been consistently higher than the provincial average in terms of the number of animals graded A. For example, 93.2 percent graded A in the Province of Manitoba. I'm trying to give some indication that over the last number of years, we have consistently out-performed, or at least been at or above the provincial average, for the percent of animals marketed as Grade A.

What has been happening, Mr. Chairman, is more than the stabilization in terms of allowing or signalling people to market their animals, is primarily the biology of the animals. There are many producers who now finish animals within the 12- to 13-month time frame, and with calving in March and April, the May and June time frame is right on in terms of animals being finished. With the new larger carcasses and breeds that are coming to market, they are just finishing them right on and that, of course, has been a changing phenomenon over the last, I would say half dozen years, in terms of breed performance and type of carcasses that have been able to finish, and the length of time that animals have been finished has been as much of a factor in this whole matter, as I would say, more so than the level of support.

In 1985, for example, the commission marketed over 80,000 head of slaughter cattle, of which 92.5 percent graded A's. This compares to provincial average of 89.2, so, Mr. Chairman, taking the entire year . . .

MR. G. FINDLAY: Month by month.

HON. B. URUSKI: Well, I don't have those breakdowns in terms of month by month, but if June was such a major month of marketing, let's just take that argument. In fact, there was a disproportionate amount of off-grades or unfinished cattle, then clearly our percentage that we reach of 92.5 would in fact been significantly depressed by that one major month of marketing as to animals being unfinished. The commission, I would say, has been doing an excellent job in trying to assist producers in making sure that their animals are in fact finished, but that's not to say that there wouldn't be some that in fact slip by and are not checked.

We do ask producers on an ongoing basis that if they're not certain that their animals are finished before they market them, that the commission will provide that type of service and assessment for them if they want to have the animals checked. That's an ongoing service that the commission does provide, but I'll have to provide the honourable member, if he wants a

Tuesday, 24 June, 1986

breakdown of month by month for the last couple of years, we'll get the commission to prepare that schedule and I'll give it to my honourable friend.

MR. G. FINDLAY: You gave me the figures the other day for May so you should be able to pull them out for June too. Well, the previous June, and if you want to wait until the end of this month, that's okay too.

I guess the next question I'd like to ask is you mentioned that the market is handling around 80,000 head. Is that 80,000 head of finished animals or is that 80,000 between the feeders and calves and finished animals? You said 80,000 head handled by the commission. Is that 80,000 finished or is that 80,000 of all types?

HON. B. URUSKI: Slaughter cattle.

MR. G. FINDLAY: As I understand the contract, each producer is allowed to ship up to a maximum of 80 percent of his calf allotment

What's the percentage of producers that are marketing exactly that maximum, and has that marketing trend to market to the maximum changed very much since the inception of the plan in '82?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, initially, it was raised as a concern that the commission limited the amount of marketings to 80 percent. In fact, in actual practice, very few producers are marketing to their full capacity of 80 percent.

What we did find, Mr. Chairman, initially, there were a few what I would call people attempting to use the commission, and I say use in a direct sense. What was happening is that they were marketing as part of their herd 100 percent of their stock as steers. Well, since when is one's herd all born as steers? It hurts one in terms of the integrity of the farming community when one or two people attempt to basically use a system that is there for the benefit of producers and actually try and take advantage of it. It's those kinds of scenarios that make the commission members put up some fairly stringent rules because there are game players out there. Unfortunately, you end up putting some fairly stringent rules because there are a few that in fact want to play those kind of games.

MR. G. FINDLAY: You suggest that some people abuse the system by overmarketing. What kind of numbers are we talking about? Is it still ongoing? And what is the average percent marketings through the some 5,000 contract holders that does take place?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, is the member speaking about slaughter animals . . .

MR. G. FINDLAY: Yes.

HON. B. URUSKI: . . . or all marketing?

MR. G. FINDLAY: No, the slaughter animals marketing.

MR. G. FINDLAY: No, Mr. Chairman, we'd have to try and get that information for him as an average. I don't believe I have any of that information here. It just so happens, Mr. Chairman, that our general manager, Mr. Joe Dunsmore of the Beef Commission, happens to be out of town and will be out of town at meetings rurally likely for the rest of the week so that some of the detailed questions we will have to take as notice and provide for honourable members.

We've got a lot of the general information but specific statistical information that members want, we will provide them with whatever we've got in our notes. If we've got the information, we'll give it and if we don't, we will have to get that information for them. In fact, even if he was here, I venture to say that we could give probably better approximate answers but we would not be able to be specific even if he was here.

MR. G. FINDLAY: I suggest the hour being what it is that we pull the pin.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is the pleasure of the committee?

HON. B. URUSKI: I think there is a general disposition that committee rise, and I so move.

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

IN SESSION

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, the hour being ten o'clock, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, that this House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Wednesday).