

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 p.m., Friday, March 12, 1976

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed this afternoon I would like to draw the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 20 students of Grade 9 standing of the Ste. Agathe School, under the direction of Mrs. Rioux. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Springfield, the Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

On behalf of all the honourable members, I welcome you to this Assembly.

SUPPLY - URBAN AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN: We adjourned at 12:30. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I would like if before we proceed with some other remarks, if the Minister would be able to answer some of those initial questions that were put to him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I'm not clear precisely what those questions were. The member was not that precise, at least that I could follow. He asked about how does the corporation determine where it will build, to what extent. They have, as I understand, some general guidelines. Family public housing is based on two percent of the population; for the elderly it is based on five percent of the population over age 65. But those are not, you know, hard and fast rules because in some communities such as Winnipeg, for example, those guidelines have to be exceeded. In northern Manitoba certain communities as well, the mix would have to be different; Thompson, Manitoba, really doesn't need any elderly housing because there's a fairly young population.

I think he asked a question with regard to the number of family housing units as compared to elderly. I believe there is about 5,400 elderly persons' housing and about 3,750 family public housing of which 2,000 of those family public housing would be in Winnipeg, about 1,720 outside of Winnipeg. With regard to elderly persons' housing, there's about 3,800 in Winnipeg and about 1,600 outside of Winnipeg. Now as the member knows, Winnipeg is an area where there has been difficulty in getting projects going. Last year I think we made some bit of breakthrough and we're hoping this year the pace can continue and even grow so that there will be more construction within the City of Winnipeg itself. I think those are the - as I understood the questions - those are the questions that the member posed and perhaps he could be more specific in the answers that he's trying to get from me or that I might know the answers to. If I've missed anything perhaps he'll remind me.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me just reiterate for the sake of clarification with the Minister. The point of the questioning I was raising as we broke off this morning was to try and determine again from the Minister what the basic goals and objectives of the corporation are and how they translate those into certain specific numbers, that there must be some assessment of those groups of the population that are to be specifically served by public housing as compared to other forms of housing. Those groups are located in different parts of the province; they are of different ages; they have different incomes and have different backgrounds. And all I was first trying to determine before we look more directly at the Public Housing Program per se is to establish so that we have the same information to work with, what really are the targets that the corporation have and to what degree they have achieved those targets as a consequence or as a result of the programs that they have initiated thus far and what kind of scheduling of achievement do they see over the next two or three years; so that we can get some further understanding of the kind of program in public housing that the corporation hopes to undertake and how it's related to what one would consider to be those in the population that are in most severe need

## SUPPLY - URBAN AFFAIRS

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . . of social housing. That was the point of the questioning, and if the Minister wanted to comment on that then I would relinquish it before I went on to further remarks.

Well, under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, the reason for raising such questions is to begin looking at the Public Housing Program per se. This program has been the most direct and immediate response that this government has made since its coming into power to the housing needs of low income people in the province. I'm not sure, I think I have read most of the past debates. I don't think that it's ever really been subject to a great deal of scrutiny, at least to the point of view of asking some questions about the make-up and character of that program itself. I think as we all recognize public housing has been pretty much the standard response in this country for about the last 20 years in the social housing field, and along the way a lot of pretty important questions have been asked about it's effectiveness as a solution to the problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I wonder if I could just invite the member's indulgence for a moment here.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: When I introduced the class that was here before, I had two slips before me, and inadvertently I read the wrong group out that was here and the members all applauded. So perhaps if I start all over again, both classes are here now and I'll get it right.

In the gallery we have 18 students of the Holy Ghost School under the direction of Mr. R. Joyal. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

On behalf of all the honourable members I bid you welcome.

We also have 20 students, I believe here now, from Ste. Agathe School, Grade 9 standing, under Mrs. R. Rioux. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Springfield, the Honourable Minister for Tourism and Recreation.

On behalf of the members of the Assembly, I bid you welcome this afternoon.

SUPPLY - URBAN AFFAIRS Cont'd

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. Thank you very much.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I was saying, I think one of the questions we should be looking at is the adequacy of the public housing solution to the problem of low income housing needs, and the adequacy of it both counted in social terms and in economic terms because right now we are planning and projecting the expenditure of a substantial amount of capital, both federal and provincial, to the Public Housing Program. And along the way are accumulating an increasing number of operating subsidies that amount to I guess, I think the Minister said close to \$3½ million this year, if that's the correct figure. And of course every time you add a unit to a public housing stock you're probably adding another \$2,000 per unit subsidy each time you do it. So when you add up the costs of the public capital that's being invested in public housing along with the operating subsidy - estimates given by the Canadian Council of Social Development say that you can tabulate an ongoing annual subsidy per unit of around \$2,000 or better depending on the location of the unit.

So, Mr. Chairman, that's an expensive item, it's a very costly item. And therefore it really has to be asked, I guess, on some cost-benefit formula whether it is the most appropriate or practical or feasible way of meeting the problem of low income housing needs; or whether in fact you could take the same amount of government expenditure and get more for your money out of it with a different kind of mixture of housing. I would simply point out, as the Minister probably knows, a

## SUPPLY - URBAN AFFAIRS

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . . number of studies have been done on this; the Dennis Fish Study that was done on low income housing for CMHC two or three years back, estimate for example that you could have far more units of housing per expenditure through a rent supplement system than you could through a public housing expenditure; that there was more bangs for the buck if you like, or more units for the dollar; and that therefore that kind of program might in fact be a more equitable program because it would reach further numbers of people; that you would in fact be not discriminating against those who aren't able for one reason or another to get into public housing.

I simply raise that question because I think we are in a time of economic constraints and we should be asking how can we stretch the housing dollar for the Province of Manitoba to its furthest extent, how can we help the most people in the most effective fashion? Therefore I think it's important to raise the question with the Minister about the equitability of the public housing program - not that it doesn't provide good housing for a certain number of low income people, the question is could we be providing more low income housing with a different mixture of programs - perhaps not by putting so much of our eggs in one basket, not by putting so much emphasis on the public housing program but taking those fairly heavy subsidy costs and spreading them out into other directions. I think, as we have talked about before, the supplement idea is one that has been applied with some frequency in Ontario. I think now they are talking about 3,500 units, where they allow the private builder to put up the capital in effect and then lease a range of units. Now the Minister mentioned that he has some agreements like that operating presently in the Province of Manitoba, but compared to the commitment of public housing it's a fairly minor commitment. I'm simply raising, not by way of criticism, but really raising the issue with him about the comparative advantage of using government funds for one form of support for low income housing needs as opposed to the other. And to really put the question to him pretty directly, could we not be perhaps satisfying more of those needs by a different form of expenditure, either through the rent supplement system or through further incentives in terms of limited dividend movements, second mortgages, there is a whole range of proposals we could raise about them. So that would be one of the questions I would like to really put, because I think that it is a very critical one in terms of the public housing program.

A second line of questioning, Mr. Chairman, while we are looking at public housing, is the location of it. Because I think one of the problems, and one that we shouldn't divorce ourselves from, is that the simple supply of a unit of housing doesn't really make for much satisfaction. What one also has to be looking at is the surrounding amenities and services in the community. Is it well placed in terms of transportation? Of shopping? Of potential occupation and employment? And one of the issues I wanted to raise with the Minister, perhaps he can give us some description really of where in fact are public housing units, particularly those for families and to a less extent for senior citizens, located? Are they being located so as to make it easier for example for people to get employment? If you are dealing with a generally low income group of people, one of their primary requirements is to get employment. They can't get employment if they are removed from places where they don't have effective public transportation. I think that the assessments of this problem that have been done by the Federal Government demonstrate that one of the serious difficulties with public housing is often located in suburban areas and fringe areas or areas which are poorly serviced and therefore acts as a deterrent to potential employment opportunities, and oftentimes acts as a handicap and a hardship for senior citizens who may be living in it.

I again would simply like to note, because we really haven't had the opportunity in the past with the Minister to raise questions about public housing, to acquire from him what kind of planning procedure goes into the location of public housing and how well is it being distributed. And is it designed and located according to the requirements of proper servicing and proper amenities. The reason I raise it in particular, Mr. Chairman, I was rather disturbed by the Minister's suggestion that he is going to depend to a large extent upon proposal calls as the way to secure public housing. And again going back to that Dennis Fish Study was done on the Federal level, they were very critical of the use of proposal calls as a way of tendering or a way of securing public housing. They

## SUPPLY - URBAN AFFAIRS

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . .said first the builder is going to give you his junk piece of land, he is going to find every sort of odd and sod little piece of land that he couldn't sort of utilize in the public market and put it up for a proposal calls, and because there is a certain tendency on the part of housing Ministers to get the number of units up and to sort of reach quotas, then they tend to too easily buy expensive land in poor locations, which doesn't do the eventual tenants much good.

Secondly, and I guess just as importantly, is that oftentimes that kind of proposal call thing can lead to serious questions of cost and that oftentimes the cost on the proposal calls for land in particular are inflated. And therefore I was concerned when the Minister said that that was the means by which he was relying upon, the production that was put forward to be achieved. I really am concerned about it and I really feel that it may be much more, while it might be slightly slower, that reverting to a more proper tender arrangement or a tourniquet operation might be a more effective way of supplying public housing. Because I think it may in fact affect the tenants as negatively as it may affect the taxpayer who has to pay the extra costs that come as a result of the proposal call system.

So that the second line of questioning, Mr. Chairman, is really where is the public housing going and how well placed is it in terms of the needs of people who are going to be living there? Is it placed well? Is it placed so that there is proper amenities? Is the planning that goes on in the communities properly undertaken? And this relates to a further question about the way in which the disputes have arisen about the location of public housing. I agree with the Minister when he says that he has run into a lot of difficulty in different communities getting zoning agreements, or builders' agreements on public housing, there is no question there's been an awful lot of community dispute and reaction against it. The issue I would raise with him is why and to what degree has MHRC sought to work and consult with those communities in which it hopes to place its low income housing? To what degree has it undertaken to sit down with the residents, explain to them what they intend to do, show them what the impact of that public housing project may or may not be and demonstrate to them that in fact it may not necessarily result in an increased cost in school taxes and whatever? And if it does, to what degree is the government prepared to compensate for it?

ANNOUNCEMENT - TRANSIT STRIKE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): I wonder if my honourable friend would allow me to make an interruption of his very interesting remarks. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to announce that the transit strike appears to be over, that City Council this morning by a vote of about 47 to 1 accepted the latest offer. I am now informed as of about five minutes ago that the union membership has voted to accept the offer by 79.6 percent majority. In making this announcement to the House, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that all members will be pleased that notwithstanding many hours in negotiations that the buses will be rolling very very shortly, and may I suggest to my honourable colleagues they leave their cars at home and use Transit Tom.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the members of the opposition I can say that we join with the Minister of Labour and members of his government in welcoming this announcement that he has made, and that this transit strike of some 47 days' duration is now ended. I am sure that this is most welcome news, and we know that all members of the House including those on this side join with him in applauding this news today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, just before I return directly to the housing, may I also say that the members of this group share in the pleasure of the House in the settlement of the strike, and would also say that we feel and hope in fact that the long hours and the commitment by the Minister of Labour in trying to find solutions have been respected and appreciated, certainly by members of this group, that we feel he is owed

## ANNOUNCEMENT - TRANSIT STRIKE

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . . some gratitude at least for the concern that he has shown to this very serious problem. We only hope now that the strike has been settled that the government will now get down to the business of finding ways of anticipating future strikes in the public service so we don't have to go through quite the same anguish that we did in the past.

SUPPLY - URBAN AFFAIRS Cont'd

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, going back to the question of public housing. One of the issues that is being raised, again with the Minister, was the way in which the corporation itself goes about introducing itself to a community in which it wants to place a project, the degree to which planning is undertaken, the consultation goes on. And again I raise it because there were certain disturbing elements that the Minister raised in one of his remarks the other night when to the shouts of applause of his assorted colleagues he said, I'm getting tired of dealing with people; or this participation is nice in theory but it doesn't work in practice. I would simply want to remind the Minister - I know that the Minister of Consumer Affairs would not associate himself with those remarks, but that certainly the Minister of Mines would because he was the most vociferous in support. But the fact is that one of the lessons I suppose we have learned, or should have learned by now, and I guess some have learned it, is that one of the most effective ways of planning in the urban area is to make sure that there is full consultation with people; that the one way that you can learn to spite yourself, to frustrate your own activities, is to play like you're going to do the authoritarian kick of coming and telling people how to do it and what you are going to do for them as opposed to doing it with them. I think that that, Mr. Chairman, I would simply raise - I hope that the Minister's own personal opinion is not reflected in the activity of the corporation. Because if it is, then I would suggest that may in fact be one of the reasons why they have trouble getting their projects accepted or agreed upon, simply because they don't approach it with the proper respect for the rights of those communities in which they hope to place these projects, nor go about the planning and consultation in the most effective manner. I would simply say that if there is a concern about the future ability of the government to locate its housing in a variety of areas throughout Winnipeg, that one of the absolute essential requirements for it is not to approach the problem from a point of view of "we know what's best and we're going to show you what we can do." I think they must approach it on a basis of shared partnership, and if it takes a little longer time on the front end to get agreement and acceptance, it will take a lot less time on the back end in terms of getting the actual agreement on the project. I think that that is a lesson that should be learned by now, and I would suggest that if it is not the working theory of the corporation then it certainly should be because they would save themselves an awful lot of grievance and probably find themselves with a more successful housing program.

An additional question, Mr. Chairman, aside from those three that I'd like to raise about the public housing project, is the question of mixture. This is an issue that has been raised I know by a number of social organizations, and that is to what degree does public housing simply become the accommodation only for the lowest on the income ladder? In fact I know that from, again a study that was done on the Winnipeg public housing projects, I think it's a year or so ago, they estimated that close to half of the tenants in public housing were single parent families. Now I think that number is close to being approximate. It may be corrected by now, but it does indicate, Mr. Chairman, that you are combining a number of people with similar kinds of difficulties, similar kinds of problems, all in the same place. One of the proposals or recommendations that have come from a number of social organizations in the field, is that we should aim for a much better mixture of population groups in public housing; that one way to avoid stigmas being attached, to avoid some of the concentration of social problems being in the same location would be to provide for mixtures of population. I know that the Government of British Columbia, at least the previous Government of British Columbia had

## SUPPLY - URBAN AFFAIRS

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . . undertaken a very specific directive program in their public housing areas to mix tenants, to make sure that there was a range of incomes, a range of families and a range of backgrounds as a way of ensuring that that community of public housing tenants was not identified simply as a low income compound but in fact was simply a housing division or project like any other, as a way of therefore avoiding some of the stigmas and some of the problems that are sometimes associated with public housing.

And again, Mr. Chairman, I am not aware of whether there is any policy in this area on the part of the Manitoba Government or Manitoba Housing, whether in fact they have acknowledged some of that particular thesis that there should be a range of mixtures and in fact are doing something to forward it. So I think that that would be again another area of investigation and I would welcome hearing from the Minister as to what is the policy or theory related to that use of public housing.

So ultimately Mr. Chairman, it does come down to the question of having raised those issues on location, planning and mixture, I still think that the kind of question that the Minister does have to answer in terms of satisfying the effectiveness of his Estimates though, is the benefits that he gets from the expenditures he's putting in; and whether in fact the corporation or he himself has explored a range of other alternatives to find out whether in fact he could get more production of lower income units for people who need help through another type of program, an alternative policy mix, than simply on the concentration of public housing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now that the member has clarified the information he's seeking, I'll try to deal with it.

You know, he's touching not on the specific program, he's talking on the generality of it to a great extent. He talks about proposal calls versus the ideal situation, which is where the corporation would own the land, the serviced land, would call in an architect, have it designed and then put it out for tender, which I suppose could be considered the ideal.

On the other hand one has to cope with the realities of what it is and not what one hopes it will be. The available land, zoned land available in Winnipeg is not that great. Therefore the use of proposal calls is a very effective instrument because the proposer must have the land already zoned with all the requirements of the City of Winnipeg being met so that when the proposal is made the project can be started immediately within that fiscal year. And it's important of course that it go in that fiscal year, otherwise money lapses.

A number of years ago, initially as a matter of fact, the MHRC I think started their program pretty well under the proposal call system, then they proceeded to acquire land and had them designed, and the experience then was that the all-up unit cost was just about the same. There wasn't too much difference. So the suggestion that proposal calls are more expensive isn't so. The corporation is very tough as a matter of fact in looking at proposal calls. I recall last fall one of the proposal calls was rejected for the very reason that the member mentioned, because of the location to services and to facilities and so on, and although it appeared on the surface as a good proposal call, it was not followed up, it was not accepted by the corporation and they looked at other proposal calls.

In the final analysis it's the all-up cost which is almost a tourniquet operation of the project which determines whether or not MHRC will accept it; and of course they then have to go to CMHC for their approval both in principle and then the actual technical approvals. I can assure the honourable member that the corporation will be looking very closely and watching all proposal call projects to assure that it's built to the standard that is desired and that meets the requirements of MHRC and CMHC as well.

He asks, where are we going? Well, you know, I could perhaps answer that question better if we had achieved the target of eliminating all waiting lists. And then of course one can then try to change the program and alter it to the point where we can then look at where people live and try to get greater mixes, a better mix than exists today, because I admit that in some areas the mix isn't as good as it could be. On the

## SUPPLY - URBAN AFFAIRS

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . . other hand I can tell the honourable member that the mix is getting better. We are trying to avoid putting the whole welfare family, for example, in one project. That is not the case. The Rent Supplement Program which is comparatively new, where we rent in private facilities, quite a number of single parent families are being placed in those facilities. I believe that there's something like - I'm trying to recall the number - about 315 units in Winnipeg which are being rented from the private sector, and those are for family purposes.

The question of participation of the community acceptance of projects, that is very difficult. When I vented my frustrations the other day, I did so because it is a very frustrating thing to deal with. When you have a program, there is a need, there's pressure; you know that there are people out there who need accommodation, and the process of trying to get it is so frustrating. This has been proven - in Winnipeg in 1974, I believe it was, the number of units that went up were really very very low. The corporation I can tell him, however, does its darndest to work within the community committee to get approvals. I know they do go to community committee meetings; they meet, they discuss and they try to get things going. Unfortunately that sometimes isn't enough and the best of intentions just don't result in any positive results.

However, as I said earlier, there was more activity last year in Winnipeg than had been the year before that. It was I think due to a proposal call system being used, because it had been set aside back in 1972. The proposal call system therefore did tend to assist construction in Winnipeg.

He talked in terms of, is public housing the only vehicle? And of course it isn't the only vehicle. It's just one of the vehicles. It happens to be the major thrust of this government and will probably continue to be because that is a vehicle that's recognized across the country. The member can be critical of the Manitoba Government, in which case he should include in his criticism every other province in Canada as well as the Federal Government because they too have made it a major thrust.

That doesn't mean that other programs aren't in place. We have as I mentioned earlier, the Assisted Rental Program under Section 44(1)(a) where up to a certain limit, because the CMHC will not participate beyond a certain amount per year, we're allowed to go into the private market and acquire some units. But I think the member should recognize that when you have a low vacancy rate and a tight market that CMHC - and I don't blame them for this, I think they're right - feels really that the emphasis should be on new construction, adding new stock rather than simply acquiring old stock and placing families in there because of their economic need. And no one denies the economic need, but to displace one family with another is, well, almost like playing musical chairs, it doesn't add to the stock of housing. Because in the final analysis what will ameliorate the situation, what will provide adequate housing for everybody irrespective of income, is a large enough stock of housing.

So the private sector will provide for those who can afford housing. And of course we have our Assisted Home Ownership Program, which is linked to the AHOP program of the Federal Government. So although we do have a Rent Supplement Program, it is a limited one and it cannot really be greater than it is or should it be because of the tight housing situation which we're living in today. When and if the situation changes and perhaps there's a four or four and a half percent vacancy rate, at that time the kind of movement that the member refers to can take place. But until that day happens the corporation will continue to try to acquire new units, it will continue to acquire as many single in-fill lots as possible within the City of Winnipeg; and so they're on scattered sites, they're all over the place, they're not set anywhere.

You know, the kind of projects like Lord Selkirk Park I think are a thing of the past. It was done and I can't really be all that critical - I personally can't be all that critical of the Lord Selkirk Park development although I know that today these things are frowned upon. I would ask the member to reflect however on what existed prior to Lord Selkirk and the places that these people had to live in. And so for all the negative aspects of Lord Selkirk, the social problems etc., the "ghetto-ization" that the member refers to, nonetheless the housing that these people now live in is superior to what they

## SUPPLY - URBAN AFFAIRS

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . . lived in before a place like Lord Selkirk Park or the Burrows-Keewatin, I think it's called Gilbert Park, before those projects came into being. And there's an attempt as I say by the corporation to get a mix - in Nassau Square there's going to be some housing for sale and some of the units will be under the public housing scheme. And it's this kind of mix that is gradually taking place and is being improved upon as time goes on.

The member asked about studies on the choice of sites, and that study as a matter of fact . . . You know, the corporation didn't have until very recently much in the way of a research and development arm. It has only recently acquired that and such studies are taking place, but even though these studies take place, in the final analysis again what will happen is what the realities dictate.

Housing is needed. The MHRC will try to get land and sites at the best locations. On the other hand you cannot build where land is not available and therefore they will take what is available, keeping in mind however that the sites chosen are accessible to schools in the case of families, and in the case of elder person housing is accessible to transit or transportation. These things are taken into account whenever these projects are planned.

I can tell the honourable member that the other provinces have similar problems within their municipalities. Unfortunately the City of Winnipeg is not itself active through a housing corporation as our other major cities. It would help a great deal if the city did have it's own housing corporation as in Vancouver, Toronto and most other major cities, but in Winnipeg it isn't the case and so MHRC is left with a major job of providing this kind of housing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I just would like to take issue with the Minister on a couple of key points. First, I don't still find his answers to be as satisfactory as they may. He said I wasn't being very precise in being general, well that's exactly what he is doing. I sat down and said I want some dollar figures, I want some costs and benefits of one form of housing related to another so we can start figuring out that when you get a budget of \$12.4 million what's the best way of getting the most number of units on the ground with it. We get some kind of answer, well we think it's the best way of doing public housing and other provinces do the same.

I just simply think we need to get a better kind of economic examination of this, and so we say, how do we cut these things so that we get further use out of our money or the best use of our money? There is always an awful lot more needed than there is money to supply it. I think therefore one of the requirements of any government is to ensure that starting out with the objective of assisting low income people to the largest extent possible, they should do it in the most efficient way and the most effective way, and that simply means getting the best use out of your dollars. And I still haven't really heard, maybe the figures aren't there - let's get some cost comparisons, for example, of one form over another. I can take the words of the Minister, but you know there's the old saying - what was the program done on civilization on television a couple of years back, and that very distinguished frosty Englishman who spoke on it said some memorable words which I will always remember, "If I had to measure civilization by the speeches given by a Minister of Housing or by the units being built, I would rather take the number of units being built". I think that tends to be the standard I would wish to apply, that I think you have to look at what's being done, what's the performance as opposed to what is the prose that's being used to describe it. And that I think is still our difficulty, that we have to examine the alternative forms, as in this case.

I would take somewhat further issue with the Minister in saying it may be that you could improve and expand the supply of lower income housing by redistribution of your income in a more effective way. For example, he said we must promote the supply of new housing. Well that is not necessarily, Mr. Chairman, the way always of going about doing it, because at the same time that you promoting the supply of new housing, new housing is a very expensive item in terms of capital use. I expect the building cost per square foot for a public housing unit now is what \$25.00, \$30.00, something in that range. As compared to - what happens if you apply your money first to supplying land

## SUPPLY - URBAN AFFAIRS

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . . that could then be used by non-profit builders or by private builders and let them use their private capital for the same purpose. Because when you're capital short as this province is, as every province is, part of your objective should be to mobilize private capital to serve a degree of public prefaces. That therefore one of the major cost components in any housing program is a heavy input of land, as well as the much heavier administrative costs of a government corporation; that the tag end dollars are applied because it is government corporation, because they've got MLAs asking questions and they have to be much more careful and precise in what they're doing, simply adds more bodies in the hallway and the corridors, and therefore the administrative costs get tagged on to it. But if you can develop ways of stimulating the use of someone else's capital either in terms of private capital or by giving a much greater accent to the third sector housing, the non-profit area, then you might be able to expand the supply far beyond what you're getting out of a direct public housing program.

I think that again when he says other provinces use public housing as their major vehicle, I don't think that's quite true. I think most provinces utilize public housing but if you look at the mixtures being supplied, the Province of British Columbia certainly in no way emphasizes public housing as its major answer to the problem. Quite the contrary, Mr. Chairman. When the New Democratic Government of British Columbia came in they made some very conscious policy choices not to promote public housing but to provide alternative fields particularly in the support of the non-profit sector. While they still continue to build public housing, it was not almost the exclusive answer in that they applied their moneys and their lands to alternative uses.

Similarly, Mr. Chairman, in the Province of Ontario, which again is one of the big housing producers, they had a thing called the Community Integrated Housing Program which provides second mortgages to groups which gives them an extra cost benefit as well as land to supply lower moderate income housing. Again it's a way of taking scarce capital and stretching it by making sure that you tag on some private effort along with it.

All I'm simply arguing or suggesting or recommending is that I think the Minister and I share objectives. We want to get more low income housing built for a wider range of people in a different kind of way. I am suggesting, however, that you might be able to do that more effectively if there was a better variety of means of doing it and that therefore you would be able to use your public capital as the teasers or as the additional filler to provide the stimulant of private activity either of a profit or non-profit form. That's really the case we're getting at. It's not that we're against public housing; what we're against is the ineffective use of public capital particularly when it's so scarce.

I would therefore suggest, Mr. Chairman, another alternative is, when he says that we must put our emphasis on new construction, well there's never been an accurate study done on the City of Winnipeg but if you look at the older housing market and the older existing housing market, there are a large number of homes particularly now available at good prices that could be utilized and particularly in that \$15,000 to \$18,000 to \$22,000 range --(Interjection)-- Oh, no, that's not quite true. Frankly I don't think the Minister of Oranges knows what he's talking about. If he wants I'll give him the other information because the work of some corporations are in the existing housing market in the non-profit field and that is a fairly active market right now, and it is available for much better use for low income families if in fact there was some leverage applied publicly.

Also another thing I don't think that we recognize, there's an awful lot of housing that drops out of the market. You know, you're putting new housing in at the top and there's always housing coming out the bottom for lack of repair, lack of rehabilitation, because the area itself is deteriorating. I suspect that we lose several hundred units of housing - I've had it estimated to me - that we probably will lose seven to eight hundred units of housing in the City of Winnipeg a year through one means or another, that simply they disappear from the market. What we should also be looking at is partially a salvage operation to rescue those kinds of units and put them back into the

## SUPPLY - URBAN AFFAIRS

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . . market in good shape for the use of lower income families. I believe there's a program in the United States called the Urban Homesteading Program which simply works on the old principle, I guess, that we've worked on in the western prairies, that the public would acquire these somewhat dilapidated or poorly repaired units, housing units, sell them at a very minimal price or rent them out to a family on the basis that they will then fix them up and improve them and be given some materials to do it, so that they in effect get their own stake in the thing. They put housing back on the market and rather than losing a very valuable asset, the opportunity is given for people to come back. And you say, well, boy, that gets to be expensive but the fact of the matter is you've got to make a choice. Are you going to subsidize a family upwards of \$2,000 a year in a public housing unit or are you going to take that amount of money or even less to put people into their own unit at less cost and not get into that heavy expenditure of perhaps \$30,000 or \$40,000 per unit for a public housing project. Now those are the kind of trade-offs that you have to make in developing a proper housing program.

I'm not satisfied with the kind of relatively vague answers that we've been getting that those kind of economic trade-offs have been examined, that they are being applied and that therefore in a time when there's a severe pinch, when there is a shortage, when there is waiting lists and when there is a real demand for housing on the lower part of the market, that we are getting the best use out of the money that we are now investing, which is really my concern, that at this time that we do the best we can with the public money that we have available.

Now the other side of that argument as well, Mr. Chairman, is this: I still think we may have to wait and see until we get to the Capital Estimates but one of the things that also concerns me is the priorities that the government sets on its capital allocation for housing. I suggested in this House, I believe, last year that in the area, for example, when we received about \$80 million back from the Canada Pension Plan Fund, from the Federal Government, at about eight percent or eight and a quarter percent, that a large part of that money should be devoted to housing purposes and that rather than being diverted into the Manitoba Development Corporation or into these other investment programs, that the basic uses should be perhaps for schools and housing. It should be used for social capital costs rather than trickling away into the maws of these other little sort of kind of ventures that the government likes to exercise itself in.

I would simply like to say, Mr. Chairman, that in the use of the capital pension plan money that is coming in, we would probably again get a better use of that money first if we put it into housing and even more importantly at this present stage, put that money to invest in the services that support human settlements and housing. One of the real serious drawbacks presently, certainly in Winnipeg and perhaps in other communities is a lack of capital for sewage systems, for storm sewers, for utility lines, just the expansion and availability of land. The Minister himself has conceded about the problem of shortage of serviced land, the difficulty in making it available, of getting hold of it. One of the reasons then again is in comparison to other provinces this province does provide almost virtually no assistance for those kind of capital investments by the city to develop its servicing. I think the Member from Sturgeon Creek and the Minister were musing on a few . . . , let's get back to local improvement type financing. Well that's okay in terms of the ordinary residential street but you still need the basic heavy capital of storm sewers and roadways and so on to open up those undeveloped portions of urban land for development purposes which we're not doing in the city. We are in short supply and therefore we don't have a program of municipal lending for capital services which again I believe that that CPP money could be most usefully devoted to. Because if we're trying to promote growth and development and progress again you're going to get a much better use and application out of your money in those cases rather than, sort of, I don't know, filing it away through the MDC which we've been doing for the last several years.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think that there are still very serious questions about the allocation of funds and the priorities we set on them and certainly the performance and results we get as a result of the public expenditures of money in the housing field.

## SUPPLY - URBAN AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I guess there's a basic difference in our approaches here. If I understand the member correctly what he is basically suggesting is he's critical of the fact that the province, through Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, is putting its capital into projects which are owned by MHRC. If I understand the member correctly he feels that more money should flow from the province to the non-profit sector, to the private sector and that we should go through the rent supplement program in order to get, as he feels, more value.

I can't agree with that because what he's basically saying to me is give the private sector money so they can build, so you can rent to pay off their mortgage so that ten years from now they can have a beautiful capital gain. I'd rather that the project was left in the ownership of Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation so it could be used ever after for public housing projects so they can control the flow in, can change the mixes as required, but in the final analysis it remains an asset of the people and it's not something that a private entrepreneur is making capital on.

Mr. Chairman, the Corporation did recognize that it needed a variation of programs and as I indicated before they have indeed, they have indeed gone toward the assisted rental program. As I indicated there are 315 units, including scattered units, being rented from the private sector. This year CMHC has indicated that they will allow MHRC to enter into that sort of rent supplement agreement for 300 additional units in Manitoba. That's the ceiling they put on it because they too want new units. They don't want to simply displace one family with another family. That doesn't really resolve the problem in the long run. So it's new housing stock.

Insofar as non-profit organizations are concerned, by all means, I hope they build and build and build. MHRC stands ready to make arrangements with them to lease as many units as the organization wants to make available to MHRC. I know up to 25 percent, certainly MHRC can enter into an agreement for. In the case of St. Andrews Place which the member is knowledgeable of, when that was built this particular section which now permits this kind of arrangement wasn't there, so that the elderly housing component of St. Andrews Place was leased in total to MHRC for fifty years, I believe. Of course a rent supplement is in place.

With regard to co-ops, MHRC is working very closely with co-ops. There are the two I mentioned earlier, Carpathia and Village Canadien which are two co-ops. One is open now and one will be open in 1976. There are three other co-ops being developed or in the development stages now. MHRC will make the land available to them and again 25 percent of the units will be leased back to MHRC so that MHRC can utilize that for public housing.

So I guess in the final analysis where we disagree is really in how the provincial public dollars should be spent. I am not inclined to spend them if I could towards the assistance of the private entrepreneur to build and therefore to eventually achieve ownership through rents paid through the public sector. We're doing some of this and this year we'll hopefully get another 300 units in Manitoba under the same system but I would not give it the high priority that the member seems to give.

Last year there was a program called the Limited Dividend Program which the Federal Government, CMHC, had announced. As I indicated MHRC, because it was structured the way it is, was able to take advantage of that program and one-third of the units built were built through MHRC, those units built by the private sector which got their funds through CMHC and the capital was there, it was allocated for Manitoba, it was used. Those units too will have 25 percent of the suites and apartments made available to MHRC so that when they're completed MHRC will be able to move families in under the public housing subsidy program.

So what I'm saying to the member is we do have a variety. To suggest that it's a singular - and I used that term once before - a singular program, a singular thrust, is quite incorrect. It's a very varied program including the construction of housing under the assisted home ownership program. Even to that extent where housing will be made available for sale some of it is financed through CMHC some of it will be financed through

## SUPPLY - URBAN AFFAIRS

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . . conventional leaders where MHRC will get - I believe it's one of the banks - that will actually issue the mortgages on it. These will be made available for public sale.

So I don't agree with the member in his attempt to picture MHRC activities as very narrow in their scope. I am suggesting to him that in the last 24 months there's been quite a variety has taken place and is taking place as CMHC itself has altered its position, as the Federal Government itself has recognized that elderly people living in the former elderly and infirm housing projects should be covered for subsidy purposes if the need is there. Only about three months ago I believe that agreement was signed. So you know it's moving all the time. It's not a static situation, and if new programs are announced we certainly get in on them.

He talks about the lack of serviced land and the fact that I have indicated there is a lack of serviced land. What I mean by that is this: that the large blocks of land where services are available were bought up by developers a number of years ago and therefore they have access to the mains which he's talking about, which MHRC hasn't got because the land that we've acquired is down the line a bit. Unless he's suggesting that MHRC acquire those lands from the present owners, which would have to be done I suppose by expropriation and we'd be paying extremely high prices because of course those are prime lands. Where services are in close proximity, and some of those lands are now, MHRC will be installing services, will be putting in the laterals, will be putting in the roads, will be putting in the infrastructure that's required so the housing can be put on the market.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, when the Estimates of the Department of Urban Affairs are debated in this House annually I usually try to relate my constituency problems to the area of responsibility of this Minister because I do represent largely an urban constituency. But, Mr. Chairman, I have some difficulty in doing this usually and essentially of course because the urban affairs of the City of Brandon come under the area of responsibility of the Department of Municipal Affairs. I guess it's really, Mr. Chairman, the problem we have with the name because I think the Latin word "urbs" means city. When we talk about urban affairs we who live in a city in the Province of Manitoba might be understandably confused when we find out that Urban Affairs essentially is the discussion and the problems relating to the City of Winnipeg. It's not without our understanding that when the Minister refers to the city, we have to relate this and correct to read the City of Winnipeg. Mr. Chairman, I am not in any way making this an issue because we've talked about this before. But it seems to me that there should be a trend or a name, objective, in this department to perhaps relate more directly to the affairs of all of the urban communities in Manitoba. Those should at least include the cities of Winnipeg, Portage, Brandon, Flin Flon and Thompson. There are reasons I think for looking at this arrangement as one that would perhaps give the Minister a more complete control of those urban problems that face this Legislature annually.

While we don't always agree with the philosophy expounded by the Minister of Urban Affairs, it's my personal opinion, Mr. Chairman, that he runs a fairly tight ship and when he deals with problems he does it in a straightforward and direct way. Perhaps this afternoon I can present to him a project which relates in rather a direct way with the comments made by the Member for Fort Rouge when he was discussing the kind of social planning that goes into the public housing that is provided in our province by the Minister of Urban Affairs and his Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation.

Mr. Chairman, one such project that is of direct interest to me and to the citizens of Brandon is a project now under way to provide on the fringe of the downtown area a three-storey apartment block of one, two and three bedroom units. This is to me perhaps a little different from the ordinary MHRC unit because I think the project is intended for single parent families. So this would be to construct a multiple-unit building which involve single parent families having one or more children in each family and to place it on a site right on the edge of the downtown area of the city. Now Mr. Chairman, my question is - and it's essentially the same question I suppose that the Member for Fort Rouge was placing: what kind of social planning is going into this? Is this a kind

## SUPPLY - URBAN AFFAIRS

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) . . . . of pilot project or are there other units where single parent families have been brought together, families having a common problem perhaps in the sense of the absence of one of the parents, to place them in a single unit on the edge of an urban area and to have to relate the total project to the kind of social planning that surely the Minister has reviewed in making this decision.

Mr. Chairman, I am not well versed in the kind of planning that goes into public housing. I assume that one of the reasons for this determination was that the site was available. Was this the most important reason or was it because of its adjacency to areas where the single parent might be finding employment, where her location close to possible employment areas would enable her to maintain a reasonable supervision over the children in the home. Perhaps the Minister has based this decision upon experience gained in other areas on similar projects. I think, Mr. Chairman, it would be interesting to hear the reasons for the decision, the kind of criteria that are applied to this sort of social planning and whether or not this is based upon success of projects of a similar nature in other areas or whether it is intended to be one in which there will be new experience gained.

I think there are arguments certainly to be placed on both sides here in terms of the adjacency of the site to the urban downtown commercial area. There might be a negative argument in terms of the recreational facilities available to children in that family. There might be negative arguments in terms of the variance to local by-laws that have to be obtained to reduce the parking area that will be included in this site to 50 percent of that which is specified for other apartment projects. Mr. Chairman, that's one question which I hope the Minister will be able to discuss.

The other one I'm perhaps bringing in here because again it is not directly under the Department of Urban Affairs but it is perhaps the major problem facing the City of Brandon at the moment and that is the problem they have with their Water Treatment Plant. I am told that the urgency is such that the City of Brandon must begin construction on a 50 percent increase, of doubling the capacity of their Water Treatment Plant, within this current year in order to meet the projected demands for treated water in the City of Brandon. Now the Minister of Urban Affairs may say this is not directly in my area of responsibility but it is an urban problem and it is one that faces the city and the citizens of Brandon and has them in a very serious position. They have to obtain some DREE grants which are federal of course but which will have to come through the Provincial Government. It will be a \$5 million project and they're looking for support from the Provincial Government and the Minister of Urban Affairs may have heard of this.

Mr. Chairman, these are the two major problems that I see that can be related to the Department of Urban Affairs and I'd be pleased to hear the Minister's comments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I do want to apologize to the member for my referring to the "city" and meaning Winnipeg and I'll try to remember to say the City of Winnipeg in the future. Because we do have a relationship with Brandon as well and when they wanted a study of their transit system it was our staff that worked with them on that as the member probably knows.

He refers to the need of Brandon for improvement in their water services. Although I don't know the details of it I have heard of the problem. This of course is handled through the Water Resources Board and I'm sure that whatever assistance the Province can render to Brandon will be made available.

He talks of a particular project in Brandon and generally he talks about the activities in Brandon. I want to tell him that in 1975-76 about 84 to 90 units of family public housing were built in Brandon itself. He may be aware of that.

The project he's talking about is on the edge of the downtown area and it's I believe a forty-family unit. It'll have some family units and also some elderly - no, they have 40 family units there. It's the old Hunt property that the member is talking about. Now I am told it is near parks and schools as far as the children are concerned and it's on a residential street. I guess what the member is talking about when he's talking about single parent families - last year because it was International Women's Year

## SUPPLY - URBAN AFFAIRS

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . . the corporation did try to do something in recognition of that year and this is in a sense a demonstration or pilot type of development.

There are six units out of the 40 which will accommodate single parent families. They're built in a cluster. They'll have a common kitchen. There is a sort of a lounge I suppose you'd call it so that the adults can meet as can the children. The corridors were designed somewhat differently than is typical in an apartment block, they are much wider because children, if they're very young particularly, do tend to run up and down hallways and this was recognized so that they could use it for playing as well. I can also tell the member that the City of Brandon Council was involved in the planning of this and they approved of this project. It will be a mix of occupants. It won't just be married or single parent families, it will be a mix. As I say the only thing that's different about this is that cluster of six with that common kitchen facility because it is felt by some, and I believe the idea was developed elsewhere, that families in that position who can get together periodically and prepare communal meals so to speak, would make for better living than just having your own little quarters and being on your own. I think it's a project that will take looking at, seeing how it goes and it may give us ideas for the future on how other similar projects should be planned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for that explanation. I take it that of the 40 units there will only be six that are single parent units and that these six will have a common communal kitchen service available. I would just like again to be sure, is this a unique project in terms of MHRC? Have they any experience in any other jurisdictions on which to go or are they basing this upon some social planning that indicates that success of this kind of an arrangement is likely to take place? Do they have any kind of experience based on other jurisdictions for this experiment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, this has been done elsewhere in Canada. As I said earlier it's not something that was simply dreamt up because it's easier. It has been done elsewhere and when I indicated the six units for single parent families with a common kitchen facility, I didn't mean to imply that that's the only units that would be occupied by single parent families. There may be more. But I simply wanted to indicate to the member that his first statement, where he suggested that the entire 40 units would be rented and made available to single parent families, I wanted to correct that. That is not the case. There may be more than just the six but in the six there will be, in this cluster of six, there will be single parent families. There may be a few more scattered through the project but that'll be by coincidence rather than planning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, before talking to Resolution 114 and before going into a parochial thing on my own area, I would like to think that after the Estimates time is sort of a major influence and I think it becomes very important, and I would hope with the Federal funds that the information gathered from all of us speaking and of course the information from the Urban Shelter Conference and the information in the Annual Report and that will allow the Minister's staff to get on with the job of building public housing.

I would like to present some questions to the Minister. Of course, I'd like to know possibly - I understood the figure quoted was 10,757 units and I wondered if he could predict any number for 1976 that may be partially or completed for that time. I wonder if he could possibly maybe look for - where would I possibly look for these project tenders that you've got planned. Being a layman I look at the News Service and Information Service that comes out to me and I find that the winners of these tenders are very unknown to me and I find if I look in the directory I can't find them. So maybe if I could find out where I could tender then maybe I would better understand where some of these companies come from.

I also would like to know if the Minister was interested in my idea when I suggested that we allow some of these single elderly people who are living alone and while they may qualify under the low income, I wondered if MHRC would consider them going

## SUPPLY - URBAN AFFAIRS

(MR. WILSON cont'd) . . . . on that criteria of being allowed into their MHRC high-rises despite their ownership of this particular dwelling so that we could then free up another dwelling for housing stock. In other words it's a new concept of thinking well here's all these single elderly people living alone. If we were to put them in a highrise, there then would be another home on the market. Some of these homes these people live in are quite large and could house two or three families. I think it bears some merit. There must be some way in which your staff could work that out.

I would also like the Minister to possibly suggest to the House if he intends to curb the travelling of many of his MHRC staff who seem to be travelling to far off cities. It would seem to me that now we are in a crisis situation where we should get on with the building locally and forget about maybe these bamboo units and ideas we're bringing back here. I'd like to know that.—(Interjection)—I'll answer questions after if you like. What I'm concerned about is that the staff is not in Manitoba and we have a housing shortage and I would like to see them here. We know we need all-weather homes. I don't think we have to travel to other countries to get ideas on new housing stock. We've got a crisis now.

Under Resolution 114 I'd like to speak about my own area. I'm greatly concerned because in 1972 under a particular letter addressed by Mr. Kaufman to Mr. Henderson and of course one from MHRC at that particular same time slot, it was felt that you would deal with the houses on Evanson Street. After some discussion and agreement it was felt that these could hold over for the winter. Here we are in 1976 and my question is: when can we expect those houses to be upgraded and the job completed as promised in 1972?

I refer to a headline story in which I took exception on November 15, 1972, to Mr. Asper, who wanted to tear them all down. I felt that this government - and I was siding with you at that time - if these homes were structurally sound that you would do your best due to the fact we were about 7,000 homes short on the market, to upgrade these homes and make them a credit to the community. I would hope that that job could be completed.

Again, as I say, I rejected the government policy and I spoke about it and I wanted at this time to - while the Minister was very critical of me - I have a letter from your staff together with copies of Hansard on page 270, in which you exempted this government in the proposed Bill 19 from any rent control or rent stabilization procedure. I pointed out that you had increased the rent approximately 33-1/3 percent and you felt that the rent hadn't been raised since 1972 so therefore this was justified. I wonder how many landlords in the private sector feel equally aggrieved.

I also wanted as I say to take exception to the comment - and as I say the members opposite are always questioning some of the futuristic statements that I make. But you did say that these 19 homes were not public housing. Well I tried to look up in the dictionary as to what public housing was and I had to return to my own personal opinion that public housing was housing that was owned by the government. Therefore I wanted the Minister to clarify that statement.

I felt also that when he claimed that the city had rejected an offer to take over the lot which presently has trucks on it and is rented for \$30 a month, that possibly this could be used for a tot lot and the Minister stated that the city had rejected it and I wrote to Councillor Bob Steen and he's come back and informed me that the Minister is only partly correct and that the city did not reject this lot. The city rejected taking over the four houses and this lot. So really it's a case of wording again. I wanted the province to offer that one lot and that one lot only to the city because I've had the assurance from the councillors they'd be more than happy to upgrade it.

I wanted to touch upon if I could at this time a question on the critical home repair program. Maybe this would be better placed under an Order for Return. But it would seem to me that I have a hard time imagining what low income families are pertaining to the 2,186 applicants because many of the elderly citizens living alone who want to upgrade their homes seem to have a hard time understanding how to apply, where to apply. I've made the number of your office available to them, and I would hope that

## SUPPLY - URBAN AFFAIRS

(MR. WILSON cont'd) . . . . proper explanations and some assistance would be forthcoming. Because I would like of these 2,186 to know how many of these went to the handicapped and how many of them went to elderly citizens and how many went to low income. What is low income? You know how many of these are from \$4,000 to \$6,000 and how many of these people in the alleged low income come between \$6,000 and \$8,000? So we can really evaluate in our own mind what a critical home repair program really is. If we as citizens of this city know that they have a plumbing problem or know that the water is coming in from back-up or whatever and they need some help in shoveling off the roofs so their home won't get wrecked or whatever that they would be able to go to the government because the government has this program and they would know that they would be judged on a need and not on maybe a line-up criteria or something to that effect. So I would like a better explanation of that. I'm not completely convinced in my mind when the government makes a blanket statement "a critical home repair program."

Again as I say many of the things have been said before pertaining to housing but I did feel that the City of Winnipeg in 1972 had struck off a criteria for low cost in public housing and I guess the question I'm asking the Minister is: is this team work that was alluded to in this criteria working? Are they having the co-operation of the city and is this co-ordination taking place under his supervision? I remember the Planning Authority. They were very concerned about - the city wanted to recommend where and identify where city owned land was and offer it to the province at a negotiable price. I think in some future pamphlet or something some information should come out to explain how this 1976 co-operation with the city is working if indeed it is.

In 1972 I believe it was, that \$53 million worth of family and public and elderly persons' housing was supposed to go into the year 1972. I just wondered just so I could compare it with today, just how many units were you able to build with \$53 million. How much of that money was the government again? Maybe this is better under an Order for Return.

I had looked at a number of standards and I really wanted to know if you got all these lots that the city claimed that they have. Apparently small builders are having trouble finding city lots because the city is possibly giving them all to the government. I don't know. This is why I'm trying in my own mind to envision if this program of co-operation has worked, and obviously the city has arrived at a comparable figure, an agreed upon figure, with the Provincial Government and possibly we could look forward to some not too large subdivisions taking place. I see in this criteria they didn't want you to have more than 40 units in total of three and four bedroom dwelling units. So I would assume on the Midland site we could possibly look for no more than 40 units to allow for a maximum assimilation into the community of these residents rather than the sort of a barrack concept of the past.

I basically will close by saying that in my limited knowledge of the housing situation but one which I feel represents the man on the street, I feel that maybe the public is expecting too much and it's up to the government to maybe in one or two of these projects to forget about the paved streets and maybe go back to the Charleswood concept of ditches and maybe some of the services are too cadillac in concept and maybe, as I mentioned yesterday talking to you about sort of the thing that people seem to expect, they seem to expect rec rooms and a large play area, indoor skating rink and a lot of these things. Possibly it's the shelter we want. While I would agree with the Member for Fort Rouge that we need to supply the services as well as just homes I think a lot of these frills could be cut out.

Rather than delay the passing of this fairly substantial amount of money, I would like to close where I left off in saying that time is of the essence. With inflation upon us it's important that we get on with the job of getting this housing on the market and getting our residents and some of our citizens into the housing that is really needed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I want to answer the Member for Wolseley in some of the points he raised. I didn't quite follow his questioning about the builders or who they were, etc. The builders that successfully bid through proposal calls or on a

## SUPPLY - URBAN AFFAIRS

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . . tender system, they are required to put up performance bonds. They are to meet all the criteria before they can get the contract. So that if the member doesn't know who the contractors are when the announcement is made - I have never looked in the phone book to see if they are in the phone book or not - but I can tell them that performance bonds are required and bid bonds are required at tender so that our concern, the concern of MHRC of course is to see to it that the track record of the contractor is a good one and that there's the performance bond to back up the performance.

He mentioned again the question of the possibility of acquiring homes by making it possible for senior citizens to move into some of the MHRC units. I have been exploring this; I have been exploring it for some time as a means of getting a flow of people from their own housing into the MHRC units and in turn MHRC would purchase the home from the individual. The problem there of course is the fact that that too often puts them over the asset level that is established for entry into public housing and this is the dilemma we're facing. I'm not sure that we can resolve that particular problem, we are still working on it, whether we can get some arrangement with MHRC in order to make this possible or not. I know I'm trying to see whether that particular dilemma or that particular problem can be met.

He made reference to MHRC some three people from MHRC who went to look at bamboo units and we can't afford to have these people go off. Well I can tell him they were away for all of ten days. I think we've benefited from it because what they viewed was probably the largest manufacturer of prefabricated units in the world and of the techniques used in fabrication and something that we can learn here because MHRC does have some RTM, "ready-to-move" plants where these units are built over the winter months and then transported to site. So anything we can learn in that regard would be of value to MHRC.

With regard to Arlington and Evanson - and he has difficulty understanding the public housing needs - perhaps I am at fault. I should have explained that public housing, when I use that term, is housing built under Section 43 of The National Housing Act and the homes on Arlington and Evanson were simply acquired from Public Works when they bought up the old Grace Hospital, the Salvation Army assets. There was an attempt made in 1973 or somewhere in that time, or '74 I believe, to see whether a co-op could be created and unfortunately that didn't work out and so everything was held back pending that decision, as well as the decision and the suggestion by the former Leader of the Liberal Party that they should be levelled and something else built in their place. The homes are being retained; they are in the process of being repaired under a work activity project called WHIP that's the Winnipeg Housing Improvement Program, it's a program funded by the Federal and Provincial Governments. They are in there now working in the homes and they will be repaired instead of being torn down because I would agree that wherever possible the existing stock is repaired, maintained and up-graded rather than simply being torn down.

In regard to that lot for recreation I can tell him that what was offered to the city was "the four lots or any part thereof" and that's when the rejection came. If the member is telling me that the city misunderstood the offer then staff is here and another advance can be made to the city suggesting that when we said, "the four lots or any part thereof" we also meant one lot if they wanted it. If they have changed their minds then certainly we'll do it.

On the Critical Home Repair Program he mentions snow on a roof and so on, and it sounded to me as if he was talking about a house where perhaps elderly people or people with low income were living and because of climatic conditions in a particular year there was an accumulation of snow or ice on the roof which might prove dangerous, that the Critical Home Repair Program could move to deal with those problems. That isn't the case. The Critical Home Repair Program is a program which is made available to people in certain incomes, very similar to the program that we had for a number of years, that's the Pensioner Home Improvement Program. It's tailored on that and it's not to deal with this kind of day-to-day problem at all. If certain work has to be done of a critical nature to lengthen the lifespan of a house, to improve its condition so it can

## SUPPLY - URBAN AFFAIRS

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . . . be on the market that much longer than that is the purpose of the program. It was launched last fall and of course it's still getting going. If the member is giving my phone number to constituents he can do so. On the other hand I would suggest to him that he give the number to MHRC because that's what they'll get from my office is simply a referral to MHRC because all of that is done through MHRC.

He asks about the city owned lands to MHRC and so on. To my knowledge there hasn't been any great amount of land sold to MHRC by the city with the exception of the individual infill lots in and around the Midland Railway area where certain homes were torn down many years ago in many cases and the city had them. They have been sold to MHRC and as I understand it there's 17 lots on which construction is now taking place. As well there's some lots in the Brooklands area, I believe 21 lots, where there is construction taking place.

He asks about the team work and co-operation by the city and I want to say to him that, in fact, this last eight months things have improved in the sense that the city officials and MHRC officials and Urban Affairs officials are working in close harmony, particularly in the Midland Railway area. As I indicated to the member they were looking at the first 50 units east of Ellen Street and as well the whole process of identifying homes that were beyond redemption, beyond repair, that those sites would be made available to MHRC, we'd acquire them from the city, we'd buy them, and have a house built on it. If it's a single lot, then a single unit would be built; if it can accommodate more than of course something beyond that will be built.

He talked about cadillac services and perhaps gravel roads and so on and as the member knows I was the one who mentioned that in the debate earlier. But the member also knows that the City of Winnipeg or any municipal jurisdiction, whether the city of Winnipeg or Brandon or what have you, they determine the services. They must approve whether or not there will be gravel or concrete and whether it will be a six-inch concrete roadway or eight-inch concrete roadway. They are the ones that have to determine that, whether it's a 66 foot right-of-way or whether it's 60 feet or 50 feet. That is within their power; they are the planning authority and so it isn't up to MHRC to try something different. We can certainly try as we did in Nassau Square. It took a long time and it's finally going and hopefully with that precedent perhaps other developments can take place in the City of Winnipeg as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Corrections will have his chance in a couple of minutes because I won't be long, I'll only take a couple of minutes of the House to ask a few questions of the Minister at this time.

Mr. Chairman, the other day I believe we were debating the Rent Stabilization Bill and the Minister indicated to the House from his seat - and I know there was some questions asked of him: how many serviced lots and how quick will some of the land that Manitoba Housing and Renewal has purchased, how soon will it be able to come on the market. He said some will be able to come on the market this year. I want to know if there'll be a couple of hundred lots that will be able to come on the market or how many? Perhaps he can give me that answer because I would like to know how many serviced lots will come on the market because it's very important, Mr. Chairman, if we are really concerned about improving the housing conditions in this province. I know that the politicians provincially, federally and municipally have prided themselves for many years and have taken great credit and said, "Well the people in Canada, we, in the provinces in Canada have the prize percentage of home ownership of any country in the world." And this was great. Perhaps maybe they were to some extent, right in the fifties and early sixties, maybe only partially right. But they sure took a lot of credit, what a great job they were doing for the people as far as housing accommodation was concerned.

Mr. Chairman, what has happened in the late sixties and early seventies, we have become a nation of renters. We are not able to supply the people with the homes that they require. We know that there was a commission, federally, done quite extensively where they travelled the country from corner to corner and asked people what

## SUPPLY - URBAN AFFAIRS

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . kind of housing accommodation you'd like to have. Naturally the people told them, most people, they would like to own their own home even if it's a small type of living accommodation, even if it's a duplex or a row-housing. But they would like to own their own quarters. Now I know it's not possible for everybody.

Again when I say this, Mr. Chairman, when I say this that's not saying that we have sufficient public housing because we haven't. From my own experience, I have you know written to the Corporation where I have constituents in my constituency in dire need, great need, to have accommodation in public housing and they just weren't able to get the accommodation because there isn't just enough. So I'm not putting any blames on the Minister that we're building too many public housing. That's not the point. The point I'm trying to make: we as a society, we as provincial politicians, municipal politicians and Federal Government have failed our society as far as housing is concerned. There were enough reports, there were enough statistics ten years ago and 15 years ago and many have been indicating, many people were saying, look because of the high interest rate, because of an increasing land cost, if we don't move in this area to acquire some land, to put the services in we'll have the difficulties that we're experiencing today.

Mr. Chairman, we've heard these statements in this House 10 years ago and not on one occasion, many many speakers in every session. So now we can look back and say what we said seven, eight years ago is true today. It happened. So I think that we as politicians have failed and the great pride that we took that we provided housing, had the highest percentage of home ownership of any country in the world is not true any more. I understand that Governor Henderson in Minnesota, now he takes great credit that his state has the highest percentage of home ownership of any state in North America or any province of North America. That's what he's saying. And he may be correct. Because, Mr. Chairman, you can buy lots in Minnesota for \$7,500, fully serviced and improved lots.

In Manitoba when we're talking about \$15,000 per lot, well if they were available, Mr. Chairman, they would sell pretty quickly and all of them would sell. But they're not available at \$15,000. The ones that are available are in West Park or in the St. Charles area which are selling between \$25,000 and \$33,000. I talked to a person yesterday or the other week who bought a lot for \$33,000. That's the kind of lots that we have at the present time. So there isn't anything available at \$15,000. If there are any lots I'd like to know where they are because we're kidding ourselves, they're not there. If you find a lot for \$16,000 or \$18,000 in some parts of the city that are a mixture of older houses and a 50 foot lot, that's what you have to pay. So I say we have failed. We have failed as far as housing is concerned, the Municipal Governments, Provincial Government and Federal Government, Mr. Speaker. So my question is how many serviced lots will be coming on the market because the Minister did indicate there will be some coming on the market.

I mentioned Minnesota, Mr. Chairman. There are people moving out of Vancouver to Seattle because they have lots in Seattle at \$7,500, fully serviced and fully improved. Again I can indicate that Vancouver is a different situation than ours because they have a shortage of space in their city proper. That's not the case in Winnipeg. There's all kinds of land around.

The other point I wish to ask and perhaps the Minister can indicate, I know that the expert on condominiums, the Minister of Public Works, indicated to this House that they cannot work in Winnipeg and Manitoba because the people are just not interested. Well that's not so.

I know that the Corporation had some experience with one in Tuxedo. I understand that land was sold to the developer for \$100 or whatever it was. I'd like to know if that corporation, have all the units in there been sold and they're owned by private people and is it working and what has happened? Because as I understand the developer ran into great difficulty. I just wondered if the government at that time did the right thing, probably giving the land for \$100 or selling it to a developer that probably did not have enough expertise in this area, did not have enough backing. Should he have been given that land to proceed with the development which in essence actually failed,

## SUPPLY - URBAN AFFAIRS

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . Mr. Chairman. Because I understand there were difficulties and it took a long time to finish the development. I'd like to know if the units are completely finished and they're owned by independent people and how is that condominium, the corporation, how is it functioning? Is it functioning at all?

The reason that the condominiums failed in this city, Mr. Chairman, because there was only one. There was only one that was put up in Assiniboia, in my constituency which was the first one that was put up in the row type housing. It was put two and a half miles away from any transportation system, two miles away from any shopping centre. No wonder it failed. That's why it wasn't successful. But surely if the government - and I feel the Minister's got to give serious consideration because it's another form of housing and I believe it would be acceptable. I think it is still much more economic because even today there's some units selling in the one in Assiniboia, on Buchanan Street, that you get a two-bedroom, full basement units are selling at \$24,000 and three bedroom units at \$26,000. Well you can't buy housing at that price anywhere in the city, you just can't.

I know that the Minister of Public Works indicated, well why would you separate duplexes? Why wouldn't you make them condominiums? Well duplexes to me are condominiums already. They're two separate units. Almost condominiums. So I couldn't understand what argument he was trying to make.

The thing that concerns me, Mr. Chairman - the Minister again, I know he's concerned more or less strictly with public housing and that's fine. But he has to have some other innovative programs if we are going to solve the housing problem. I think that we have to start looking at rehabilitation of older homes in the older sections. I'd like to know if the Corporation, the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, has purchased any houses, the older houses in any sections. They're there, Mr. Chairman. If you drive through the city you'll find, I'm sure at the present time you'll find three or four hundred houses on the market and some of them are priced at \$15,000. Good accommodation. Full basement, poor wiring, no kitchen cupboards, needs rehabilitation, needs renovation. I tell you for \$5,000 you could probably have a good unit - for \$18,000 to \$20,000. And what we're doing, we're not looking at older houses and this is an area that the Minister has to be innovative. He has to have other ideas and the problem isn't that great. I think that you can solve it pretty quickly if you just say, well look, I have to talk to the private sector as well and I have to see if the Corporation would be interested to rehabilitate and renew some of the older houses instead of destroying them completely.

Perhaps the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation could purchase some of the older homes for their purposes and it may be they could solve some of their problems. Again this is not talking against public housing, Mr. Chairman, because we need more. Because from my own experience I've tried to, in many instances in the last year, tried to get people into public housing and I couldn't. Someone, a widow that's trying to keep her three children in school and trying to work and trying to keep her household going has very difficult times and it's difficult for this lady to pay \$250 rent. If we can get her in a rent structure that's something more reasonable in public housing and I know she's waited a long time, is still waiting. This is eight, nine months later because they're not available, they're not available.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Minister will not just say, well look I don't care about the private sector. All I'm concerned about is what Manitoba Housing and Renewal is doing at the present time. Well I'd say that's maybe fine but you will not solve the housing problems in that way. I think you have to think on a much wider scale, Mr. Chairman.

The other point I would like to know: how much money has the Minister got in the Critical Home Repair Program? Can he indicate is there a couple of million dollars or what it is and what kind of a program; how successful has it been to the present time and how many units or how many people have availed themselves to the program? Because I did some checking around. I think it's a good program; I think it's serving a need for the low income people, for senior citizens and that's the kind of program not only that you're serving a need but you're also renewing some old houses that can be

## SUPPLY - URBAN AFFAIRS

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . rehabilitated and you're giving them another life expectancy probably of 20 to 25 years and maybe longer. So that's why it's a good program. Even 15 years, I think that's still a great program. So I hope the Minister will review that program quite seriously after he's had some time to let it run. That's the kind of program that he can put more money in and I don't believe that anybody would criticize him for putting more money into a program like that. So this is some of the questions I'm raising with the Minister at the present time. I am concerned how many lots you're putting on the market or how many will come on stream.

The other point that I wished to ask and I know that I haven't got my Throne Speech with me but I believe it was the largest thing in the Throne Speech. It was the 70 million or more that will be going in housing. I believe that's the figure, which was a large figure. I would like to ask the Minister out of that \$70 million, if my figures are correct, how many units have you got on stream at the present time or how many units are started, or what percentage of that \$70 million is allocated for? Because this is the middle of March and if you haven't got anything allocated and nothing on stream, well we're going to have great difficulties because you will not be able to spend that money into housing and here I believe the government should be putting some of its own money, not only all of Federal Government's money, not all of the MHRC, but also some of its own money into such programs as rehabilitating and renewing some of the older houses which I think would solve many of our problems. So I hope the Minister can tell me how many units are started at the present time and some of the other questions that I raised.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister for Corrections.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I will take but two minutes.--(Interjection)--No, I'm watching the clock. If you people will bear with me I will be only two minutes.

One of the difficulties that the Member for Assiniboia has is that he's a nice guy and he wanted to give me an opportunity but nevertheless he had to do his job as he saw it.

I want to compliment the Member for Crescentwood. I listened to his remarks and I thought he made a most responsible presentation, albeit I don't agree with everything that he said. I had risen earlier and I seemed to get the message that I was going to be ruled out of order. I could have perhaps stood earlier on this subject, Mr. Chairman, because it borders on the line of matter of privilege where I am accused of doing certain things on Page 869. I just want the record to show for those people in my constituency that read it and have drawn this to my attention they take it as, - you know, not too kind remarks. They've used stronger terms. I won't use their terms. But I intend to deal as I said earlier only once with the Member for Wolseley. I hope that that will be enough just so people will know that I intend to deal with the arguments that he makes, not him but the arguments that he makes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 114 - the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I should reply to the Member for Assiniboia and advise him that the land which MHRC owned and which I referred to is in south St. Boniface. I can't tell him how soon it's going to be made available simply because the plan of subdivision is being worked on. The rezoning has to take place; the development agreement would have to be signed with the City of Winnipeg and so therefore it's not within MHRC's power to determine what date. I would hope that some movement could take place in '76. I don't think that any houses can be built on those sites in '76 but perhaps the plan of subdivision and even some of the services might be installed in this calendar year.

He says that he agrees that we need more public housing and I'm pleased to hear that. He talks about condominiums and refers to the Minister of Public Works. You know I think condominiums will be built when the market is ready for them. Usually in other jurisdictions it's been indicated that when the ownership of the part of the suite becomes more attractive than the renting of it, that that takes place. You can't just artificially create a demand for condominiums. So as rents increase and as ownership becomes more attractive then there will be a market for condominiums.

He agrees with the program, the Critical Home Repair. There's \$4 million in that program. It's a very new program, it's only started in October and I'll certainly be

## SUPPLY - URBAN AFFAIRS

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . . monitoring it because I think it's one of the more important programs. As he agreed we should try to protect the old housing stock as much as possible.

He talks about purchasing old stock and the problem there of course is that, as I indicated, CMHC wants more housing and not simply a matter of sort of playing musical chairs. Although I can tell him we have bought in the Brooklands area we have bought 42 units. In north Point Douglas we've bought seven units. We bought six units, a six suite small apartment block on Ross Avenue and we did buy last year I think it was in the Fort Garry area, a 50-unit apartment block. But we were very limited because - I know we were wanting to buy one more and CMHC said well no, if you're going to buy it then we'll take that off the capital that's made available to you for construction of new units. Of course that's very self-defeating so that didn't go through.

I think I've answered all the questions he's asked. I can't tell him how many units are in the stage now where they're sort of where the planning is at. The proposal calls, what I'm looking forward to, April 2nd is the deadline for proposal calls and that will determine to a great extent the amount of construction within the city and therefore will determine the allocation of funds and where they should flow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 114 - the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if you wanted to call it 4:30. I had some topics I wanted to discuss on this. Maybe the House Leader can indicate whether they're prepared to move ahead on the Private Members' section.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't mind calling it 4:30. But I know that the Member for Brandon West is hoping that the Attorney-General will be back here at 4:30 to deal with a bill that he wanted dealt with. I'd want to accommodate the honourable member but if he'd just as soon that this was dealt with on Monday, it doesn't matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: There's two areas that I wanted to deal with, Mr. Chairman, so I'll start and if the Attorney-General gets here then we'll proceed when he arrives.

The first was an area of concern - I notice that the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation is now addressing itself to the problem - it's in the technical field. We've covered a lot of the other areas with regards to MHRC by different members that have made contributions here. One of the areas of concern is that housing design in Canada really hasn't adapted itself to the energy problem that the country is facing. With Manitoba in particular being in a geographic location where energy costs are a major factor for homeowners as well as the other sectors of our society, I wonder if the MHRC has given any thought to urging the federal people who set the standards for housing to start upgrading these standards.

We've gone along for I don't know how many decades now with typical specifications for housing that are set in eastern Canada where the climate is a lot different from western Canada and an awful lot different from northern Canada. Still the specifications have been almost invariably set just by the straight requirements of eastern Canadian design. We've gone along for instance with insulations in the walls of houses that are very minimal. Typical R7 insulation, that's all that has to be done to meet the standard. We've gone along with double glazing on windows and this sort of thing. But we're at the point now where there is speculation that, just as a yardstick, where the heating costs of homes are now going to be a bigger factor than the annual tax bill. I think everybody has been much more conscious of their tax bill over the last few years than they have been of their heating bills because the heating costs have gone along increasing fairly gradually until the last few years. Now they're on the upper trend at an extremely rapid rate.

Well the point of it all, Mr. Chairman, is that the costs of upgrading our housing design, the initial first cost is so small in comparison to the operating costs that are being carved by inadequate design, basically inadequate design, that it seems almost incomprehensible that the specification authorities, principally the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, could have let us go this far without recognizing the change that is

## SUPPLY - URBAN AFFAIRS

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . . required. Because once the house is built, it's a very major job to go back and have to redo it a few years later when you find that these operating costs are becoming a burdensome factor, extremely burdensome and an unnecessary one. In other words what you build today is what you're going to have to live with for the next several decades, 30 to 50 years or whatever the life of the house is. So that there seems to be very little foresight that is going into predicting the type of design that should be a minimum design from the point of view of operating costs. So we've gone along with this for decades now, Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that voices have been raised particularly in the technical community advocating that the standard be upgraded. I don't think it's a legitimate rebuttal - you don't hear it very often but you do hear periodically that it increases the cost too much if you do it. Certainly that's not the case. It isn't the case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being time for Private Members' Hour. Before we rise I'd like to inform the committee we've spent 34 hours and 50 minutes in Estimates, 11 hours and 35 minutes in the Department of Urban Affairs. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

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

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR - PUBLIC BILLS - SECOND READINGS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I believe that there is an inclination to waive resolutions and to deal with the bill standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 26?

MR. GREEN: Yes, the Attorney-General has told me he won't need the full hour to deal with this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: He'll only have 20 minutes anyway. The Honourable Attorney-General.

BILL NO. 26 - AN ACT RESPECTING THE CITY OF BRANDON

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General; Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I'm a little concerned. You say I only have five minutes. We have massive manuscripts and documents that we must deal with in detail. I would like to just comment by saying that we have examined the bill and I think that it is an issue of whether or not the errors which occurred were innocent and technical in nature. The advice from the department is that they were technical and innocent errors.

I've received suggestions from Brandon itself, arguments that in fact this is not the case but that it was something less than innocent in respect to this matter. I don't think that is a matter that we can deal with properly at second reading; I think that our best plan would be to permit the bill to proceed to committee so that we can hear the representations by the City of Brandon and by the objectors at that time. I would so suggest that we permit the bill to proceed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West shall be closing debate. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I note the remarks of the Honourable the Attorney-General in respect to some contrary opinions as to the nature of the errors which occurred.

## BILL 26

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) . . . . I think that it's important that those people who feel there may be some difference here should have an opportunity to present their views in committee. At the same time the city does have a sequence of events that they would like to proceed with in order to bring this small project to a development stage.

I hope that when the bill does go to committee it will be possible to give proper notice to those people in Brandon who would like to present their views. At the same time I hope there will not be any greater delay than necessary in making a decision one way or another in respect to the bill. In addition to the opportunity which those people in Brandon have to present their views in Winnipeg, there will still be an opportunity when it goes back to city council for them to appear at a city council meeting in which a money by-law will then have to be passed. So I think there is good protection for those who wish to present any opposing views.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. It's intended that next week we will be proceeding in the same manner giving priority to bills and then to Committee of Supply. The next department - I had announced Health and Social Development but it's now changed to, excuse me, I had announced Northern Affairs - it's now changed to Civil Service Commission followed by Labour, followed by Northern Affairs and then probably Health and Social Development or Education.

It's also hoped that on Monday afternoon we will also be able to go into Committee, concurrent Committee of Supply meeting on Public Works, the Department of Public Works in Room 254.

I would hope also that by the end of next week we will be able to have a committee meeting on one of the other committees. I have not been able to speak to the Minister to whom Hydro reports yet but I'm hoping to have a meeting of Public Utilities for the Hydro Report, for the Telephone Report, etc.

If there are no further questions, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Crescentwood have a question?

MR. STEEN: Yes, I have a question to the Government House Leader. Is it not true that on Monday we have the installation of the new Lieutenant-Governor? Is that going to interfere with our . . .

MR. SPEAKER: That will be afterwards.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that that is so but I understand that these things are done very expeditiously and that we will be in the House at 2:30.

I would move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Accordingly the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 p.m. Monday next.