

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, May 30, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery where we have 34 students from Grades 1 to 8 from New Haven School under the direction of Mrs. Linton. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Education.

We have 23 students of Grades 7 and 8 standing from Barrows Junction School under the direction of Mr. Kustinak. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Swan River.

On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, my first question is to the Minister of Northern Affairs and Renewable Resources, and that is to ask the Honourable Minister if he is undertaking or will proceed to undertake a review of those cases of complaint within the Public Service where undertakings were given by the Crown, in some cases in written and documentable form, for the payment of accumulated overtime and related consideration and which, apparently, has not been honoured by the Crown with respect to certain terminations and layoffs that have taken place in the last several months.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will give the Leader of the Opposition the firm commitment that we are reviewing those particular cases. We found it rather difficult to understand why certain overtime bills, if you wish, or times, were being submitted 10, 12 and 14 months in the past and with the lack of substantial records we have found it difficult to substantiate some of the claims, but we certainly are reviewing it and will honour those that we can possibly find any credence to.

MR. SCHREYER: I would ask the Honourable Minister if in his reference to 10, 12 and 14 months in the past, he will include those cases with respect to overtime which was substantial in some cases, four, six, eight months in the past, where work was being done in the field involving such activity, diverse activity, as gravel crushing, etc., etc., which is being done on our roads, northern roads, etc., and which is part of the normal operation of building and providing services throughout the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition makes reference to the — I'm assuming — the previous four to six months and I said that some of the bills went back 10, 12 and 14 months which would be inclusive of. To again repeat, we are reviewing all those particular cases and where credence is established, they'll certainly be paid.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I undertook to provide

the list of the changes with regard to regulations and fee structures in Manitoba provincial parks with regard to cottage lots and the different lease fees being charged and I would like to give this to the Member for St. Vital.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to direct to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Could the Minister of Consumer Affairs see to it that his department is not releasing unsolicited press releases on behalf of Ministers who are before committee and would like to make the announcement in committee and find themselves being finessed by Information Services having issued a release?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, the member in his question suggests that there is a certain amount of finessing being done by the Information Services and the Minister. The Information Services normally have any press releases cleared by the Minister concerned. I would think that that is the normal process. I'm not aware of any deviation from that pattern or that policy but if the Minister has some specific instance, I would be pleased to . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister to look into the question of Information Services having released a press release while the Minister of Urban Affairs was before committee with respect to Leaf Rapids Development —(Interjection)— The Minister of Housing, that is correct, and the Minister of Housing being surprised that the release was issued when he was before committee dealing with the subject.

MR. MCGILL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, now that the member has identified a specific instance, I will endeavour to determine what deviation there was, if any, from the regular policy of the Services.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister has indicated to me that Information Services releases information only on the basis of announcements of government policy or introduction of second reading in the House, can the Minister explain why a press release was issued with regard to a speech on general matters that was made by one of the Ministers at some function in a community in Manitoba last week?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, the general nature of the function being served by Information Services is to provide the public with information on matters of policy and general positions of the government. If the Minister feels that there was some specific deviation in the matter and in the instance which he relates, certainly we will look into it and endeavour to ensure that it does fit with the normal policy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the same Minister on a considerably different subject, and that is to ask the Minister with respect to his statement of yesterday relative to the Rent Control Program, whether the decision that there would be allowance of one-half of 1 percent with respect to those tenancies in which domestic power or electrical energy was paid for by the landlord, and a half percent more tolerance where it was paid for by the tenant. Can the Minister say whether this allowance of only one-half of 1 percent was determined by a calculated formula or whether it was simply a case of a general assumption?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I can tell the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that there were calculations made, that the department endeavoured to find a formula that would best fit, in an averaging kind of way, the situation where either heating or power was paid for separately from the rental of the apartment; that differential did not exist in previous phases. As a result of experience and as a result of the calculations that were made it was determined and it was decided that we would use this matter of difference to make it more equitable in Phase IV.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, in this case, strangely — or perhaps not so strangely enough — I am not disagreeing with the Minister; I am simply asking for confirmation that the allowance that is made for the cost of domestic power is a magnitude of one-half of 1 percent in the formula. Is that correct?

MR. MCGILL: Well, the Leader of the Opposition is asking specifically if it is correct; I can tell him that the department, in reaching this half of 1 percent formula, is using an average, and attempting to reflect it in as fair a way as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the Minister of Labour, who is responsible for the Workplace Safety and Health legislation. In view of the fact that extensive regulations have been passed now in Saskatchewan to improve safety in the handling of anhydrous ammonia as well as the storage of this chemical and in the training of workers in the proper handling of this material, will the Minister undertake to develop similar regulations for the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, the training program in the individual companies is handled by the employers themselves; with regard to the fire inspections, that is handled by our fire inspectors. Fire commissioners train the fire people in that. But other than that, it's the employers themselves that carry out their own training programs.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question relates to the adequacy of the present regulations. While companies may do training, they train within a set of regulations and officials work within the set of regulations, so my question still stands, Mr. Speaker, whether the Minister will use her staff to bring about a better set of regulations to provide for an enhancement of safety in the handling of this particular dangerous chemical?

MRS. PRICE: It hasn't been determined at this time, Mr. Speaker, whether it isn't adequate at the present stage.

MR. EVANS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Well, in view of the fatality that occurred last year in the City of Brandon in the handling of this material and the hospitalization also of a half a dozen fire fighters at that time, would the Minister utilize her powers under Section 14 of the Workplace Safety and Health Act and hold public hearings in this matter in order to get the views of the industry and of the public and everyone concerned and possibly then utilize the results of these hearings to bring about new regulations to improve safety conditions in the handling of this chemical?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I did tell the Member for Brandon East the other day that I would be coming back to him with regard to the accident that happened and I will have the answer for him tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Renewable Resources and it relates to an area of the province within the Interlake where farmers were not able to remove their crops last fall and relates to the fire regulations. Could the Minister indicate whether in his change of policy, from policy of flexibility to one of rigidity, whether he's now prepared to review that policy again because no permits have been issued to allow farmers to burn off stubble even though they have made provisions for a back-fire or furrow around the field to have that? Fire permits were not issued and in fact some farmers were charged.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Renewable Resources.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, you have to determine the interpretation of the word flexibility or inflexibility or responsibility. I don't really believe, to the member that's asked that question, that there has been any great change in policy. There has been no specific change in policy from myself. The conservation officers in the field in hot dry types of weather make an on spot decision whether fire permits should be issued on a particular day.

In the question in relationship to one specific instance that you were involved in, the man was . . . The member that asked the question. —(Interjection)— I said the member that asked the question involved in. He did, I understand, go ahead and burn without a permit and I understand he was advised not to. I understand the next day that proper fire guards were furrowed up and he was issued a permit, but this isn't a change from flexibility to inflexibility. There's been no directive

from us to get easier or tougher on this particular issue.

MR. URUSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate, apparently there were phone calls made to Winnipeg and there was advice given that no permits would be issued at the time whatsoever and that's what I'm really relating to because I've been informed that there were phone calls made to Winnipeg and that no permit under no circumstances at that point in time would be issued.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I would suspect that the member is absolutely correct, that there are particular days within the province and particular areas within the province, that permits will not be issued.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Attorney-General. Given that yesterday he made an indication to the House, and I believe to the press, that he has legal opinions respecting the Jarmoc agreement which the Minister of Tourism signed, or had signed by his department, would he undertake to table those documents in the House which give the legal opinion outlining the government's responsibility regarding this agreement?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, given that this Minister doesn't answer questions any better than the Minister of Tourism . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he use a little bit of courtesy in the asking of his questions. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, I'll refrain from comment on your ruling. However, some courtesy could be expected from the other side as well.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Tourism. I believe that the Minister has met with a group called the Coalition for Park Development (Manitoba). Can he indicate his reaction to the Coalition's proposal, that instead of continuing with the Jarmoc proposal, which could be very detrimental to the Whiteshell Lake in the Whiteshell Park, that his department consider the survey carried out by the Coalition, where they have pointed out that there are 3,000 to 5,000 cottage developable sites in eastern Manitoba that are outside of the particular Whiteshell Park, and if the government would pursue these site locations as an alternative to the over-development of the Whiteshell Park, which seems to be the direction his department is going at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, we had a very good meeting with the members from the Parks Coalition representatives, from such groups as Green Peace, the Manitoba Naturalist Society, the Wildlife Federation, the cottage owners, were all represented at that meeting.

They expressed certain concerns about the development in the particular area in Whiteshell. We assured them that before any management plan was adopted as policy by this government, that they would receive further input into the master plan. They also agreed that, because of a lack of planning in that particular area over the last number of years, there was not a public forum at which people in the area, as well as they, could have expressed their wishes with regard to that. So we will be developing that with them.

They also pointed out certain areas where they felt cottage lots and additional camping sites could be made available, and my staff will be looking at that. As I mentioned before, we're interested in having a feedback from as many people as we can, to try and alleviate some of the pressure that is on the existing facilities in the province.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Honourable Minister, and following some of the remarks that he made in reply to my question, can the Minister confirm that the Coalition for Parks Development did point out to him, that from 1971 to 1977 there has been an ongoing, in-depth evaluation of the whole parks system by experienced, responsible members of the parks branch, and that now he, as Minister, has appointed to the study group persons inexperienced in park planning to achieve what he recently described as a middle course. In effect it amounts to a rejection of these departmental studies and is of great concern to the Coalition for Park

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, when one member representing one of the organizations was confronted with that particular statement, they said that was the rumour, that they understood that these people were not capable of planning these facilities and that they were not sure about that particular subject, so I asked them the same thing. I think that the people that we have there are good people that will be able to compile the information and make it public to the people.

There were some other misunderstandings. For instance, there was an misunderstanding of the statement that I made in the House — it was a reply to the Member for Logan with regard to opening up the cottage lots. They understood that 600 cottage lots would be opening up in Nopiming Park and I think I indicated fairly extensively in the House at that time that that included the whole province and included some sites in northern Manitoba as well as Grindstone Point and other areas.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. In view of the information from this morning's Public Utilities Committee to the effect that there had been occasion in 1975 when wire-tapping was done in excess of the authority provided for in the court order, and in view of the fact that in 1976 the guidelines were tightened and new guidelines were developed, can the Attorney-General confirm that those guidelines which were put in force in 1976 are still in existence and whether or not there have been any changes to those guidelines since 1976?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not a member of that particular committee but I'm prepared to accept the question as notice and examine the Hansard and answer the question at a later date.

MR. PAWLEY: A supplementary. Can the Attorney-General advise whether or not there have been any instances brought to his attention during his tenure as Attorney-General, outside of that incident which I referred to earlier in 1975, where tapping was done in excess of the authority provided for in the court order?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I'll accept that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Tourism. I asked him a similar question a number of weeks ago but he said it would be in his report on the Jarmoc incident and it wasn't in there, so I wonder if he could tell us when, where, and under what circumstances the Minister himself met with Mr. Jarmoc.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I met with the particular gentleman sometime in early November in my office.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, another question I asked previously that was not in the report was: Who were or who are the financial backers of Mr. Jarmoc and the condominium development proposal?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, the thing that I've been able to ascertain is that he has a line of credit at certain banks and was dealing also with some credit unions.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Attorney-General. I believe that today the Attorney-General met with representatives of the Chilean community in Winnipeg and I wonder if he was generally in support of their submission and is there any action that he can take as a Minister, or his government can take, or this House can take, in support of their opposition to the oppression of people in that country.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I did not meet with that group.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Can the Minister confirm that the total membership of the Gillam volunteer fire department has resigned *en masse* to be effective May 31st, tomorrow, and that they have done so in protest of his department's newly implemented methods of remuneration for their fire brigade?T!

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, that matter is presently under review I accept that question as notice and hope to be in a position to answer it tomorrow.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister also confirm that those newly implemented procedures will have a detrimental effect on internal brigade discipline and will also hamper the fire brigade's efforts to give money to community projects, victims of fires, and to build a fire hall in the community of Gillam?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware that there are any newly introduced procedures but I'll accept the balance of that question as notice.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is some urgency here, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister prepared to direct his department immediately to return to the previous methods — and I assure him there are newly implemented methods — to return to the previous methods until such a time as acceptable methods of remuneration can be worked out in consultation and in co-operation with the Firefighters' Association in Gillam and also in other communities adversely affected by the newly implemented procedures of his department?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to take whatever steps are necessary to protect the health and welfare and wellbeing of the residents of the Local Government District of Gillam.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System. Has the chairman and general manager of the Manitoba Telephone System informed the Minister that the operations and performance of the Manitoba Telephone System have been impaired by the chairman and the general manager being the same person?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. This is to the Minister responsible for the Task Force. Has the chairman and general manager informed the Minister responsible for the Task Force that the operations and performance of the Manitoba Telephone System have been impeded by the chairman and general manager being the same person?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for the Task Force.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Member for Transcona, the chairman and general manager who is a member of the Task Force noted the fact that there would be a conflict of interest if he dealt with that matter and allowed that matter to be dealt with by the Task Force in his absence. It was a recommendation of the review team. The matter was discussed; the chairman and general manager was present during that period of time. The decision was made with his full knowledge but with the recognition that he was, at that point, placed in a position of apparent conflict of interest being both the chairman and general manager at the time.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary. Is the Minister telling me that he did not ask the advice of the chairman and general manager of the Manitoba Telephone System with respect to this contentious recommendation even though he is sitting as a member of the Task Force because he has experience in public administration? Did you ask his advice or not?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the recommendation which was given by the Honourable Member for Transcona is that contentious; I think it happens to be common sense. But I should indicate that the chairman took the position that he did not want to make a comment and that was his decision — that is, the chairman and general manager who is a member of the Task Force, it was his decision not to proceed in that way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. Can the Honourable Minister inform the House when the Workplace Safety and Health Division will be making their report on industrial lead poisoning to the Minister in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, there is an initial meeting taking place this afternoon at 3:30 in my office.

MR. JENKINS: I take it then, from the Minister's answer, that they are dealing with this problem. What I want to know is what procedure is her department taking with regard to checking of industrial lead poisoning within industrial plants in the Province of Manitoba?

MRS. PRICE: I think, Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member for Logan is referring to the article that was in today's paper, the gentleman that gave the information to the news media is really not an expert on medicine, safety, chemistry or whatever, and Dr. Krywulak, who is our Occupational Director, and one of two people in western Canada who holds a certificate, is in agreement that only people that are knowledgeable about such subjects should be making remarks about it to the news media, and that Mr. Rabinovitch is not one of them.

MR. JENKINS: Well then, my next question to the Minister: Is then she considering herself to be an expert in this field?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I have not professed to be an expert in it but I have my department studying it and there has been an ongoing study in this regard without having to be told by Mr. Rabinovitch.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister reporting for the Manitoba Telephone System. It refers to the meetings of the Public Utilities Committee. Can the Minister give the House an undertaking that the General Manager of the Manitoba Telephone System and the General Manager of the Manitoba Data Services will be present at the next meeting of the committee at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday morning, to answer questions by the committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MCGILL: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture, and ask him if he could provide to this House either changes — is he going to bring in changes to the legislation dealing with the Cattle Producers Association Act? In his press statements he made comments that there are easy opt-out rights for producers within the legislation. Could the Minister inform this House and the farmers of Manitoba what those easy opt-out rights are?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, if I haven't made it clear, I would like to make it clear that the opting out or the participation in that regard will be done after the provincial or the producer elected board; however, if it is not stated clearly in the Act, that we are prepared to make it very plain that no one will be forced to participate in the association.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, then I ask the Minister, how could he make that statement in advance, well knowing that none of those provisions were in the Act, and all the farmers in the Province of Manitoba believed that there are easy opt-out provisions, when there are no opt-out provisions contained in the Act?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, it reads in the Act that if the individuals do not want to participate, that there has to be an opting out, a clause, made up after the producers' board is elected. After the producers' board is elected, and if that has to be an addition to the Act, and I have made the statement and I will make the statement, but it will be certainly clarified before it is proceeded with.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, just to follow up on that, the Minister's statement, and I quote, "insures that only those who want to pay fees to the association through a checkoff or other means will be required to do so under the headline of easy opt-out rights." How can the Minister, on May 12th is the time he issued that statement, make that statement when there were no provisions whatsoever in the Act?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, in the last two or three days, there have been approximately 12 questions asked in relation to the fire at Snow Lake. I would like to, with your leave, answer them as I go through.

The weather was a question, and a small statement on the weather: On May 16th a dry lightning storm passed over the Snow Lake area. This was followed by cool weather and a light snow storm. By the 19th, temperatures were increasing, and on the 20th, dry lightning storms along with strong hot winds were being experienced. Cooler, damp weather returned on May 23rd giving way to clear weather on the 25th.

The cause — there was a question in relation to the cause: We believe ignition was from a lightning strike from a storm which passed over the area on May 16th. It is not uncommon for a lightning strike to smoulder with no evident smoke for several days before the right climatic conditions occur which permit it to burst into open flames.

There was a question on detection. The fire was located in the area covered by Air Detection Block 6; the tender to provide detection coverage was originally let to Northern Aviation Flight Training Centre, to commence on May 15th. As this particular carrier could not provide a valid operating certificate according to the Ministry of Transport, the block was re-tendered and the contract awarded to Air Park of Lac du Bonnet, to commence June 1st. In the meantime, the Manitoba Government Air Division provided a Cessna 180 to fly the block. Air Detection flights with the Cessna 180 started on schedule May 16th; the fire was detected and reported by the ground control on May 20th.

There were some questions in relation to the patrols that were flown, Mr. Speaker, I believe from the Honourable Member for Rupertsland. On May 16th, patrol was flown in the afternoon in Block 6 which covers this area and there was no smoke detected. On May 17th there were no patrols flown because there was snow in the area. On May 18th patrol was flown in the afternoon and there was no smoke detected. On May 19th patrol was flown in the afternoon and there was no smoke detected. On May 20th, the day that the fire was detected, there was a patrol flown in the afternoon, and by that particular plane, there was no smoke detected. On Tuesday, May 16th, Fire Detection Block No. 6 was routinely patrolled by our Cessna 180, registered as CF MAC, during which time electrical storm activity was observed and reported in the vicinity of Reed Lake. This particular Cessna is fitted with long-range fuel tanks that give it a 4-½ hour flying capacity at cruising speeds of approximately 140 miles, and I believe that's the question that was asked by the Member for Churchill.

There was type of patrol that was asked, I believe, by the Member for Churchill. The type of patrol flown is at the discretion of the Fire Control Officer within each block area. He alone determines which patrol to fly, or if a patrol is even necessary. To make this determination, a complex formula which computes variations of temperature, humidity, wind consideration, previous days' rainfall, is boiled down to a numerical rating known as Fire Weather Index, and I won't go into the details of the Fire Weather Index. But it's worth noting that the three to four days after the lightning strike, up to the day that the fire was detected by a ground crew, was in the low, variable hazard area.

On Saturday, May 20th, the index had increased from a low one up to a seven, which is above the low hazard, over the block, and a patrol — this was the day the fire was detected — the patrol

plane was dispatched at 1:30 p.m. There was nothing showing over the entire block when the patrol was completed. The first fire observation report came in from a ground patrol at 5 p.m. I have previously reported that it is not uncommon for fires to go unreported, from four to five days, because of their peculiar characteristics and combination of ground temperatures and other climatic variations.

The entire Aerial Detection Program is being conducted by this government on the basis of the best information available from professional staff. I can assure you there is no reduction of any kind, in either the number of blocks flown, the size of the block flown, nor the numbers of the aircraft flown.

The tenders for Aerial Detection Flying were called and awarded on the basis of strict tendering protocol and the only reason the awarded contract was not in force, arose out of a licence dispute between the carrier and the Federal Minister of Transport, which we have no jurisdiction of in that particular area.

The last question, Mr. Speaker, was the suppression. Suppression action started on the 20th shortly after the fire was reported. That was in the evening. Water bombing began at 6 a.m. the following morning by the Canso and the Canadair began bombing in the afternoon of May 21. One hundred and twenty-five extra firefighters, plus conservation officers were employed at the fire. Besides the Northern Regional Conservation officers, five additional conservation officers along with one fire attack crew, were provided by the western region.

The fire was a threat to the Hydro power line to Dickson Mine to the north and to the Grassy River Provincial Park to the south. Neither sustained damage and no structures were burned. The fire was in a state of being held by May 28, and some portions and equipment are presently being demobilized.

Just in relationship in closing, somebody asked how big, how small? The Snow Lake fire this particular year we believe will be determined to be something less than 24,000, with a cost of suppression of \$155,000.00. The major one, I think, last year was the Riverton one, which was 130,000 and some odd acres, at \$238,000 for suppression costs. Though a year before was the Bissett one for 32,000.

Fire occurrences to date, of May 29 in 1977, there were 626; as of May 29th this year, Mr. Speaker, there's 138, which is really, in effect, about 22 percent of what it was a year ago, and I think we will all be quite pleased with that.

The final question the Member for Churchill asked about ManFor's expectations in that area; the burned area is not in ManFor's five-year cutting plan and this area is certainly presently inaccessible.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the facts that I have presented and the facts that I've presented to this House are accurate enough that the irresponsible statements made by the former Minister of Northern Affairs should be refuted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Health.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland on a point of order.

MR. BOSTROM: A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The other day in the House when I asked a question of the Minister, whether or not there had been a reduction in the Fire Detection Program in that area, he called this question bordering on garbage, if I can recall the Minister's words directly, and he was reported that way in the press, Mr. Speaker. And today his answer confirms the question that I was asking him in that this Fire Detection Program has deteriorated; they are no longer flying the twin-engine aircraft in northern Manitoba to detect fires in that particular area. They're using a Cessna 180, which has a slower range. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. If the honourable member has a point of privilege, I wish he would raise it.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, the point of privilege is that the Minister made a statement to the House at that time, indicating that the charge or allegation that I was bringing up at the time, which I believe was based on good information, was garbage, and today he proves that he was wrong; and that the type of aircraft that they're using represents a reduction in the service; the reduction in the type of aerial surveillance that should be done; and the fact that this fire broke out and it was not spotted until it was too large to fight, shows that they did not have the proper kind of

Tuesday, May 30, 1978

surveillance or else they would have had the water bombers in there soon enough, when the fire was of a manageable size, and that's the whole idea behind detection programs.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable member for his comment. I understand that he was raising it as a matter of privilege, which in my opinion, was not a matter of privilege. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: I'd like to ask the Minister of Northern Affairs, despite his rather long answer, whether it is correct then, that for a period of some days — I can't specify how many — that for a period of some days a contract that was let by the Crown to a private firm to provide fire detection flight service, was non-operational because, in fact, they were not licensed to carry it out. Is that correct?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, to the Leader of the Opposition. The Manitoba government supplemented a plane for the particular days and it doesn't really matter, you know, you have a block to fly and you fly that block, Sir, it would take you a little bit longer or not, and some people should be aware of that, but they're not.

MR. SCHREYER: I'm aware, Mr. Speaker, about how block flying takes place. I'm asking the Honourable Minister if it is a fact that a contract that was let by the Crown to a private firm to provide this service, was in fact never carried out because — and here I can sympathize — it was not carried out because the firm involved was not in a position to do it simply because they could not obtain the licensing from the Government of Canada. Therefore, my question is, as a result of that, was there a non-operational period in which there was no detection flights being carried out at all?

MR. MacMASTER: The tender to my records would have taken place on the 15th. We put a plane in on the 16th.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for questioning having expired, I'll proceed with the Orders of the Day. The Honourable Government House Leader. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Mr. Speaker, if I may make a change in respect to the Public Utilities and Natural Resources Committee. The name of the Honourable Member for Selkirk to be exchanged for that of the Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Before proceeding to the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I should like to announce, just in case honourable members have forgotten, that the committee on Public Utilities will be meeting again on Thursday morning at 10 o'clock.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, that Mr. Speaker do now leave his Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, just before the question is put, I wonder if I might ask the Government House Leader, since I believe he was the one that intimated the other day, that because some honourable members of the New Democratic Party that were a few minutes late for committee may well have slept in, whether it could possibly be true that this morning at 10 a.m. when colleagues from this side were present at the committee, honourable members opposite — with two exceptions — were not, that they possibly were sleeping in.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, now I have only got one problem left. I have now convinced honourable members opposite that they should be at committee meetings on time; I will endeavour to do the same thing to ensure that members on this side of the House are at committees on time and then we can start at 10 o'clock instead of three minutes after, as was the case this morning.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Health and Social Development and the Honourable Member for Crescentwood in the Chair for the Department of the Executive Council.\$

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen: Committee come to order. We are on Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, Resolution 7. There were two persons who were on the list as of last night who indicated that they wished to speak and they are the Member for Transcona and the Member for Rock Lake. Would the Member for Rock Lake like to start?

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: No, Mr. Chairman, to sort of collect my thoughts again I just wanted to ask the Minister, we are talking about Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation and the number of homes that I'm given to understand that are built in The Pas. Could the Minister give how many and are they all occupied?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Housing.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): The houses referred to in The Pas are called the Bell Avenue Subdivision. There are 52 units, 12 of them are filled with public housing, that was the agreement we had with the Town of The Pas and the balance of them are empty, that's in the Bell Avenue Subdivision and then we have 9 nine houses along the street just in front on the houses in the subdivision which are also empty.

MR. EINARSON: How much money is involved here, Mr. Chairman. My point that I'm trying to make is what is the losses to the government on this particular project then? Is it possible to give any round figure as to, you know, you've got 9 nine houses that are empty, the cost of building these 9 nine homes and the loss in revenue in leasing from the time they were built?

MR. JOHNSTON: We have an agreement with the Council of The Pas that they will only be sold or they will be rented at market rental values and at the present time the estimated loss on the units is \$708,594 if we sell them at the prices that we have just planned to sell them at. We have just finished a market study and the real estate man in The Pas is going out with the new prices.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, is the CMHC not involved in these homes then, in financing?

MR. JOHNSTON: No, not in the loss but . . .

MR. EINARSON: No, no, I mean in the finance of building them.

MR. JOHNSTON: No, the construction was done on the basis of in-term financing by the Minister of Finance in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. EINARSON: So in other words then, you can legally sell these homes. If someone wants to, a private individual wants to buy one of those homes it would be permissible to do so, is that the understanding?

MR. JOHNSTON: Beg your pardon.

MR. EINARSON: If a person in say The Pas was interested in buying one of those 9 nine homes, it will be permissible for MHRC to sell them to a private individual?

Tuesday, May 30, 1978

MR. JOHNSON: Any of them, yes, of the 50. I think the honourable member is coming to the point where when we are involved with CMHC on Section 43 money to build public housing, we are not in a position to sell those houses because CMHC is involved in the financing and their regulations are that we can't sell them unless we can show that there are absolutely no people available to fill those units.

MR. EINARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you. Last night when the Member for Selkirk was asking some questions about West Selkirk, the Minister invited him to look at the detailed figures with the staff of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. I was wondering if that invitation would extend to myself as well with respect to West Selkirk and South St. Boniface?

MR. JOHNSTON: Certainly.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, I will pursue that, not now but sometime in the future.

When we left off yesterday, I think the last question I had asked was regarding the 1978 Operating Statement and the Projected Statement of Operations for 1979.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister. The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: With respect to this. . . Who's got the floor?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I was going to give it to the Minister. He was in the throws of having a Statement of Operations distributed. I was of the opinion that he was going to either answer your question or make a comment on this material that's been released. To the Minister, do you wish to comment on it now ?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, the comment I would make is that it is the material the member asked for, I've distributed it and he may have some questions on it.

MR. PARASIUK: I'd like to thank the Minister for providing this information. In it you have the Corporation's Share of Operating Subsidies and for the fiscal year that we've just ended, we have the share being 10.475 million, and then what's projected for the year 1978/79 is 13.074 million. I had thought that previously the Minister had indicated that our subsidies would end up in the range of the \$16.5 million. —(Interjection)— Excuse me, I didn't catch that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. JOHNSTON: When the total 1976/77 program is on for a full year and as I understand it the program that we have for the 77 units that are being built right now, they will come on next year which we estimate will be approximately \$16 million. As the honourable member knows, they are built under Capital Authority and they come onstream for subsidy usually the following year.

MR. PARASIUK: Okay. I'm going to take this and I'll try and get back to it in a little while when I get a chance to digest it a bit. I had a number of questions to ask the Minister regarding the possibility of getting what could be called a program-by-program update of Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. If you look at the annual report for 1976-77, there's a program description and some statistical information saying what is the status of that program, I guess, as of March 31, 1977, then you go on to assistance to non-profit groups and I'd really use the annual report as a type of guide and just go through program by program if the Minister is in a position to do that or if he has some type of other update, I'd look at that as well.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, there's no change in the programs . . . As a matter of fact, the member is quite welcome to this. It's the programs that we have that are ongoing with the department, the same programs.

MR. PARASIUK: Okay, if I could just go through that then quickly. With respect to the Public Housing Program, Section 43, Section 44, when you say no change contemplated in this program, that means that MHRC doesn't envisage any public housing under these two sections for this fiscal year that we're in right now.

MR. JOHNSTON: No, there is no change in the funding relationships. The program is still in place. We have never said we will not build another public housing unit.

MR. PARASIUK: Then can I get an indication from the Minister what public housing units under those two sections will in fact be built or are envisaged for this particular fiscal year?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, as I told the member last night, we have just had our confirmation — not a confirmation but information given to us that we would have \$14 million for Section 43 this year. What programs, what units will be built has not be finalized as yet.

MR. PARASIUK: So you do have a federal allotment of \$14 million.

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. PARASIUK: I'm not sure of how the budgeting process works on this. Do you have to budget for the gross amount and then get 90 percent back from the Federal Government if you use the 90 percent federal, 10 percent provincial or if you use 50 percent federal and 50 percent provincial, how does the budgeting work on that?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, you would budget the entire 100 percent capital authority and then we have, up until now, after CMHC approves it, an Order-in-Council is passed, they then start to come in with the money.

MR. PARASIUK: So I believe you have sufficient capital authority for this allotment.

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. PARASIUK: And this capital authority is a carry-over from prior years' capital authority.

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. PARASIUK: So you have \$14 million under Section 43. The subsidies are determined on an as-is basis, I guess, at the end of the year.

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. PARASIUK: But you do not have any concrete plans to give us today with respect to how that \$14 million will be utilized in this fiscal year.

MR. JOHNSTON: No. They are being worked on at the present time.

MR. PARASIUK: There is some, I think, confusion in some of the public's minds and possibly my own, this is why I've been asking these questions occasionally in the Legislature. There is the thought that MHRC will be building no public housing. Now, the Minister is saying, I think, that if there is a need, we will be proceeding with public housing. That means that some reports to the effect that the province is getting out of public housing aren't true, the Province of Manitoba is still in public housing, if the need arises the \$14 million will be allotted this year, is that correct?

MR. JOHNSTON: That's correct. As the member knows we've done a study on the applications that we have on file for senior citizens; we are now presently doing a complete study on the applications that are on file for public housing and the study as to what areas where they are mainly required. I think I mentioned the other night that the core area of Winnipeg is probably the one that is of the most concern. There is one that is proceeding and that is the continuation of the Midland property.

MR. PARASIUK: Does the Minister feel that he has sufficient land in what might be called the core area to proceed with housing and to proceed with utilizing this \$14 million allotment to deal with, I think, a pretty critical need in the core area which I think all members in the House agree exists? Does the Minister feel that there is sufficient land held right now or which could be made available to MHRC so that at least a portion of the \$14 million could be used this year to try and at least meet some of this need in this fiscal year?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, we have land and we have land that is presently in the process of being expropriated. The expropriations are not complete and we certainly hope that they'll proceed a lot faster than they have been but we have only built on, I believe, three properties of expropriated land where we don't know what the price is yet. The reason for that is we were well along and through our LARK Committee that was set up headed by Mr. Nugent, the estimates were that we'd be very close on the price so we went ahead with them, the major one being on Stradbroom Street where there are 75 units being built.

The board has just approved the purchase of 26 scattered sites from the City of Winnipeg. They are suitable for public housing and the staff have been directed to develop the program to utilize these sites. In addition, as mentioned, the expropriated land prices are being settled.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has indicated that he is proceeding with using the instrument of expropriation where necessary to acquire land in the core area, and he is indicating that MHRC is moving along with respect to either purchasing scattered sites or expropriating sites for possible public housing in the near future. I think when you look at the core area you run into some dilemmas, however, and that concerns the price of land. The price of land in the core area, although some people are arguing that it's an area that is run down and getting more run down, the price of land in the core area is very high. I know that in the past when MHRC has attempted to purchase land in the core area, it was found that the price has been very high or that the seller, the potential vendor, has been holding out for a very very high price. Often that land is vacant; often it's being used as a parking lot; often the taxes on it are quite low so that the person can afford to keep it there, in a sense, on spec. So that if anyone actually tries to buy one of these vacant lots, one finds that the price is so high, usually, that it makes it very difficult to be eligible for CMHC funding to complete the project, if one purchases the land. And that's the problem if one tries to utilize what might be called this — not utilize the expropriation but just try and bargain for the land. And I think that's been a continuing problem in the core area, and I think that's one of the reasons why the method of expropriation was tried. It was thought that rather than end up bartering with people who are really acting as pure speculators, usually, and who have no real pressure on them to sell that land, unless they get a very very good price for it, that it would be best to go the route of expropriation and let a judge hear the arguments on both sides to determine what a fair price is.

Now, it may turn out that that price is above what MHRC people and this advisory committee has assessed the market price to be, or the fair price to be, because in some senses the market isn't working that well in the inner core with respect to land. The land isn't being utilized, but it's not being taxed, therefore there's no pressures on it, and the price is very high, but it's not being used. So I gather that the Minister is prepared to try this out, continue on with this, and determine what prices are actually arrived at through the expropriation process. Is that correct?

MR. JOHNSTON: We are not prepared to continue expropriating; we are prepared to continue with the expropriations that we inherited, except in some cases. We have had, I believe, three cases that we have started to negotiate the land back, or is in the process of being negotiated back. We have Mrs. Katona, whose house was expropriated; it wasn't a derelict house; she was living there, enjoying life, and the government took her property. We decided to — she came to us with her attorney and we negotiated it back. In the case of a Mr. Nicado, he took us to court. He had plans for his piece of property on Stradbroom; I don't know whether his plans would have met the approval of the City of Winnipeg zoning, but he did have plans for it. He took us to court; he lost the court; he was prepared to continue his case. We took the attitude that it wasn't a piece of property that was condemned or anything of that nature; we negotiated it back to Mr. Nicado. I believe there's another one where there was an apartment that was expropriated while it was in the process of being sold, and the person buying it was going to renovate it and fix it up. We have approached anybody that has come to us concerned that their land was taken from them, that had plans, on that basis. We have had many that are very happy with the expropriations. We will continue them on that basis.

Pardon me, there's another one on . . . St. Paul and Arlington? Four; there's been four.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Does MHRC have any property in the core area of Winnipeg which are suitable sites for senior citizens' housing?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. PARASIUK: Could he indicate what those are, and if there are any plans to proceed with any senior citizens' housing in this fiscal year because we've all agreed that that is the area where the need is greatest? We have a waiting list of some 731 people; I would imagine that the waiting list may, in fact, get larger. The greatest preference for senior citizens is to locate somewhere downtown, conceivably south of Portage Avenue, and I'm wondering whether in fact anything will be starting this year.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, as I said, we have the updated waiting list. We are presently waiting for the Federal Government arrangements. The member can, I think, realize that \$14 million will probably build in the neighbourhood of not more than 500 units at the most, under Section 43, and that would have to be senior citizens in the city, and there are some areas in the country we were presently looking at. But the other negotiations with the Federal Government regarding the 8 percent write-down that I mentioned the other night, we have not as yet been told how much per unit we can spend on that program; it hasn't been finalized as yet. So, to get any program into place on that has been extremely tough for us to do. We have properties in the core area that can be used for public housing or senior citizens' housing.

MR. PARASIUK: But as of right now, there are no projects ready to go right at this particular stage. You are still in the negotiating phase; you don't have any that you are ready to commit, conceivably in this construction season, which I think will be over the next three or four months?

MR. JOHNSTON: No. We have none ready to go right now, if that's what the member is asking. We can still get into place if we find that there is a need to go ahead. We can still get them into place as far as the programs are concerned to have approval by November 30th to carry on with them the next year if we decide the need is there.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairman, just for clarification, the Minister has distributed a two sheet description of the programs and what I was hoping to do was to go through each topic one by one so that we could do it somewhat systematically and have that area covered so that we've covered what might be called the program area of the department, or of MHRC, then after that there might be a couple of questions pertaining to what he might envisage in relation to some of the announcements he's made and some discussion possibly of global targets, but I was wondering if we could just go through on a topic-by-topic basis. We have them, and I think we could go through them fairly quickly and fairly systematically, on that basis I'd yield the floor to other members of the committee who would want to ask questions on public housing. I think it would probably be an expeditious way of dealing with it, do you concur?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe to the Member for Brandon East, and the Member for Lac du Bonnet, the suggestion has been placed before the committee by the Member for Transcona that we go through this two page, or a page and a bit of programs and he has some questions that he would like to ask the Minister relating to this listing of programs, and suggested that if any members have any questions that aren't following this format, that perhaps they might want to proceed with them before he starts in on this. Is this sort of agreeable to those two gentlemen and have they any other questions they'd like to ask the Minister that are perhaps - —(Interjection)— Or as the Member for Transcona suggests, perhaps we might follow this sheet now and then if there's any questions at the end, then we'll go back to those particular questions. Is that agreeable? The Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: The only comment I have, Mr. Chairman, is that public housing is so broad ranging and it covers the entire province, both family and senior citizens and it's possible that one might have the number of questions on a particular town or area, you know, outside the City of Winnipeg, we seem to be talking about inner city programs in Winnipeg right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Although last evening, to the Member for Brandon East, we had quite a go-around in western Manitoba in the various smaller towns and villages as to what was in place and what wasn't.

MR. EVANS: I have some questions and points to make in that respect, but I'm not disagreeable with that approach, I just say that public housing is a very broad-ranging subject.

MR. PARASIUK: Well, what has he got there are Section 40 . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We were just sort of, the Member for Brandon East, trying to find the sort of a game plan that we might follow.

MR. EVANS: Well, that's fine, I can try to go with this. That's agreeable, the only thing is that public housing is very broad-ranging and there may be the odd question we may omit, so as long as it's understood that we'd be coming back to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Transcona.\$

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, maybe the Minister can give us the up-date and I know he had it in a press release that he issued last December and I don't have that press release with me. How many low-income family housing units we will have when the commitments are in fact built and how many senior citizen housing units we will have?

MR. JOHNSTON: By the end of 1977 the construction program will have 8,206 units in Winnipeg, it consists of 4,819 elderly persons housing and 3,387 family houses. In the rural area we will have 4,182 consisting of 2,262 elderly persons housing and 1,920 in the family and 2,262 as elderly. That gives you a total of 12,388 units.

MR. PARASIUK: In this respect, especially with respect to the elderly units, and I just see a \$14 million allotment under Section 43 which could be used for senior citizens housing, this could conceivably build 500 units. I have been looking at some of the material prepared by the Department of Health and Social Development with respect to the elderly in Manitoba, and I've been looking at some other documentation regarding the elderly in Canada and the United States and all the statistical information indicates that the number of elderly people, or the proportion of elderly people in our society is going to be increasing quite substantially over the next 25 years. Given that —(Interjection)— M re any people are getting the quickly. I think that something in the order of one in three people by the year 2000 will be over 65 years of age. Given that situation which is happening and will happen ' is the Minister taking those studies by the Department of Health and Social Development with respect to aging into account, is he looking at the general demographic trends in Canada and North America in trying to determine the longer term need for senior citizen's accommodation in the Province of Manitoba, rather than just going on the basis of filled in applications, because I think that this is something that can't only be dealt with by putting out an ad and asking people to make applications per se, I think some type of anticipated demand analysis has to be done. You have to look at rural urban migration and you have to do some sophisticated planning as the Minister is indicating he is going to have his staff do, so I'm asking him if he will take into account the longer term demographic trends in Manitoba and in North America when he's trying to project need for senior citizens.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, yes we are, we're working at that all the time and regarding the statistics that you have from the Health and Social Development, we have similar statistics that we have gathered regarding the senior citizens that will be in , let's say the market if the member wants to refer to it that way, in the year 2000. But there's also something else that has to be taken into consideration and watched very closely too, is that the senior citizen in the year 2000 will be a person who has means greater than the senior citizens than we have at the present time. They have access to pension plans and they have many other things available to them for their retirement age than the previous senior citizens have had. So, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that our research has to be done on the basis of what is the best type of senior citizen housing planning that we're looking at. It might not be just the government owned public housing where you have very very tight qualifications regarding assets are concerned, and as I mentioned last night the way the Federal Government is moving, they're moving the same way because of the statistics that they have available to them and they have up-graded their nonprofit type of a program. There's no question that we are watching that all the time.

MR. PARASIUK: You know, in this respect, I think that the Federal Government is moving in the right direction with respect to non-profit housing. I hope that they will provide even more flexibility between some types of joint ventures between provincial housing authorities and non-profit organizations. I think that the past MHRC-CMHC program was far too narrow and that's because of CMHC restrictions. I think that elderly people in a community, especially a community where people have a sense of community, where they know each other fairly well, these people don't want to

get into segregated elderly housing. They do want to be in close proximity to other elderly people but the way the program had been operating in the past because of CMHC restrictions, you could only go into a home if you met the income qualifications and there were numbers of people who didn't qualify and consequently they couldn't get into the senior citizens' housing. It made it sometimes difficult to get a good mix of senior citizens' options available in a community.

Now the point is, what happens if you don't have a non-profit organization in place in a community but you do have the need. That is, if no Lions Club or Knights of Columbus or church group, or you name it, comes forward and says, "Yes, we're going to take advantage of the non-profit housing provisions; we're going to build a 100 unit senior citizens' complex; 50 of these will be MHRC subsidized units and the others will be subsidized under the federal non-profit program which is a shallower type of subsidy but some older people will probably require the deeper types of subsidy or it might be 25 percent and 75 percent but the proportion will vary. I think MHRC does have that option as far as I can tell with their program right now as it is developing if the Lions Club builds a senior citizens' home, it may decide to take 25 percent of the units.

But there are many communities that don't have that level of group organizations or non-profit organizations in place to take the lead and yet these places do have the need for senior citizens' accommodation. It's in situations like that that I'm wondering about whether the Minister is prepared to have the MHRC Non-Profit Housing Corporation take the lead and build a non-profit senior citizens' residence, some of which will be subsidized under Section 44 and some of which will be subsidized in other ways.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, the MHRC has a non-profit organization as the member knows at the present time. It can be utilized; it is set up to build non-profit housing in Winnipeg or probably any other community in Manitoba but the municipality or the town itself can set up a non-profit organization very simply and if they don't have Kiwanis or service clubs or anything of that nature, they can set it up themselves. —(Interjection)— I beg your pardon? No, I won't forget the Kinsmen. But that's possible.

There will be areas in Manitoba where there won't be any service clubs and there will be a need for the government to go in and build public housing under the, whether it's an 8 percent write-down or whether it's under Section 43 the way it presently is, if we have funds available to us. There is no question in our minds that there will be places in the Province of Manitoba that nobody else will have an interest in other than the government and we are very conscious of that.

MR. PARASIUK: So, just to clarify it in my own mind, you are expecting that in the future there could be a variety of ways in which senior citizens' accommodation could be provided.

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. PARASIUK: That could be provided by the province under Section 43, this could be provided by the province using its non-profit corporation, using the 8 percent write-down, this could be done through service clubs using the 8 percent write-down, this could be done by municipal non-profit corporations using the 8 percent write-down.

MR. JOHNSTON: No, I think I'd like to correct that and clear it up. When I mentioned the 8 percent write-down, I think the member is referring to the program that I said that the Federal Government was coming out with whereby they would write-down the interest to 9 points of the interest if the non-profit organization put up 10 percent of the money; they will write-down 8 percent if the government puts up 100 percent of the money. The other 8 percent program that I'm speaking of is the one that CMHC is presenting to us as a province to replace Section 43 funds. In other words, we would have to go on the market for the money as a province and we would then receive an 8 percent write-down from the Federal Government — the province — instead of having Section 43 money allocated to us, we would go out and we would borrow the money. We would make our decisions on how many would be built; we would approve our own plans. This is the type of arrangements that we're working on but at the present time they haven't told us what price we can go to on those units.

MR. PARASIUK: I've got some confusion with respect to this latter program. You're saying then that the Province of Manitoba will go the private financial institutions and borrow money. Will this be in Canada or will they be allowed to go to off-shore markets or outside of Canada when they borrow the money, or are there restrictions that way?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance would make the decision as to where the

province borrows its money but the Federal Government would give us a write-down of 8 percent on that money. Where the Minister of Finance would decide we can borrow money is something that I'm not able to answer.

MR. PARASIUUK: The reason why I've got concerns is that if there are no restrictions and you can go outside the country, you can probably get the loans at a fairly favourable interest rate although you might get hurt on the other side by the changes in currency values so that's a double-edged sword. However, if you start trying to borrow money locally and all provinces start doing that for housing, you may run into some problems of insufficient capital supply for that. I say that in the light of the current situation regarding a shortage of investment capital. Right now we have a situation on the energy side whereby the country used to average something in the order of \$5 million per year in energy investment and now it's projected that over the next 20 years Canada, as a society, in constant dollars, will be investing something in the order of \$12 billion to \$14 billion a year in energy investments so obviously there will, in fact, be capital shortages elsewhere.

What I'm concerned about is the Federal Government coming to the province and telling them, "Well, look, you know, we're going to give you this very favourable short-term deal," and the province finds itself in two or three years in a situation where there is a capital shortage, where a lot of money is being utilized elsewhere and we are paying fairly hefty interest rates, and I'm quite concerned when all the provinces go to the market at the same time because there will be a tendency for the provinces with respect to housing construction to go to the market at the same time. Has the Minister taken this into account in his negotiations?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned the other night, the Federal Government seems to be wanting to get out of Section 43 and it's very obvious in the amounts that they've allotted to us, it looks like they will be out of it by next year, or the next two years at the latest. At the same time they give us this offer of the 8 percent write-down if we borrow the capital and we're not completely in favour of the arrangements that they're presenting to us at the present time. This is what we've been discussing. We have been talking to them about the availability of capital in their program, and the concerns that we may have or may run into. The other concern that we have is the program, when we finally get it finalized with them, is probably not to our liking at the present time in this respect. The other provinces are talking to them as well. The 8 percent write-down, we would gain 17 cents a unit this year if we went ahead with any units on the program.

MR. PARASIUUK: 17 cents?

MR. JOHNSTON: . . . per month, unit per month would be our gain.

MR. PARASIUUK: I'll give you a piggy bank.

MR. JOHNSTON: The other problem with that is that the Federal Government's input is always fixed and ours won't be, ours will be involved in the maintenance and everything else. So we see in the future that that program of the Federal Government's is not as desirable as we'd like it to be although there are some things, it has its advantages in that under that program we'll be very free to do as we please without too much interference from CMHC.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: I'd like to ask a supplementary question. Has the Minister or his staff calculated what this new federal program or this new federal approach means in terms of the rent that, let's say, the tenants would pay? At the moment, as we all know, they pay a rent geared to their income, their ability up to 25 percent of their income. Has there been any calculation completed on what a typical rent might be under the new program that's being proposed as compared with Section 43, Public Housing Program that now exists? It seems to me that at first glance, particularly with no continuing federal involvement in the way of subsidy, that there's a possibility that as time goes on there may be increasing costs and increasing rents for the tenants because of inflation and perhaps in a less equitable way than is now occurring through the existing public housing programs. So, I wonder if the Minister could tell us whether there's any calculation available as to what it would cost, let's say, for a typical senior citizen under the new program as compared with what that senior citizen would pay for a one bedroom bachelor suite now under the existing public housing program.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, the rent has nothing to do with really the costs of the building, the rents are according to income. It's on a scale according to income from 16 to 25 percent in the province of Manitoba at the present time. The Federal Government's proposal is that in all new units it will be 25 percent of gross family income as far as the rent is concerned. That's the proposal that the Minister has put forward to us in Ottawa and to all the other provinces. We have said that we don't really like that, we would prefer not to have two scales in Manitoba. What we would be involved in is all new units would be 25 percent of income, gross family income, and then we would have the units that we have now on the present sliding scale which works out to an average of about 22 ½ percent of income. Nobody is down as low as 16 percent of income in Manitoba, it works out to about 22 ½ percent. We have said to the Federal Government that we would prefer to work to a 25 percent over a period of time if they're going to insist on 25 percent. They have not been flexible on that. In other words, any new units that we build they want us to be charging across the board the lowest of 25 percent, the base of 25 percent.

MR. EVANS: Well, by way of further clarification, my understanding is that the approach of the Federal Government is to subsidize the interest rates, but there are other costs that vary through time particularly maintenance costs, and especially heating costs, energy costs which are rising. So while the rent may be struck at 25 percent of gross family income at the beginning, what about say in year five when the energy costs have risen substantially? My understanding is that there's no provision for direct subsidy other than the subsidy of interest rates, so unless I don't understand it, or unless I don't have all the information, it would seem to me that the rent could go up through time as maintenance costs and operating costs rise as they are inevitably going to rise unfortunately.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, as I said, the Federal Government's input would be fixed. It's the old story of the Federal Government negotiates these arrangements and his input would be fixed. Our costs, if we have inflation because of maintenance, etc., would be at a point that would not be 50-50. The province could be putting . . . With the 8 percent it might come to 40 percent of our costs of operation and we'd be paying 60, now that doesn't necessarily say the rents are going up, it says that the cost to the province as far as subsidy and operation would go up and those moneys are found out of general funds. The Federal Government, going back again, has said on all new units the base will be 25 percent of gross family income. And that we don't like, we'll have some people in the new buildings or in the new construction paying 25 percent and another group paying less. We have said that we would like to work, over a period of time, to the 25 percent base. They haven't accepted that.

MR. EVANS: Well, as I understand it then, Mr. Chairman, with the new program — again I don't have the details so I'm floundering around for information here — under the new program even though the Federal Government agrees to a very deep subsidy, it will be up to the province, MHRC, to carry any additional subsidy in the future. There's no subsidy arrangement for the CMHC.

MR. JOHNSTON: The arrangements would be on the new program an 8 percent write-down on interest and if that wasn't 50 percent of the cost of operation, the province would have to pick up the rest.\$

MR. EVANS: When this new program that's being announced or in the process of being formulated, I gather there are many questions being asked by the provinces so that this program isn't by any means final. When would the Minister expect that this program might come into effect, might be available to the provinces? Even though it's available, it doesn't mean that it will come into being. So that's one question: When might it become operative?

The other question is: What about the role of the non-profit route as opposed to the role of MHRC? Do you expect that with this new program that the bulk of the social housing will be by the non-profit route as opposed to the public housing Section 43 route because, as you indicated, it's possible that that type of program, Section 43 program, would no longer be available, or the moneys would not be available for that type of programming.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, not the moneys in Section 43 that it has now. It looks like the program of the Federal Government in a couple of years will be the 8 percent write-down and there will be no Section 43 money so any public housing or any public units that are built by the province would have to be on the basis of a base rent of 25 percent and up and done on the 8 percent write-down program of the Federal Government under Section 43. In other words, the Section 43 grants will not be 50/50 grants; it will be an 8 percent write-down.

Now, if the member is asking me which I think is the best type of a program for senior citizens,

I think the non-profit approach is probably one of the best ways to go. As the Member for Transcona has said, there are all different types of senior citizens and it isn't the fact that they don't have any money that they want to live in senior citizens' accommodation, they want to be with people that are their own age or they can no longer handle a house or the farm or anything of that nature. The write-down, or the gift on the forgiveness of interest that they're offering on the non-profit program is very attractive and it gets the rents down to a very low rent. I know there are many senior citizens could handle it. If you sold a house for \$30,000, the interest alone would probably handle your rent in one of those but there is always the province's involvement in that if they have people that apply that don't have the means to pay the economic rent on that unit, the province is available to help subsidize with the Federal Government under our subsidy program, senior citizens in those units. So, you know, we're talking about being able to accommodate senior citizens period, and we're getting rid of the harsh qualifications of assets, etc., which you have to have. The Member for Brandon East knows full well that we have been saying to senior citizens, "Get rid of your money to get in senior citizens' housing." That's basically what's been happening.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I realize that a lot of senior citizens do want to get into public housing because they have seen over the years the type of construction that was put in place was very attractive and also in many of the communities, in fact throughout the province, these buildings have become focal points for social activity, recreation for the elderly which I think is an excellent development. I know in the City of Brandon, the focal point of activity for all senior citizens is centred around one or two of the larger buildings that exist. That doesn't mean to say that there aren't many other activities for retired people elsewhere in that community, but the focal point, without doubt, is around the public housing that was put in place.

I appreciate that people with higher incomes want to get into public housing for that reason, that they are well built, that they do provide a basis for a lot of recreation, a new interest for the elderly. What I'm concerned about is whether the non-profit approach which I know doesn't have that income restriction or the asset requirement restriction, whether the non-profit approach will enable rents to be relatively modest even though they may be higher, whether they would be relatively modest. The Minister makes reference to the possibility of subsidies for those who don't have the income or the assets but I just understood him to say a while back that that program may be curtailed, that is, assistance under public housing, the subsidy program. I would have thought that that may be curtailed for new construction in the future. If there is no new construction permitted under Section 43, surely the subsidies that are available under Section 43 will no longer, or Section 44, will no longer be available for that new construction. So, how will it be that you can subsidize a low-income senior citizen in the future if that program is dissolved. How can you do that through the non-profit mechanism?

The other point is, is the province prepared to subsidize the non-profit group apart from the subsidy — I'm not talking about the subsidy now for the individual; that was my first question — but is it prepared to subsidize the non-profit corporation in the future in some way, whether it be leasing of land for \$1.00, some start-up costs, or what have you, or is it going to be left entirely to that organization to communicate with the Federal Government and carry on from there. I mean, that could happen. It could be a matter in the future where these non-profit groups would go straight to the Federal Government and there would be no provincial involvement whatsoever. Is that something we should foresee, the reduction in the role of Manitoba Housing and maybe the phasing out even in some of these areas while the individual non-profit corporations deal directly with CMHC? Or is it the intention of the government to continue to provide some assistance to non-profit groups in the way of, as I say, free land leased for \$1.00 let's say, or some other type of subsidy?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the member is asking the participation of the Provincial Government in the non-profit program. First of all, let me say that the non-profit program of the Federal Government that they've come up with probably amounts to three times what it presently has been under 15.1 — three times better. Now if somebody wants the write-down to 1 percent, they have to find 10 percent of the money for the program and land can be included in that. The Provincial Government can be involved in land, as he said; as I said, we can be involved in helping them . . . we could probably just — my staff hasn't even talked to me about this but off the top of my head, if we wanted to go for a write-down to 1 percent of 5 percent that they have left to them and let them find 5 percent; that's possible too. But the economic rents in these buildings will be considerably less. I mentioned that there is one going ahead on this basis because they were promised that they could go ahead on the new basis, or advised to wait for the new basis and they had their plans and everything, and their contracts let and the Federal Government people said to them, "Well, wait; wait because we've got a new program." Well they can't wait much longer.

In Carman, they're moving ahead and the rent that will be charged in Carman — I'm not sure, Bob, do you have any figure of what it may be? — CMHC feel in that particular unit the rents would start at \$160.00 a month for a bachelor suite. Now there are certainly senior citizens who can't go that high. Then the province comes in and we have to take a look at our subsidy for people that can't get up that high but we have to take a different look at the program.

In the non-profit housing, The Elderly and Infirm Persons' Housing Act provided \$1,700 for single units and \$2,150 for double units, required a 10 percent land equity requirement, rents as required were further supplemented under the provisions of the rent supplement," — and I'm leading from what the member has, and if this assistance must now be reviewed in the light of the revisions of the federal program, the province is going to have to take a look at the program regarding our subsidies. I certainly think that it's a tremendous advantage to have that non-profit program the way it's going to be.

MR. EVANS: As a matter of clarification, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister saying that the project in Carman is going ahead under the new program or the old program? It's under the new program.

MR. JOHNSTON: Under the new program. Even though we haven't got the agreement signed, the Federal Government is going ahead with them.

MR. EVANS: So under the new program, a typical one-bedroom or a bachelor suite would be — I'm not sure whether you said a bachelor or a one-bedroom — whatever you said in your example, \$160.00 a month. That's without any provincial involvement.

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. EVANS: Without any provincial involvement. Okay then, for that type of accommodation, if by chance you were to build a senior citizens' home under the public housing section, what would the rent be? Is it possible for your staff to . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, the rent would be according to income.

MR. EVANS: Yes, okay, then at 25 percent of the old age pension let's say, what would that bring it to? Or if there is such a thing as a typical elderly person's income. I guess it depends, of course, on what kind of pensions they have but let's assume they just have the old age pension, you know the basic pension.

MR. JOHNSTON: With the basic pension of \$274.00 a month, their rent would be \$65.00.

MR. EVANS: Yes, so generally then, the person on the bare federal pension would not be able to afford this type of accommodation.

MR. JOHNSTON: That's right.

MR. EVANS: But are you saying that you would be prepared to subsidize, as this was our program before, we would be prepared to subsidize some pensioner who wasn't able to afford the \$160.00 because of a lower income, we were prepared to subsidize him by saying okay, we'll put you, in effect, under Section 43. Is that still . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: Section 44.

MR. EVANS: Section 44, is that still the program?

MR. JOHNSTON: No, if it's in a non-profit, I think that we would be responsible probably for 100 percent of the subsidy, the province would be.

MR. EVANS: I see. Under the old program' the province would subsidize individual units or individual people so that the non-profit would have a combination, it would have some people who would be paying a percentage of whatever their income was and then there would be others who would be in those units on a subsidized basis. I believe there are two or three that exist in the province now where you have that mixture, some that are subsidized under public housing and others that are not. Are you saying that in the case of the Carman project, now there would be no such provincial

subsidization?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, in the past the Federal Government did share in the subsidy for senior citizens in non-profit buildings. Because of the new arrangement, the subsidy for senior citizens who need assistance to be in that shelter would probably be 100 percent from the province. In fact, I think it would be —(Interjection)— Yes, it will.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I'll have to check back on Hansard on that but I think the Minister might have implied earlier that Section 44 money might be used for non-profit housing but now you're stating that Section 44 money cannot be used for the non-profit housing.

MR. JOHNSTON: If I did, I apologize.

MR. PARASIUK: No, I'll check, I'm not sure; I'm just trying to clarify that in my own mind. I'm not trying to . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: I think I can clarify it now. If I said it, I'm wrong. Under the new program, it'll be 100 percent subsidy if we're helping people in non-profit buildings. —(Interjection)— That's right, if it's there, we'll use it. Naturally we'd like to have the subsidy but I don't think it will be there.

MR. PARASIUK: Well, you see, that's the concern I have in both of these areas. The non-profit housing program has a lot of attractive features to it but there certainly are some hookers and the hookers are being put in by the feds and that's not unusual; they've been doing it for the last ten years given the particular bent of Prime Minister Trudeau and that is to try and put on certain responsibilities onto the province. Often the province gets stuck with the responsibilities without having the clear transfer of financial capability to do that and that is something that concerns me with the whole area of housing. Originally the Federal Government did take the initiative with respect to providing social housing and it had played a very strong funding role in that respect. In order to make its books look good, it's going to transfer the responsibilities and the job of finding the money onto the province and I'm afraid that the province — and not this province necessarily by itself but other provinces as well — will then try and make their books look good by transferring a great deal of the responsibility for finding the money to pay for housing onto the municipalities or they'll bring out the old concept of user fees when in fact people won't be able to afford the housing.

Now if, in fact, Section 43 is being phased out, and that's what the Minister implied earlier, that means the Section 44 subsidies are being phased out as well, there will be no new subsidies, which means that a province will find itself in a position of having to subsidize non-profit housing units for people who are just on the normal old age pension and probably the CPP because they probably won't have sufficient money to live in these types of non-profit housing. So what I'm afraid of is that non-profit housing will become nice middle-class housing but those people at the lower end of the income scale won't be able to afford to pay the rents in non-profit housing and the province which now, or in the future, will have to pay 100 percent of the subsidies, will find itself in a financially difficult position and possibly unable to pay these subsidies.

I look at the statements that you have given us regarding subsidies and I see that they do go up and they're going up, they're \$10 million and they're going up to \$13 million and they'll conceivably be \$16 million. But for every one of those dollars, there's another federal dollar as well. What concerns me is reaching a situation where we still have the need, especially with respect to senior citizens because we do have an ageing population and the pension provisions in this country aren't that good and they're under review right now and there is some fear that maybe these will be restricted. We'll find ourselves in a position where the need dictates that the subsidy still should be paid; they will be going up in roughly the same proportion but instead of being cost-shared 50/50 with the Federal Government, they'll be cost-shared 100 percent by the Provincial Government. The province will then say in the future, "Whoops, we don't have the money to pay for these subsidies." So I would caution the Minister about being too enraptured with the federal proposals because I predict that they are going to end up costing us more money than we are receiving now and I predict that the Federal Government is trying to do what it's done with respect to block funding and it's trying to do what it's done in a number of other areas of federal-provincial activity and that's pull a sleight of hand and transfer responsibility onto the province but not transfer sufficient fiscal capacity to ensure that the province can carry out this responsibility properly.

Now, has the province been able to negotiate any safeguards in these formula? I know that in discussions of equalization between Ministers of Finance, in discussions of other fiscal relations between the province and the Federal Government especially through the Department of Finance, the provinces try very hard to ensure that the Federal Government gives them some guarantees that three or five years down the line the province isn't stuck in a position where it doesn't have the money to pay for the responsibility that's been transferred onto the province. Now, has that been something that the Minister has been negotiating with the Federal Government and is he in a position right now to predict whether this particular package of programs which the Federal Government is, in a sense, putting forward and in a sense also imposing on the province, will be a better deal fiscally, financially, to the province than the old program in terms of meeting needs as they arise and can be predicted over the course of the next ten years in Manitoba? We've been doing that type of calculation with respect to health costs and social service costs, I'm wondering if the Minister has been dealing with this issue on the area of housing costs.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the member is sympathizing with me now. Actually, based on the 1977 construction costs, public housing built under the new program will cost the Federal Government 17 cents per unit more, the province 17 cents per unit less and the tenant approximately 5 percent more in the first year, if they make us go to 25 percent.

MR. PARASIUK: That's right.

MR. JOHNSTON: Now, regarding the non-profit, as I've said, we like the program but it does have some drawbacks. We have been in meetings with the Federal Government since it started, I think I mentioned the Federal Housing Ministers' Conference in February and we have had our officials at five meetings now and the sixth one being tomorrow. I have made my position quite clear by telegram and discussions on one occasion with the Federal Minister as to my concerns regarding rents and the subsidy programs. To date, we are still in negotiation and we are hoping to get it settled. The last answer I had on a request for a Ministers' meeting, the same as Mr. Tardiff in Quebec, Mr. Bennett in Ontario and the new Minister in Alberta, Mr. Chambers, we've all requested a meeting with the Minister, a Ministers' meeting. He's come back and said that he wouldn't like to schedule one until we've had the officials meet in Québec tomorrow and Thursday. But we are presently negotiating with the Federal Government the nature of the provincial assistance that will be acceptable to the Federal Government under the global funding program. We are endeavouring to ensure that the nature of the provincial assistance will be such to ensure the continuing pressure of the Federal Government for their share of the participation. We're all negotiating that with them. All the provinces are united in their concerns and are requesting early meetings, as I said, with the Federal Minister. This is what is going on at the present time regarding the Federal Government's housing program. They have given us some broad guidelines but we haven't settled it as yet and we're left in a very — all the provinces — left in a position which is up in the air as to where we're going on the housing program, other than that we have been told that we have, for this year, Section 43 with the federal 50-50 supplement of \$14 million. So we're still negotiating unofficially. I haven't got an official letter. My people have had those discussions with them.

MR. PARASIUK: No, I can appreciate the position that the Minister finds himself in in dealing with the Federal Government with respect to these changes, or tentative changes — I guess many of them are changes already — in the housing program of the Federal Government. I'm just cautioning the Minister in these negotiations to be very wary of the carrot that the Federal Government usually puts forward and the carrot usually has a three year duration and after that it turns into a sour pickle. That's happened too often in the past and, unfortunately, I think that there usually is a greater degree of change, you see, at the provincial level politically than there has been over the last hundred years federally and I think that the Federal Liberals assume that they will be in forever so they take a ten year horizon and often provinces take a shorter horizon in mind. I'm just hoping that the Minister will be doing the calculations to ensure that what appears to be 17 cents less per unit to the province this year will continue to be 17 cents less per unit to the province 3, 4, 5 years from now and that's the gamble. The Federal Government usually comes along and says, "Well, that's the gamble." It's usually not a gamble from their perspective. They've usually done the analysis to indicate to them that the risk is going to be borne by the province and I think that's what is going to happen.

Your colleague and the previous Minister of Health and Social Development was complaining about that with respect to block funding and I think the same thing could be happening in the whole area of housing. I know that the federal officials and the Federal Ministers have been looking for

ways and means of transferring responsibility and future financial obligations for programs onto the provinces and I am a bit concerned about the fact that the Federal Government actually isn't providing more options to the province and isn't providing the possibility that Section 43 and the Section 44 option could be continued. Once that option is lost, you can't go back to it afterwards and I'm just afraid of the province negotiating itself into a position of short-term favourable gain and a long-term unfavourable fiscal position.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, as the member knows, the Federal Government operates on the basis of the golden rule in negotiations and it's he who has the gold rules and I'm fully aware that you have to be on your toes with the Federal Government. As a new Minister, I went into the Ministers' meeting in February with my eyes wide open and came out feeling that we were really moving along in something good. I must say that the Federal Government and the Minister did promise meetings, did promise negotiations, and he has done that. They haven't all quite come down to our satisfaction as yet and we're going to be negotiating very hard as I know the other provinces are too.

MR. PARASIUK: Well, I would hope that he puts the pressure on in the next four or five months. It's surprising the extent to which the Federal Government is much more agreeable as you get into that stage of their parliamentary life.

I'll go on now with — if we don't have questions on that — onto the rural and northern one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, unfortunately I was not able to be here last night and I understand there was some discussion about certain projects in Manitoba outside of Winnipeg and I don't want to be repetitive so very briefly, however, I would like to ask the Minister: Is the MHRC going ahead or is it not going to go ahead with the project at Birtle?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I will be repetitive. The project at Birtle, as the letter from the Mayor states, was a project that the examination of the feasibility of it was not completed and we are presently taking a look at it and because of remarks of the Mayor here, starting at the third paragraph, "As you are aware, MHRC and the Town of Birtle negotiated a transfer of property for the building for \$1.00 which would indicate our desire for the purpose of needed accommodation. Our housing authority did receive a number of applications in response to an ad in the local paper, no canvass or interviews were conducted."

Mr. Chairman, he goes on to say that one of the problems is our qualification of assets, and we have informed him by letter just lately that we will follow up the research with him, but regarding the qualification of assets we have informed him that the new federal program is one that he might well be looking at. So we are in the process of studying Birtle at the present time.

MR. EVANS: So there hasn't been a decision to not go ahead, but the inclination is to suggest to them that they use the new federal program?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, it is a suggestion. We are studying Birtle at the present time.

MR. EVANS: I might add, Mr. Chairman, that in many instances over the years, long before I became Minister, I don't believe it was the practice to interview and examine every single application, nor do I believe that there was any particular magic in the 2 to 1 formula. You can have a 3 to 1 formula, a 4 to 1 formula, or a 1 to 1 formula, there is nothing magical about those formulas.

I had the pleasure, I must add, of visiting the good town of Birtle on a couple of occasions, including lengthy discussion with Ray Howard, the Mayor, and the Council, who were very enthused about this particular project. I would say this that I give the elderly credit in this province. They are doubting Thomases, they will believe something is going to go ahead when they see the construction under way. This is true for many many communities, and our experience in the past has been, when the old folks see something under construction then they are ready to submit their applications. You will find that many many applications will flood in after construction is under way, when they definitely see something happening. They are doubting Thomases and maybe they should be because they will believe it when they see it, and when they see something happening then you will see the applications come in. That has been the experience, that applications do flood in once construction starts.

So I would hope that something happens in Birtle. I think that you can look at the information

Tuesday, May 30, 1978

in the area. There are a lot of elderly people, I don't mean just in the town but in the surrounding community, who would be very happy and who would want to live in such accommodation.

My several discussion with the Mayor and the Council, not only on two, I think on three occasions, because once we were there as a Cabinet as well, would indicate that there was that need; plus discussion with the various senior citizens groups, talking to people in the personal care home and so on, and I note our good Speaker, the MLA for Birtle, is also here, Birtle-Russell, and maybe he can verify that. But that was the impression I had.

So I would hope that something could happen, because it is a very important town. It has a fairly large market area and it is a town that is going to be around for a long time and if it doesn't grow — I am sure it is going to grow a bit — so I think that there is every reason, economic reasons as well as social reasons to see some senior citizen's accommodation in Birtle. The site was selected after some considerable search and it seems to be a fairly good site. You have to have good strong legs to walk up the hill though, but it is a fairly nice site. It is near the church and it is near the shopping centres or the main street. So that all in all the people were very pleased to see something go ahead. So I would hope that something can happen in the not too distant future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Speaker.

MR. GRAHAM: At the invitation of the Honourable Member for Brandon East, I would like to ask the Minister if he has had any correspondence with the Rural Municipality of Birtle as well as the town?

MR. JOHNSTON: No, I haven't.

MR. GRAHAM: Would the Minister be prepared to ask the advice of the Rural Municipality as well as that of the town?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, I would, Mr. Chairman. I would be very happy to have discussions with the Municipality.

Mr. Chairman, on Birtle, what I have before me says that there are 15 eligible people and the survey, as the Mayor says, they didn't complete one. The policy of the Corporation has been to build half, so 15 and I must say it's not economical to get down too low, but it was 18 units that were planned in Birtle. Of the 15 people that made application, six of them own their own homes. Their asset qualification may not have been there. The Member is quite right, when you start to build and senior citizens see this nice building going up, a lot of them want to apply and then they find out they have got too many assets and they start to give them away in order to try and get into the senior citizen's housing.

Mr. Chairman, I don't think that that's just the best way to go ahead spending the people's money in Manitoba. I think there has to be more research done than that.

Mr. Chairman, the Member says when you build you start to get applications. Last year there was approved in Russell, Manitoba, ten public housing units. They held an open house a month ago on Sunday afternoon to try and fill them and there are still four empty. They held an open house in the area to try and fill them, invited everybody to come and see them, and there are still four empty, because they haven't got enough people to qualify for them.

Mr. Chairman, we have no intention of going ahead and building under those circumstances without doing more research on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: I just want to ask the Minister. What he is talking about in Russell are family accommodations — are these public housing units, family public housing units?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, ten of them.

MR. EVANS: They are not. . .

MR. JOHNSTON: No, they are not senior citizen. . .

MR. EVANS: They are not built under the Rural and Native Program, eh?!

MR. JOHNSTON: No, they are built by MHRC. Started last September.

Tuesday, May 30, 1978

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know what formula was used to decide on the construction of those particular units. As a matter of fact I wasn't really aware that they were going up until I guess they were going up.

MR. JOHNSTON: I beg your pardon?

MR. EVANS: I wasn't aware that those particular family units were going up until, you know, the process was in operation. But at any rate I would ask the Minister if he has had any discussions with the Mayor of the Town, Mr. Kinney, as to what could happen to those particular structures, because my advice from him was, the advice I received from him was that they will be disposed of. He had utter confidence that there were people that needed housing. God knows that there are people that live in the Town of Russell that live in housing that could be improved, let's face it. Whether people can qualify for them is another matter. I am not that familiar with the local situation, but the Mayor seemed to be very confident that those units could be disposed of and I suppose if you can't rent them under Public Housing, which is unusual, but if that is not possible you can always sell them I suppose, or put them under the R and N Program, Rural and Native Program.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the only way we could sell them, maybe CMHC would let us, but unless we prove to CMHC there is absolutely nobody who can qualify for those units we have no authority to sell those houses.

MR. EVANS: Well, then could the Minister advise whether he could put them under the Rural and Native Program?

MR. JOHNSTON: I would have to ask my officials on that. Well, my officials tell me that if you put them under the Rural and Native Program, the Rural and Native Program is a sale program, and it would be under the same qualifications or restrictions as the other. But as I understand it this building is not separate units. —(Interjection)— They are separate units.

MR. EVANS: Well could the Minister be a little more specific, can not the MHRC apply to CMHC with some realism that these units should be considered under the R and N Program, instead of under Public Housing. I think there is some precedence for that.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I am informed they are not separate, they are townhouses. We will investigate whether they can be sold, but it certainly will put us to a lot of unnecessary trouble.

MR. EVANS: Well, the Minister isn't prepared to tell me whether that can happen or not. All he is saying is that he will look into it.

MR. JOHNSTON: I said we will investigate it.

MR. EVANS: Has he had any co-operation from the local council in this respect?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, it was the local council, or housing authority and everybody who got involved to have the open house for the whole area to try and rent those units and find people that qualified.

MR. EVANS: Well, at any rate I wish the Minister luck. I am very surprised, but at any rate what I was asking him about was senior citizen's accommodation. Because of his concern in the family side, is the Minister advising us that nothing will happen in terms of new senior citizen's accommodation for Russell, or could he give us a progress report for Russell?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the Minister approved 24 units for Russell last year, that is the progress, they are being built. They were built when you were Minister, they were started then.

MR. EVANS: No, I don't recall that they were under construction.

MR. JOHNSTON: Pardon me, it was 40 units that have been built in Russell.

MR. EVANS: Is it under construction now?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, it was started last September.

MR. EVANS: Okay, for the Town of Roblin, what is the situation there, Mr. Chairman.

MR. JOHNSTON: The Town of Roblin is presently being restudied for 24 units.

MR. EVANS: And the City of Portage la Prairie?

MR. JOHNSTON: The City of Portage la Prairie is redesigned to 70 units.

MR. EVANS: So therefore you are proceeding with the Portage la Prairie. . .

MR. JOHNSTON: Portage la Prairie was being proceeded with on the basis of restudy to 70 units.

The proposal the Minister received from the housing authority or the MHRC was for 50 units in Portage la Prairie of senior citizens, and he returned his letter approving what he thought should be built, it was 50 units for Portage la Prairie and for some reason or other it was planned at 100. It has been restudied, it is going ahead. It will be 70 units.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, what is the Minister referring to? Would he repeat that statement about 50 and 100? I don't quite follow him. Are you suggesting that I got advice that it would be 50 units and that we turned around and suggested 100 instead? Is that what he is telling us?

MR. JOHNSTON: I am not going to be much more repetitive, Mr. Chairman, but on October 10th, 1976, the Minister from the Board received a suggestion of the units that should be built in 1977. The Minister returned the letter to MHRC on the 21st of December, 1976, suggesting that these certain units be built, in it was 50 units for Portage la Prairie. 50 were suggested by the Corporation.

He also suggested that we go ahead with Gimli, Teulon, Winnipeg Beach, Shoal Lake, McCreary, Alonsa, Emerson, Gimli, Birtle, Shoal Lake, Rossburn, Roblin, Swan River, Anola, and Birds Hill.

It was 50 units came back in the suggestion in Portage la Prairie. In Portage la Prairie, if I might just finish, Mr. Chairman, in Portage la Prairie the plans were put forward for 100 units, it was changed for some reason to 100 (70) units.

When the instructions went from Mr. Fedoruk to the development staff, it became a hundred units. And I might say, of the original suggestion from the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, of the units that were to be built or suggested to be built, the only ones that were still on it when it came back from the Minister and were finally started were ten out of the whole list.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I might say to the Member for Brandon East that the Minister read into the record last night almost the identical information.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, with regard to Portage la Prairie, which was the city I was inquiring about, I can advise him, if he is interested and concerned as I know he is, that the corporation had some very sad experiences in trying to get bids at an agreeable price in places such as The Pas, Brandon and Dauphin.

For some reason or other, units that were a combination of 40 units, even 50, 45-50 I believe — certainly 40 — were coming in outside of the City of Winnipeg at a price that was not acceptable to either the MHRC or to CMHC. In other words, for one reason or other, builders could not come in — and this is based on a competitive bid system — could not come in with suitably acceptable prices. So the alternative was — if you wanted to proceed to try to bring in housing into growing areas such as Portage la Prairie or such as Dauphin — was to go bigger. And if you go bigger you get a lower average per unit. And this was the firm recommendation of Mr. Fedoruk when he was the general manager to me. I recall him saying that one way to overcome it is to build a larger size, and it was his recommendation to go to 100 where we would accommodate for a large growing city, such as Portage — not only in the city but in the surrounding rural municipalities.

So if he is concerned about that, then let me tell him that there is nothing magical about certain staff recommending a certain number and the Minister, along with the general manager and other senior people, having a meeting and making a decision, because that's what senior management

Tuesday, May 30, 1978

is all about. It's not for junior staff or middle staff to make all the final decisions. If he thinks he is going to be there as a Minister and let all the other staff besides him make the decisions, well I'm going to suggest to him that he is not going to show the leadership in this area.

So I want to make it very clear that the one reason — in fact the fundamental reason for going larger on these projects in places such as Dauphin and Portage, is to be able to put up structures that come within the cost guidelines of CMHC, and that is the essential reason.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, it has been my experience since I have been Minister that the costs coming in on our construction have been exceptionally desirable on any types of units. Our quotes were coming in lower than we expected, since I have been the Minister. We were even able to get the project in Flin Flon much lower and have CMHC approve it, with the construction situation the way it is.

In Portage la Prairie, while the planning was going on to increase it to 100 units, somebody didn't take into consideration the Oddfellows were just going to open up 88 units at the same time.

MR. EVANS: I'm sorry; I didn't hear the last of it.

MR. JOHNSTON: Somebody didn't take into consideration that 88 units were being opened up by the Oddfellows at the same time, in Portage la Prairie — at the same time we were increasing ours to 100.

Mr. Chairman, regarding the comments about the Minister, it will be my intention to take advice from my officials and I'll run the department the way I see fit, thank you.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to hear the Minister make that statement because the can will hang around his neck, as it does around any Minister's neck, so I suggest you can get all the advice in the world but you — you yourself — have to make the final decision. And I say that, too. Later on I'd like to discuss this matter of the role of the board vis-a-vis the role of the Minister, because these are administrative questions but I think they are relevant.

The Minister may be very fortunate now because there is a great amount of unemployment in the construction trades, in the construction industry in this province so I'm sure prices should be coming down. But I would suggest to him he go back to the record. He has looked at other old files; I suggest he look at the bids that were produced in The Pas, in Dauphin, and in Brandon. There are three specific projects for senior citizens ranging around 40 units, maybe some were around 50, where the costs were not acceptable to CMHC and that is a fact, and it's on the record. I would advise the Minister to look it up. The fact is that we were rejected and in some of these projects we were directed not once but twice, and the only way it could proceed is if you brought in a larger unit, a larger type of accommodation I was advised, where we could bring down the average unit cost. And this is the essential reason for going larger in Dauphin and for having to go larger in Portage.

I would say personally, if I had my druthers, I would go for a smaller size. I'd like to see more smaller or medium size structures. But given the fact that there is this problem, or there was this problem, of undue high costs not allowing us to get NHA financing, this was the particular course that was suggested to be followed and this explains very categorically the point of Portage la Prairie, coupled with the fact that there is a lot of industry moving into Portage la Prairie, and other developments — government offices, and other signs of economic expansion in that city. I think there are plenty of economic indicators that would suggest that the population was going to grow and is growing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. DON ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a question for the Minister. Did I interpret some of the comments by the Member for Brandon East correctly in that he was unaware that there were ten units went into Russell last year? Did I interpret his comments correctly?

MR. JOHNSTON: I would have to check Hansard. I think he was referring to the senior citizens that went into Russell when he said he was unaware.

MR. ORCHARD: Until construction had started. That they were being approved or . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes. He may have said it on the other; I'm not sure.

MR. ORCHARD: Then there obviously has been quite a few changes since October 11th, because, as the Member for Brandon East said when he was offering you advice on how to run the department, the Minister must make the final decision. That obviously wasn't the case when he was Minister responsible if he was unaware of ten units going in until after the fact. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, just before I proceed to a different area, the Minister yesterday indicated to me that consideration was being given to the construction of non-profit senior citizen housing in Petersfield and Lockport. From that, then I assume that the Minister has no criticism of the construction of the senior citizen housing unit in the town that's presently underway, that there is a recognition that there is a great deal of demand for senior citizen housing there.

MR. JOHNSTON: Is the member speaking of the 63 units being built?

MR. PAWLEY: That's right.

MR. JOHNSTON: No, I have no criticism on that.

MR. PAWLEY: In respect to the rural and northern program, I would ask the Minister if he could enlighten us as to the targets for this year under that program.

MR. JOHNSTON: The Rural and Northern Program in 1977 . . . Capital commitments for 174 elderly units, 155 family units. These units will be built in 1978. The discussions are presently underway with CMHC as to their needs and the MHRC capital commitments in 1978. CMHC budget allocations for 1978 — their 75 percent share totals \$8.4 million. Provincial capital requirement \$2.1 million. Total possible program \$10.5 million. The possible number of units is 350 total.

MR. PAWLEY: Could the Minister provide us with a breakdown as to where those units have been constructed, or where they will be constructed?

MR. JOHNSTON: They are not all allocated as yet. The discussions are going on. As you know, they go into areas that are 2,500 people or less.

MR. PAWLEY: Those that have been allocated, could we have some breakdown?

MR. JOHNSTON: I'd have to get it for the member. —(Interjection)— Well, yes, that's true; there is an element of response to demand because these units are sold, as the member knows, and we have this amount of money budgeted with CMHC to go ahead. As the member knows, we have certain towns allotted to us and the CMHC have their particular towns allotted to them. We're planning to have a program of \$10.5 million.

MR. PAWLEY: Would the Minister advise us as to how many, under this program, were constructed this past fiscal year?

MR. JOHNSTON: Total units in 1977 were 155.

MR. PAWLEY: That's of the senior citizen or the family housing?

MR. JOHNSTON: Combined.

MR. PAWLEY: Combined, 155.

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. PAWLEY: So there is an increase anticipated for this present year over last year's fiscal program.

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon East.

Tuesday, May 30, 1978

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, has the Minister indicated to the committee those towns in which senior citizens' housing will be built this year? That is outside of the City of Winnipeg. If not, could he do so?

MR. JOHNSTON: No, I have informed the Member for Transcona that we do not have that program finalized as yet.

MR. EVANS: Well, can we expect an announcement when that program is finalized?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. EVANS: Approximately how much funding is being made available for senior citizens' housing outside of Winnipeg? Has that decision been made and if so could the Minister indicate that number?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, for the fifth time in this committee, I am informed that the allocation, unofficially, from the Federal Government on Section 43 is \$14 million. Now that means we can build approximately 500 units, and we're looking at it.

MR. EVANS: Is the Minister prepared to go back to CMHC to get a bigger allocation, as has been done for some years?

MR. JOHNSTON: At the present time we're negotiating with the Federal Government damn near weekly and have been for several weeks, and I've said that five times in this committee.

MR. EVANS: Is the Minister telling us specifically then that he is negotiating with CMHC with regard to getting additional funds under Section 43?

MR. JOHNSTON: Not necessarily. We are informed by the Federal Government that they are trying to get out of Section 43, the way it presently is and it would look that way.

MR. EVANS: So there is no attempt, then, to, for whatever reason . . . The Minister, I gather, is telling us that the \$14 million budget for public housing will be likely the target or will be the final amount that he will be dealing with this year.

MR. JOHNSTON: As I said, we have an unofficial statement to my officials. I have no letter in writing from the Minister that is official, as yet. When I get one, we will then start to discuss it.

MR. EVANS: The question of housing need, Mr. Chairman. In the process of deciding on expenditure of moneys, the question of need comes up. The problem is, of course, that you can find that the need for social housing is usually greater than the corporation can possibly supply — well, certainly within a year. Maybe over a period of years, if there was an aggressive housing program followed by the province in co-operation with the Federal Government, a lot of this need could be met.

I am satisfied that the need has been met over some years. I think the Minister indicated that there was now roughly 12,400 units of public housing in existence, that's both for families and for senior citizens, both in the City of Winnipeg and outside the City of Winnipeg. So a great deal has been done.

I might add that it was done because we perceived that there were many people who, for one reason or another, could not afford housing that was adequate. In other words, there was some failure of the market system, and therefore, you have the, I guess if you will, the intrusion, if you like, of government or the involvement of government. As a matter of fact I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, the fact that we have the National Housing Act in existence, itself, is indicative of the involvement of government that has come about because the market system, left pure and unadulterated, could not meet the needs of thousands of Canadians, not just Manitobans, but thousands of Canadians. So, whether we liked it or not, federal and provincial governments in this country, with all political parties, have been involved in providing housing, essentially of a social nature with social objectives, although there are other kinds of housing that may be built for other than purely social reasons.

But whether we like it or not, there has been a failure of the market system and we are attempting to provide houses. I might add that, although we talk about public housing, it should be very clear, of course, that when the government is involved in building public housing it's not the government itself that is doing the building, it may be the developer, but certainly it's the private enterprise

sector that does the building.

I believe I could safely say that maybe with the odd exception of some rural or native housing that's been built, all of the housing has been built by private enterprise. And when MHRC has a large budget, it is private enterprise, the private construction industry that benefits in the sense that it provides work, it provides jobs in that area and, of course, the tenants — the future tenants themselves — naturally benefit in the long run. But let's make it clear that when the government, through MHRC, engages in a large scale public housing program, one of the benefits — not the major one but certainly an important one nevertheless — is the stimulation of private enterprise in Manitoba, the stimulation of the construction industry.

The construction industry contractors have had an excellent relationship over the years with MHRC and I'm sure the private construction industry is rather unhappy when the Minister announces a reduced program or when the government announces reduction in construction spending for housing, whether it be for families or for senior citizens.

It's very good to engage in planning and have targets and know exactly where you go, but I would suggest that, of the two evils of sort of perfect planning or lack of planning, rather, as an evil or an undesirable situation, lack of planning, or the other one where inadequate housing is provided, or no housing is provided, I would say it's much better to suffer lack of planning and proceed with, at least, doing part of the job as best you see fit.

And while you may make a lot of mistakes in trying to get housing in place with good intentions and with admirable objectives supported by an excellent staff, and with the co-operation of communities and organizations, mistakes will happen. But I say it's better to go ahead and try to do something and make a few mistakes. It's better to have a program that's going to begin to meet the needs of people, senior citizens and low income people in particular, than to become so hide bound by a lack of plan, or a concern for lack of plan, that very very little happens.

I'm not suggesting that that is the case. I'm saying, in a hypothetical way, I guess, that if I had my options I would rather go for some aggressive program to meet the need and not worry too much that we had every last number in place before we could proceed. It's much better to try to do something because the job is great and there is a lot of work still remaining to be done.

I think one could go around this province and find that there are many many communities that could stand more of this social housing and certainly many parts of the City of Winnipeg could stand more social housing.

I agree with the Minister when he talks about problems of having family housing located in the suburbs. I think the place for a lot of the family housing, for low incomes, should be in the centre core of Winnipeg, in the older parts of the City of Winnipeg, for various reasons. I think it's for the benefit of those people, themselves, because they're closer to places of work, and for various reasons, it accommodates them better. Then, of course, this explains one of the reasons why a drive was made by the previous government, through MHRC last year, to find properties, suitable properties, for the construction of such housing, because the fact is, that it has been, it was very difficult to find suitable sites, particularly for family housing — it's very difficult — almost impossible to find suitable sites for family housing in the inner core of Winnipeg. That's regrettable, but that is the fact. It's the major reason why the MHRC went to the expropriation method last year, because that was one way to get on with the job and, particularly, the problem being made acute not only because of the lack of housing but because of the numerable fires that took place. Since 1974 there were 76 people killed in fires in the City of Winnipeg, regrettably, in inadequate housing, older buildings, in the centre part of Winnipeg.

There are a lot of other stories about social problems resulting from inadequate housing for people in that part of the city. So, by the expropriation method, using people like Ross Nugent, who is an expert in this, and I believe Mr. Poapst, who is of the Winnipeg Real Estate Board, or the Manitoba Real Estate Board, whichever organization, people with good experience assisting us, this committee selected sites for expropriation. I might add, Mr. Chairman, that the prices, the bids, were made deliberately low because we didn't want to decide on the prices. We wanted the bids to be low so that they would go to the court and so that the court would decide on a fair price. We didn't really want to decide on the price. So we deliberately bid low so that the courts could make a decision.

If there was the odd place that was not suitable, I think that's regrettable. We relied on people such as Ross Nugent and Mr. Poapst to guide us, but again, you know, if you try to do something and if you do things, you do make mistakes. So I say it's better to have engaged in this program and maybe made the odd mistake, forgetting whose fault it was, than not to carry out the program.

I think this is one of the most critical programs, certainly one of the most critical social programs that government should be carrying out today, and that is, the provision of adequate housing in the centre part of the City of Winnipeg. I would hope that the Minister doesn't have too many obstacles in fulfilling that program, and that he doesn't get easily discouraged because there are a lot of impediments, there are a lot of difficulties arise that were not necessarily foreseen in the first place.

But it's something that must be done. I would commend the Minister to give it as much attention as he possibly can. I think, certainly, it's got to be a priority area. I would suggest to the Minister, if he hasn't discovered already, that the business of putting housing in place, the right kind of places, the right kind of housing for the right people, is a very difficult job. It's not simple and it's something that takes a lot of time and it has a lot of frustrations. So I sympathize with him because it is a challenge. But I would commend to the Minister a high level centre core program and I, for one, feel that no apologies should be made for using the expropriation route because I don't know how else you get that land. If there was some other way, fine. But from past experience there was simply no other way to obtain suitable sites.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I have just two comments. The private industry can take care of the public housing. The member seems to think that it is low-cost housing that we're building. We're not building low-cost housing. We're building housing for people with low incomes and our job is to get over the affordability gap. Our subsidies can be done in units built by the contractor. It's quite true that contractors cannot build housing for low income people without subsidies and neither could the government. We have to subsidize, too, they're both in the same position.

The fact that we were in it as much as we were is the reason why they weren't. They weren't being talked to, as far as I can see, to become part of the plans the same as they are in Ontario and in other provinces. But it's our intention to try to have different programs other than the one program. I think the Member for Fort Rouge, for five years on this committee, has said to the previous government, "For heaven's sakes, there are other programs available."

I think it's probably — irresponsible is the best word — to bid low, that is the problem we're having, because the CMHC came up with the moneys on what we bid, and if the Judge says it's higher, we have to go back to CHMC and work them up, and if they don't want to go up, we'll be in the position of being in not a 90-10 split, but probably a 20-80 split or something of that nature.

The extra money will be on the shoulder of the province. So it was not a good idea to bid low. Mr. Chairman, the CMHC made it very clear, and I had it checked when I became the Minister, with the officials of CMHC and the City of Winnipeg, as to the price that they decided upon, and they said, "That was it. That was it. If the Judge decides higher we have to go back and negotiate," but we weren't encouraged that we were going to get very far.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, could the Honourable Minister indicate what percentage of an average project is land cost? What percentage of the total cost is land cost? Say, well, he can pick a 50-unit building or he can pick a single family, or townhousing, but of the total cost, what percentage is land cost?

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, I'm afraid I don't follow the member's question. The land costs are taken into consideration by CMHC. If they decide that that land is costing too much, it's the province that has to come up with the rest of the money. The land costs all become part of the building and that's what happened on many of the proposal calls. As the member well knows, the proposal calls, the Province of Manitoba paid probably on the basis of 80 to 20, or 85 to 15, or something of that nature, because of the land costs that CMHC would not accept. There are several units that were built on that basis and it doesn't only end up with us having to find more capital; it ends up with us having to pay more of the subsidy when that happens.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour of 5:30 having arrived, I am leaving the Committee and returning at 8:00 p.m.t\$

SUPPLY — HEALTH AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats: . . . We are on Resolution No. 59, Clause (j) Community Field Services, (j)(1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister with regard to the vocational rehabilitation, is this the section where we might get information on the VRDP — that is the Vocation

Rehabilitation of Disabled Persons and the Acts that were and have been in force for a number of years with Federal Government participation? I believe it was 50-50 cost-sharing. In the light of the new financial arrangements with Ottawa is this particular program going to continue under old cost-sharing arrangements? Is it going to be subsumed under the new block-funding arrangements? And if it is, is it the intention of government to continue with the VRDP Program which is, as I recall, one of the best in Canada because Manitoba took advantage of all federal moneys that were available to develop programs in this field?

So I'm wondering whether the Minister could tell me if this is the area to talk about it, and if it is, whether in fact he can shed some light on what the new government thinking is with regard to these particular programs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the question of rehabilitation and rehabilitaton funding and VRDP really doesn't come under this section of the Estimates. —(Interjection)— No, it comes under Resolution 60, subsection (c) Rehabilitation Services to the Disabled.

But I can just briefly say to my honourable friend, Mr. Chairman, that VRDP is subsumed under the new block-funding arrangement that is being debated in the House of Commons. It has been introduced for first reading. I don't think it has had second reading yet, but will obviously be the subject of debate in the immediate future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (j)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, with regard to mental health and mental retardation, again I'm not sure whether I'm in the right area or not, or whether I should be under 4.(b); I'm not sure. The move that was started a few years ago to try to get people out of mental institutions, people who went into the institution but then, with a certain amount of training and education, could be brought back into the community and housed in community group homes. Are these the field services that would be the support staff to those homes and the community resources that would make it possible for these community residences to serve their residents who have been discharged or released from mental institutions to go back into the community? I'm wondering, again, is this the right section in which to talk about these things? Would the Minister advise me?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, once again the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks is a little ahead of the schedule on the Estimates. Group homes in the field of mental health and mental retardation comes under Medical and Rehabilitative Services, which is Resolution No. 60. But certainly the section we are looking at, Community Field Services, includes community mental health and mental retardation services, operated and maintained out of our departmental field resources.

MR. MILLER: Then I'm not out of order in discussing it now.

Mr. Chairman, as the Minister knows, there has been a movement to try to get people out of the institution because it has been recognized that in dealing with mental health we for too long institutionalized people and, in doing so, we really didn't do them much good, except to remove them from sight, I suppose, and that there is a recognition now that they can function in the community after certain treatment, after certain education, that they can in a limited way function within the community providing they are in sheltered surroundings — the security of a group home. And some of these have come about as they moved out of the institution.

That's not to say that the institutions will ever close down, because there are certain numbers who will never be able to graduate — if you want to call that word "graduate" — out of the institution itself. But certainly there is, as I say, the recognition that too many people, far too many years back, were placed in institutions and simply forgotten about because we didn't have the knowledge, we didn't have the understanding and the public fear of an unacceptance of these people in the community had to be overcome.

Now this program has been launched and has been fairly successful in some areas. I am concerned that in the City of Winnipeg — which, after all, is the largest city in the province and the most of Manitobans live in Winnipeg — and that because of the difficulties in getting public acceptance in the neighbourhood or on the street for these kind of homes, group homes, I am concerned whether the government will in fact be moving with some dispatch and with assurance to make such community homes available, whether they be run by an agency or a private group, or government itself. Or is the province going to adopt the passive attitude of simply saying, well, until such time as a community committee clears it, or the City Council clears it, our hands are tied and we are not going to do anything about community group homes

because the residents of a particular street may have objection to it, and the City Council is not prepared to re-zone or to vary the zoning to allow a group home to be built. I am wondering if what I'm saying is the attitude of the Minister?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I can advise the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that the attitude of the Minister is that de-institutionalization in this field is certainly a desirable philosophy, a desirable trend, provided it is done responsibly and carefully. There are some possible pitfalls to wholesale de-institutionalization that have been pointed up by experts in the field in other jurisdictions in North America; in fact, I've had some exposure in recent weeks as I've been attempting to learn my job, to studies that have been done in the United States, both in the field of mental health and mental retardation, which have outlined the new abandonment, if one may use that term, of de-institutionalized patients.

I know that the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks is referring to group homes in particular, but the whole trend, the whole philosophy of de-institutionalization encompasses simply more than group homes. The thrust is to get people out of the institutions, into the community, and there's always the danger that some of them wind up in lonely, single rooms; in effect, isolated and abandoned and far worse off than they were when they were in the institutions, so there are aspects to the question that have to be approached very carefully. If we can do it all through group homes, then that is a procedure that perhaps carries a little less vulnerability, a little less of the nature of the danger to which I have referred, with it, but even there one is looking at the problems of obtaining the opportunity to establish group homes in certain areas. One runs into various municipal and administrative difficulties, neighbourhood difficulties, and then over and above all that is the actual ongoing operating cost of the group homes themselves. So, it's a subject that certainly has the interest of the present Minister and the government; it's a philosophy and approach that I subscribe to, but I subscribe to it with some caution, such as that to which I have referred.

We, here in Manitoba, with respect to our own institutions, have experienced a rather dramatic decline in in-patient population in some of our mental institutions in the past decade, although figures have remained pretty well constant in the past three years. Looking at the Brandon Mental Health Centre, Selkirk Mental Health Centre, and the Eden Mental Health Centre for 1975-76-77, we notice a very insignificant difference in in-patient population, a difference of eight in total; a total of 929 in 1975 and 937 in 1977. The population at the Selkirk Mental Health Centre was substantially higher a few years ago than it is now; the figure for December 31st, 1977 was 326; it used to be substantially higher than that. The low figure represents the de-institutionalization that's taken place thus far in that respect. The population of the Manitoba School for Retardates was 937 at the end of 1975; it was 892 at the end of December, 1977.

So, again, a small reduction, Sir, as we move in the direction which the Member for Seven Oaks has described. But we can only move as fast as we can locate, situate, fund and operate community residences, and it's my hope that we will be able to produce a plan with the Manitoba Division of the Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded, later this year, that will provide specific targets in terms of the total number of community residences we would like to aim for over the course of the next two years. Whether it be a number of six, or 12, or 20, I can't say at this juncture, but my long-term ambition, or my short-term ambition, really, Mr. Chairman, is to get up to 200 residents out of the Manitoba School for Retardates at Portage. We obviously won't be able to do that overnight, but if that answers the member's question about where we stand on de-institutionalization, I offer it to him for the record.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I'm aware of some of the problems that the Minister indicates about the people who are discharged from institutions to live out on their own, and they may just as well be in the institutions because they are totally ignored, they have no resources or backup services, and the answer certainly is group homes rather than discharging them as they did in the United States, where they're simply in some room, totally by themselves.

But Mr. Chairman, there's another aspect, too. The Minister indicated that although there had been an earlier, somewhat rapid decline in population at some of the institutions, it had slowed down, and he may find, on checking, that the reason for that is that because of medical technology, people in these institutions are living longer, and people who have been there for 10, 15, 20 years, simply cannot be discharged out into the community. They're so totally institutionalized that they cannot, even in a group-home condition it's unlikely they can function, and that the trend has been towards trying to get — in the case of children, for example, get them early enough, even though they may be institutionalized for a while, get them out again, so it's an in-and-out situation.

My concern is that the Minister uses the same approach: it's a desirable philosophy, and he subscribes to it, but — and there's always that but — we will only move as fast as we can. So,

what is the fastest we can? What is the obstacle to moving? — as fast as we can locate residences, or community group homes, which implies what I was asking before; are they going to take a passive role and simply say, "Well, it's up to the City of Winnipeg to make the necessary zoning changes," or, "It's up to the community to accept them within a neighbourhood," and if that is the attitude, they'll simply wait until these group homes can be located within today's zoning requirements. Then, Mr. Chairman, I'm concerned that nothing is going to happen. I think that the province has a responsibility here and has to take the leadership role in establishing these group homes.

The other caveat he put on it is, as finances are made available. Again he agrees with the philosophy; he agrees that he subscribes to the idea; he recognizes the value of it, but again it's cost first and need, second. A number of times in going through the Estimates of this Minister's department, we get that sort of response. He's all in favour of motherhood, but — and he's always got that "but" — and the "but" is always depending on the money that is going to be made available to him, I assume, by his Cabinet colleagues. I'm afraid that with that attitude, very little is going to happen.

If he feels that ten community residences are not enough, then let him aim for three or four. But to simply say, "Well, we'll have to wait and see. We don't know what moneys are available, what zoning is available," I'm afraid that nothing is going to happen. The program that was started — and it's a slow program, I admit, because the community resources have to be in place; it is difficult to establish these homes — but unless there's a definite commitment by government to push in this direction, to move in this direction, to make funds available for this purpose, then a passive attitude will simply mean that we stop the clock — we don't turn it back, I suppose, because those community residences that are group homes that are established will continue — but we stop the clock until I don't know when.

And my concern if that happens, then instead of a drop in population of the in-patient population in the mental institutions or the Manitoba school, we'll start seeing a rise again, as occurred earlier.

I'm sorry that the Minister is unable to be more specific, apart from saying that it's a desirable philosophy to which he subscribes; he's in favour of the institutionalization, but he's not able to do anything beyond that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to raise a number of questions with the Minister in terms of the direction his department is going. It's quite clear that our party is strongly in favour of community clinics. I wanted to deal with one of the community clinics, with a particular problem faced by them, and that is Mount Carmel. I want to, in particular, focus in on the report that was made to study the operation of that clinic and ask the Minister, in effect, what he's going to do about it.

I guess a number of weeks ago, if not a month or two ago, some stories appeared in one of the newspapers, if not both of the Winnipeg dailies, concerning a report undertaken by Dr. Ken McCrae, Norman McCormack, I believe, and Sally Longstaffe, concerning the operations of Mount Carmel. They, in particular, commented on the operation of the Day Nursery Centre, the Child Day Hospital and primary medical care.

There is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that the report was critical of that operation and as it has existed, at least, over the past year. The report was entitled, I guess, "An Interim Report" and was presented to the board in February of 1978. I want to draw to the Minister's attention some of the problems contained in this report because I want him to indicate to us, what he is going to do to correct these problems now.

I want to, for instance, point out that according to the McCrae report, that the clinic seems to function well in a number of areas but has particular failings in the operation of the program for young children, the baby and toddler nursery. They express what they say, is a grave concern for the present operation, and this is what I want to focus in on.

They point out, for example in general, that it's difficult to make a certain evaluation because of the fact that the clinic does not carry complete records and recording procedures. So I want to focus on that particular point, Mr. Chairman.

The central section of the report deals with the following comments, and I would like to read these into the record, a couple of paragraphs on the baby and toddler nursery. It says as follows:

"This is of grave concern to us." The doctor who is speaking is, I believe, the foremost authority on children in Manitoba, Dr. Ken McCrae, who is also an expert in child abuse, but we're not dealing

with child abuse in the traditional understanding. We're probably dealing with child neglect in this particular instance. So I want to read a couple of paragraphs from the report:

"Large numbers of infants spend a great part of the first two years of their lives here, with very little individual ongoing attention devoted to them. Children can be seen at times literally row on row, some rocking, some staring blankly for long periods, and some crying alone in corners, with no one available to comfort them. The barest space allotment is available and little play material. Furniture is adult size and oriented. The lack of significant language development by age 2 in children who have been present in this nursery since their early days attest to the inadequacy of the stimulation.

"The children are universally indiscriminate and largely silent. A visitor is almost always greeted by numerous little people, literally clutching one's purse for the duration of the time there. The nutrition, until recently, was judged inadequate, but this has been alleviated by the recent hiring of a dietitian, who has planned more appropriate meals.

"Physical care given is quite reasonable, as each child is bathed and redressed daily on arrival and often given individual attention for about 15 minutes at this time. This may constitute almost all the individual attention given a child for that day. Many interactions between staff and children are of a rebuking nature, particularly for activities judged as aggressive." And the final paragraph:

"Some children in this group, perhaps as a result of previous handling at home, are observed to react to others with aimless physical aggression almost as soon as they can walk. Others have reacted with excessive compliance and can be observed at 2 years of age and less, for example, putting laundry away and assisting each other when one falls."

So, Mr. Chairman, it would seem that there are some serious defects in the operation of that particular child nursery, and there are other comments that are made. There are suggestions made, that there should be an immediate appointment, for instance, of a new head of nursery, that the Mount Carmel Clinic professionals should meet together more regularly and liaise with other community professionals and outsiders, etc.

So that was Mr. McCrea's letter, and just briefly from Norma McCormick's report. I think the key sections are perhaps this point. She says, "I feel that in light of the above, that the facility is, in reality, functioning as a day nursery to a large extent yet because of its name and purported purpose it is not licensed as such." That raises an interesting question — no licence. "Should an attempt be made to seek licensing as a day nursery the facility would be found to be in violation of the regulations set out by the City of Winnipeg because of:

- (a) The small size of the physical facility.
- (b) The number of children being accepted.
- (c) The child-staff ratio.
- (d) The sanitation facilities."

And a final point, Mr. Chairman, is the recommendation by Norma McCormick, director Health Sciences Centre Day Nursery. The recommendation is that the Day Treatment Program should be temporarily discontinued and suitable alternative arrangements made for the children.

My concern here, Mr. Chairman, is for the children as opposed to the clinic. It appears that the youngest children who come to the clinic, frequently on a daily basis for long periods of time, are not being given what would be considered to be the proper kind of stimulation and, consequently, the proper kind of care. And the report calls for some additional evaluation, or calls for more study of the matter.

But these are the questions that I ask the Minister as this time: I ask him whether he is satisfied, whether he has checked into these allegations and whether he feels they are justified. I then ask him what action he intends to take to correct them.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Elmwood presents me with something of *anon sequitor* in that he puts a number of concerns on the record that I think a great many of us share — perhaps all members of this House share — but he does so in connection with a situation on which I don't feel I have the particular right or mandate to comment at this juncture, and I am not sure that it should be the subject of debate in this committee or in this Legislature because of the stage that it currently rests or stands.

The concerns expressed by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, as defined by Dr. McCrae and Norma McCormick in the report that was done on the clinic, have produced considerable public discussion and controversy and naturally commend themselves to the members of this House and

to the government as concerns and as subjects of interest. But thus far what we have is a report that was developed on the clinic that was presented to the board of the clinic and that is now in the hands of that board for study and possible action. The board of the clinic has certainly not officially approached my department or my office for any comment or any opinion, much less any advice or guidance. I expect to be in communication with the board, with the administration of the Mount Carmel Clinic in an official way at some point in the future, although that's not a certainty. It may well be that the board determines that it can resolve the problems to some degree; the issues and concerns raised and expressed in the report might result from perhaps a less than desirable degree of communication or understanding; and that consultation and communication between the framers of the report, the administration of the clinic, and membership of the board itself can resolve many of the problems, if not all of the problems, right at that level.

If that happens, I doubt that the issue will ever surface as an issue for the government or for me, as Minister. If it doesn't happen, then I'm sure it will surface as an issue for the government. At that time, I would want to explore all three sides of the story: The side presented by the framers of the report, the side that would be available through the staff of the clinic, headed by Mrs. Ross, and the administration of the clinic and the board and its members, and the side that would be available through the patients and the clientele served by the clinic itself.

From that kind of exposure, I would hope that some definite facts could be drawn and some definite conclusions could be formulated. But we are nowhere near that point in time. I have seen a report critical of the Mount Carmel Clinic. I have also seen reports critical of many other institutions; I have also seen reports critical of this government; I have seen reports critical of the previous government. And I would think it would be a strange world if I weren't, and my honourable friend weren't, constantly exposed to that kind of thing.

So I'm not in a position to react formally or officially except to say that what the honourable member has said is worth saying, in terms of putting on the record the feelings that he has and that I'm sure many members of this House share with respect to the need for good, high quality care for the clientele being served by that clinic and particularly for good, high quality care treatment, services and programs for the children there in the child nursery.

The honourable member asked me if I have checked into the allegations. I haven't checked piece-by-piece into the allegations. I have had the report made available to me and I have looked at the report but I haven't checked into the individual allegations.

At this juncture, Mr. Chairman, I don't think there is very much else I can say about that particular subject. I appreciate the honourable member's concern. I hope that it does not prove to be founded in facts that would tend to indicate or to prove that the Mount Carmel Clinic is failing to do a good job. I don't think that we should rush to make that judgment or to prejudge it on the basis of that report until we see what the consultations between the board and the framers of the report produce.

The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks asked me a few moments ago where the government stood with respect to location and citing of community residences in the mental health and mental retardation field and what our policy would be with respect to the various difficulties at the administrative level and municipal level that one runs into in that field. I can tell him that we are holding discussions with the City of Winnipeg on that subject. I would also like to suggest to him that if we are going to get into sort of wholesale examination of the community residents and group home question, if it's all the same to him I would prefer that we did it under Resolution 60. Really what we are talking about in terms of mental health and mental retardation in this section on this particular resolution, is community mental health and community mental retardation work and workers, as supplied by our departmental field resources. And when we're getting down to group homes and group residences, we're really into the division of Medical and Rehabilitative Services.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, you know the Minister gives us a very smooth answer and he gives probably the answer that anyone could anticipate. Namely, it's not his problem; it's a problem for the board. And, you know, I say to him that I know there are competent people on the board. The chairman happens to be a former Deputy Minister of mine; I have a considerable regard for him. I know there are competent people in the Health Department and I know there are competent people at Mount Carmel, and the people who made the study are experts in their field. But you know, Mr. Chairman, somebody has dropped the ball; somebody has failed — given all of these competent people — something has gone wrong in one aspect of their operation.

I am not criticizing or condemning the Mount Carmel operation. I am criticizing one aspect of

their operation, which I think has been a dismal failure. And that, I believe, has been substantiated in the report.\$

You know, Mr. Chairman, I say to the Minister, who is asleep at the switch? You are giving, providing \$400,000 or \$500,000 a year to Mount Carmel; the United Way is providing \$70,000 a year to Mount Carmel — it seems to me that somebody in the Provincial Government has a responsibility to look into this, to make recommendations and to ensure that these amounts of money are properly spent. They will probably also find out that they need additional money. They will probably also discover that they need a new clinic and that a capital expenditure will have to be made. And I commend that to the Minister, that he do provide more funding and that he should also provide a new building. But in the meantime, Mount Carmel is operating in their present building and some of these problems may be attributable to the physical environment. I also believe that in this case it is more than the physical environment, it is also the program, that there is a deficiency in this particular program.

So, you know, I say to the Minister, he is spending . . . I have two figures; I don't know which one is right. One is \$402,000 out of the papers; one out of the report that says \$550,000.00. Whatever the amount is, MHSC is involved in this; the Provincial Government through HNSD are involved and the United Way is involved. Don't those people look at this? Don't they know whether they are getting value for their money? Don't they check and check again to see what is happening?

The responsibility, Mr. Chairman, I believe, to maintain program standards, ultimately falls on the Minister. I don't think he can just say, "This is for the board. Let the board clean up its own act. Let the board make the decisions." He is giving the board the money. If the board isn't doing a job, then I think that presents a problem for him. If the staff isn't doing a job, then that also presents a problem for the Minister.

So I say, again, that the Minister cannot just pass it off as a responsibility of another body of people. He is responsible for Health and Social Development and the MHSC.

And I raise this other question with him: Isn't there a day care office in the Provincial Government, and how can they allow this operation to proceed? I mean, they must be aware of what is going on. And if not, they, too, were asleep at the switch. Have they done anything to, in effect, legalize the operation — if I could use that expression — or to correct its deficiencies to make sure that they are operating in a proper manner?

So those, I believe, Mr. Chairman, are the responsibilities of the department and I believe that at this point in time, given that the report was presented in February and I suppose the Minister has had the report in his hands somewhere in March and April, and I realize he's —(Interjection)— Just in a couple of weeks. And like most Ministers of Health, they can hardly get out of their office; they're crawling over mountains of reports. Whenever I went to see some of the previous Ministers — my colleague from Seven Oaks — I could never find the Minister, because there was a mountain of reports; he was somewhere on the other side, and we used to shout to each other, like the morning side of the mountain and the twilight side of the hill. —(Interjection)— Well, the former Minister is a mountain himself; a virtual mountain of a man, and he was easier to spot. But I realize that it is literally impossible for the Minister to read all the reports. No man can do that. And I simply ask him, based on his understanding, and based on the points that I am making to him, what is he going to do about it? He knows there's deficiencies; he has a responsibility to correct those deficiencies; what action is he going to take?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can tell my honourable friend that I have talked to Dr. Ken McRae, who has been described by the Honourable Member for Elmwood as an extremely highly respected expert in this field, and whom I know to be such an expert. I have talked to him and I have had some informal, unofficial discussions with persons connected with the clinic, I have visited the clinic and had conversations with Mrs. Ross and with persons both serving on the staff at the clinic and persons who are served as clientele of the clinic. That's all I've done so far; I'm waiting; I've had some conversations with the Chairman of the Board and I am waiting to hear whether the board wants to discuss the problem with me further. To go beyond that at this juncture I think would be indefensible intrusion and intervention on my part. The matter is in the hands of the board at the moment; that's what the board is for. I don't dispute the honourable member's reference to the physical plant, and I certainly have been subjected to pretty strenuous entreaties from the administration of the clinic for funding for a new building. We have not been able to offer that up to this point in time.

I gather that the previous administration and the Chairman of the Board, who was the Deputy

Tuesday, May 30, 1978

Minister for the Honourable Member for Elmwood when he was Minister of Public Works, either were not able to find the necessary resources to fund it, or hadn't come to that decision themselves, up to the point where they left office. But certainly, it's something that has my attention and my interest. I recognize they have difficulties with the confines and the age of that physical plant at the moment. I must say that the public discussion that has ensued from the report to which the member refers has tended, I think, to reflect pretty favourably on the administration and the staff of that clinic and the work that it does, and I don't intend to rush in with any self-styled expertise until I get further information from the board.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I want to correct one statement the Minister made. I wouldn't want it to be on the record. He implies that the former government, or he stated that the former government somehow wasn't able to find the funds in order to launch the building. The reason that Mount Carmel Clinic was not started some time ago had nothing to do with the funding. The funding was there; it was a commitment, and would have gone ahead. The reason was the problems that they encountered in acquiring the site. It was part of the tripartite landholding, federal, municipal and provincial, that took a great deal of time and effort to get unblocked, to make it available to Mount Carmel Clinic for the purposes they wanted it, because the original agreement was that it be for housing, and that had to be set aside; the requirements to go through the City of Winnipeg and to get the proper zoning permission to use the land, that is the reason why the delay took place. It had nothing to do with the financing.

Then, when they finally got that, and that took an awful long time and I recall I had to intercede and phone the Minister in Ottawa, although I was no longer in the department, to get CMHC moving, because they were dragging their feet. Subsequent to that, an architect was called in by the board. He was given the responsibility of designing a building and it was at that point they were just about ready to go at that point, when the election took place. But to suggest that somehow, we couldn't find the money, and now they can't find the money, just isn't so. The delay took place for reasons other than financing, and I regret that this present government just simply froze Mount Carmel Clinic when everyone agrees that the services they are rendering are important; they are needed and they are necessary, and a part of Winnipeg which has always been underserved and which the Mount Carmel Clinic has tried to service, to some extent successfully, over the years, but until they get proper facilities, the likelihood is that you're going to get the sort of criticism and carping about their program that we've heard in the last while. They need that facility desperately, and for this government to simply say, "Well, we froze them," once they've said it, it's like engraved in stone: "We have frozen." They have simply put off something they are going to have to do anyway, because I can't see how they can possibly ignore the needs of Mount Carmel Clinic for a new facility.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)(1)—pass. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to add a word, to discuss the community programs, and what the Minister and the Member for Seven Oaks were, at the start of this meeting, discussing, and then of course we went back to the clinic. I want to be careful, though, Mr. Chairman, because I think there will be occasion to discuss the institution themselves. But I think that under this program, we should talk about the depopulation of these institutions. I find no fault with what the Minister has stated, the first part of it, anyway, where he felt that the policy would be to try and get as many people as possible in the communities. This is exactly the policy that we had. He is saying that this has to be done in an orderly fashion. I might say that we made a mistake, that the start of the policy was to get the people out as soon as possible, and I think that we went a little too fast. We weren't ready for that, or the people weren't ready for that, and we didn't have the proper group homes, so we sent people in the community and that caused a problem because many of them ended up in the psychiatric wards of the hospitals here in the city, and then there was no room for the people; there was a shortage. So the policy was never changed, and I am pleased to see that this is the same policy, but we felt that we had to be a little more careful.

Okay. But what should be done? I think that the first thing is that you have to educate the public. And that is not an easy thing to do. I think that the public will have to realize, and the communities, and the local politicians, at that level — and the school board — will have to realize that they have a responsibility of not only the bright people in their communities, but those that are handicapped. And I'm a little concerned. And again, I don't want the Minister to chastise us a few times for saying, "Well, these are rumours." But I think that the government is asking for that, the way they are — well, I call it flying balloons, or giving a certain interview and letting the people think that something

is going to happen, and saying, "Well, we haven't got the solution."

And, there was a bill brought in to do just that; it wasn't proclaimed, purposely. It was to educate the public; I think I'm referring to Bill 58. And the Minister of Education, a few weeks ago, seemed — I wasn't there; I only read something that concerned me; I'm not sure and I hope the Minister can tell me — the Minister seemed to be backing away. To say, "Oh, well, you know, we're not even thinking of when we're going to proclaim it; it doesn't exist." He seemed to be afraid of it. I know that in the former government the Minister of Education also was quite concerned. There's a pretty large group of teachers in the Teachers' Society, and the school trustees that were concerned, but nevertheless I think that we must have the leadership here. We can't back down, and it is not going to be something popular. It is what? — pioneering, up to a certain point, but it has to be done, and I would hope that some day, and I would hope that we should be advised that when this bill will be proclaimed, and the people will have to realize, the school division, the school teachers, and so on — that with some help — I think that they will need special help for special needs of some of these people — but this will have to be done.

So I think that's number one. You can't just say, "Well, it's a great thing; we're going to do it sometime," and, like my honourable friend accused the Minister of saying, "Well, you know, this is great, but what are you doing about it?" Fine, this year, he's getting away with a lot of "That, this is good, and I'm going to look at it," but he'd better get ready because next year we won't be as nice and we'll want to know, and the public will want to know, what is he doing? All right, that's number one.

Number two, you must have the facilities in place before you start getting the people out of these hospitals, and you can't just build facilities and get all the people out of the hospital and do nothing for the people that are in the community now who are in danger of being institutionalized. I think that there has to be a rationale. But the Minister was vague on this, and I want to know. We brought legislation in last year; again, we felt that this legislation was needed; it wasn't a plan to get the government to take over; it was something that wasn't going to be popular but it was something that had to be done. We brought the legislation that the zoning, notwithstanding the zoning bylaws of different municipalities could be over-ruled by the Minister of Health for his programs. I'm not saying that there was a fear with some of the municipal politicians that thought the government would be telling the people what kind of house to build, and so on, I'm just referring now to the social problems of the government. And the legislation is there, if anything is blocked, to prevent — and that's happening a lot — a group home from being constructed.

The Minister, just a little while ago, said, "Well, you know, it's very difficult to find a place where it will be accepted." Well, that's not good enough. I want to know if the Minister is saying, "Now, we'll either change this legislation —" I think that he said that the whole Winnipeg Act will be reviewed, but I think we can talk about that. I'm not too interested in what's going to happen at this stage, anyway, what's going to happen to the Winnipeg Act. But I am interested in this legislation. You can review the Winnipeg Act all you want, but is the Minister going to take advantage of this? They are all social programs, including the Family Day Care Program. I want to know, because right now, the legislation that's in the books allows the Minister, the department, to go ahead with their programs. Of course, it stands to reason that they should co-operate with the municipalities as much as possible, and this was being done. I think that the staff of the department were instructed to work with the city. The city were talking and I think they brought in by-laws saying that the zoning would be changed. I want to know if the Minister is going to take advantage of this legislation if he needs to. Or in other words, that that problem that he mentioned a while ago, that it's going to be difficult before the people accept, and that could go on for years, the people opposing it, and so on. You fight for a while, and nothing will be done.

This is what I would want the Minister to answer, on those two things; the education part of it, and the means, the legislation, that will enable the government to encourage, to approve construction or setting up of some of these group homes.

If the Minister would prefer that we deal with my next question on the next item, or on another item, he can tell me and I will go along with this. But I would want to know how much money there is in the budget — and I know it's not under here — to build? How many homes will be built? How many group homes, or better still, how many beds, how many facilities — not necessarily new homes. I believe that the Association for the Mentally Retarded made some suggestions to the Minister. It is difficult to stay in order and talk about this at this time because that involves the Portage Home for Retardates and the group homes. So I will let the Minister answer my first two questions and if he can indicate, when he's finished with that, if he wants me to continue on the group homes and Portage, or if he'd sooner that I wait under another item, then I'll go along.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the zoning arrangements that are pending to enable siting and construction of community residences in various parts of the city, there are discussions taking place right now between my department and the City of Winnipeg.

I would have to consult with my colleague, the Minister of Urban Affairs, to determine what precisely he might be thinking of in terms of amendments to The City of Winnipeg Act, but I know what the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is referring to. Certainly we had difficulty, when we were in opposition last year, with the amendments to The City of Winnipeg Act on a number of levels and it was not related certainly in our minds, to the question of siting of community residences or group homes for the mentally retarded or for the mentally ill, or for anybody, any clients in the social services field. —(Interjection)— No, it wasn't related to the question of social programs at all. It was a matter of where we thought the authority and jurisdiction should lie with respect to planning decisions in the City of Winnipeg and whether we felt that a super authority should be vested in two Ministers of the province, of the Crown, regardless of what party was in office at the time.

The difficulty, of course, is that it's hard to separate the two questions because the practical implications or the practical application of the legislation, will have an effect on the ability of the province to move to initiate locations of group homes and community residences in particular areas. So I well understand the sense of the honourable member's question.

I can't enlighten him at this juncture as to the changes contemplated or proposed by the Minister of Urban Affairs, my colleague, where The City of Winnipeg Act is concerned. But I have a concern that we minimize the barriers and the obstructions as far as we can, as fully as we can, to the location and siting and construction of community residences and group homes. I know that we need them. I know that that's the only way we can ever practise de-institutionalization, ever give it anything more than lip service. So I am intent on having a structure that is as flexible as possible for us to move in the direction of community residences, as we make the decisions and appropriate the resources to do so.

The question that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface raised last in his remarks, would be better covered under the debate on Resolution 60. I can tell him that what we're looking at at the moment in terms of community residences — for the mentally retarded this is, not for the post-mentally ill — but I can discuss the total number of spaces, the total number of beds and those that we propose to add to that total. But we probably should be doing that under Resolution 60.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, we'll do it then. Mr. Chairman, I didn't hear the Minister comment on Bill 58, the proclamation of Bill 58, the education of people, and I think that's quite important. I'm not satisfied with the other answer, it's vague again. I don't think this is an area that we could wait.

It isn't easy. The Minister said that in opposition they were quite concerned although they agreed with me at the time, that they wanted to proceed, whenever they made up their minds, on the government, any government made up its mind on the question of social programs, and that's all I'm interested in. I don't care how it's done. I don't care if they put something in the Act, if they bring in an amendment to make it clear, it is only in this instance, I am only asking him about that. But I think it is very important because I want to know if next year the excuse will be, "Well, we had the money. We were ready to go ahead, but we couldn't get permission to build."

Now the Minister and the government of the day can decide how far and how fast they go. This is permissive legislation for the government. It doesn't force them to rule on everything. I certainly agree and they're continuing now, if his department is discussing it with the City of Winnipeg, that's what they should do and they should try to co-operate. But sometime the Minister must have the last word, the government must have the last word, you can't just blame one and blame the other. Now the city accepted that in talks that I had with them. In fact, they welcomed that, because quite candidly, one of them told me, "Well, this is good," because, you know, this is really a difficult thing. They say they're great. People like the program, it's a great thing, and you've got to be human and you've got to help everybody, but don't get these things next to my place. Therefore, you know, you move to the next guy and it's the same thing. It's a great thing but don't build near my place.

So I just want to know if the Minister is going to retain or — I don't care how he does it — amend the Act, but retain the last word. In other words, that they will not say, "Well, the City of Winnipeg will not allow us, there's a zoning bylaw, we can't do anything about it, and therefore, we're not going to go ahead."

I think that the Minister knows that the Association for the Mentally Retarded, at their last meeting — and I think they probably approached the Minister on that — they wanted to go ahead and bring a resolution that the responsibility for re-zoning, when it comes to social programs — they were thinking of their own mostly — but social programs would be left to the Minister, and they meant all over Manitoba. So I hope that I can have a more direct answer.

If the Minister says, "No, we don't want this." It's easy. It's not an easy decision to make but it's easy to explain, to tell me exactly what the government intends to do. They can say, "No, this is not our jurisdiction. We feel that it's the City of Winnipeg and we must go by them, and if they say no, we have to go through to the proper channel, and that's it." —(Interjection)— Or they can say, "No, the responsibility of social programs in Manitoba is our responsibility and nothing must come in our way, if we feel that this has to be done." In other words, if we pass the buck again and blame the City of Winnipeg or the municipalities, or if the Minister said, "Yes, if there's problems, but if we feel that this must go through, well then we have jurisdiction and we take precedence and we have the last word." I would hope that the Minister can now tell me, be more direct and tell me, does he want to retain this right? Because it's in the Act now, he has this legislation; or no, we're giving that back to the City of Winnipeg because it is their jurisdiction and we're not going to dictate, we're not going to go and bring programs if they don't want it."

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to retain the right to make that decision or to have the freedom and the flexibility to make that kind of decision, if that's necessary, if that's the only way we can get it. I would like to give the honourable member a direct and definitive answer, I really would. I can't until we've concluded our talks with the City of Winnipeg.

If it is possible for us to come to an understanding with the City of Winnipeg that this kind of avenue is necessary and desirable and must be made available, and we have to have the city's co-operation on that, and short of their co-operation we are going to be forced to consider something more authoritative in the way of legislation, and they agree that they can co-operate, will co-operate and would like to avoid the authoritative procedure, or the authoritative power vested in statute form, then it well may be that we can work with the city without having statutory authority of the nature currently embodied in the City of Winnipeg Act, and to which the honourable member refers.

If we're able to reach that kind of an arrangement with the city, that would be my preference. If it turns out that in the course of the next two years, as we attempt to site group homes and community residences, that that kind of assurance or co-operation from the city is not forthcoming and that our plans and hopes are then stymied — and not just the City of Winnipeg but any municipality — that our plans and hopes are then stymied and we're frustrated and up against a brick wall again, then I would have no hesitation in resorting to a request for statutory authority of the type contained in the present Act.

But I would prefer to do it without having to resort to that kind of authority. I would like to give my honourable friend a firm and definite answer, but we haven't concluded those discussions with the city. The only firm and definite answer I can give him is that I intend to pursue the concept of de-institutionalization and the creation of group and community residences, and it follows that I will be seeking the widest possible flexibility in terms of location in order to do that, and if stymied in pursuit of those locations we'll have to resort to something stronger.

The honourable member reminded me of his questions about Bill 58, and that's correct, I apologize. I neglected to respond to that question earlier. I don't know to what extent that question may have been examined and explored during the examination of the Estimates of my colleague, the Minister of Education. It might have been discussed there, but I feel, quite frankly, that the basic decisions and the basic guidance and leadership in that area must come from the Minister of the Crown who is responsible for Education.

I recognize the ambitions of the previous administration, in pursuing Bill 58 to the point that they did, are certainly humane and once again they are objectives that I don't doubt we all subscribe to, but the practical and financial difficulties have created problems for successive governments in this province, the previous government and the present government, and I can't assure my honourable friend that we have come to the conclusion that we can surmount those practical and financial obstacles easily.

We have, in fact, come to the conclusion that we can't surmount them easily and it's going to take hard, slow, sort of staged work, step by step work, to be able to introduce the kind of measure envisioned in Bill 58, on any broad scale, and I think it will be some time in coming.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with Rule 19, Section (2), I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour, and will return at the call of the Chair. The Honourable Government House

Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I believe that there is general agreement that we will proceed straight through without interruption.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: That was a fast trip, Mr. Chairman, you came back pretty fast.

I'm less than satisfied with the comments of the Minister. It is so vague that there is one government, there's different departments, but people have certain responsibilities. As far as Bill 58 is concerned I think that the Minister could tell us what he thinks, what he wants, and then fight it out in Cabinet if need be with the Minister of Education, but I think he has to push because the first thing that he said and he's repeated it and I agree with him and we're all with him is he wants to get less people in institutions, more in the community, and certain things have to be done, and he recognized that himself. Number one, is the public has to be educated, they have to be ready and they have to be willing to do their part, so should the school division and so on. Now, if that is the case, it's very easy. I think that then you have to take proper steps to make sure that the people are educated as soon as possible.

You know, it's practically that the Minister wants to say well this is a great thing, and he's hoping that there's going to be certain problems, that he won't be able to go as fast in the meantime, it's not his fault, and he's saving dollars. I'm so tired of having the dollar sign in front of us constantly when we're discussing these kind of problems and the people are getting carried away, even the people of Hansard, Mr. Chairman. Yesterday's Hansard when we started our discussion, has got: "Mr. Chairman: Gentlemen, the hour of 5:30 p.m. having arrived, I'm leaving the Chair until 8:00 p.m. \$ D1 Supply Health and Social Development." The dollar sign comes all over the place. And look at it on page 2793 until 8:00 p.m. \$— Supply Health and Social Development. And it seems to be that they, you know, cost first . . . —(Interjection)— I think the Chairman is part of the government and probably is, I don't know if he got his marching orders or what. No, I'll blame the people of Hansard on that. —(Interjection)— Oh, you you've got enough problems of your own without. . . that's right, that is a problem of yours, oh, now I know why.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on this other situation the Minister says I hope that we can do it in co-operation with the city. Well, everybody in this House and the former government hope to do it with the city, there is no doubt about that. In this legislation it's permissive. If I understand, it's very hard to get a clear direct answer, but if I understand, the Minister is saying that that legislation, or seemed to indicate that this legislation will disappear. And then if it doesn't work, then he will ask for legislation. So that will be another three or four years. You know, nobody has to re-invent the wheel, this was done. This legislation was brought in after years and years of getting nowhere, and then the councillors change and there's so much pressure on them, ask Wilson, there's so much pressure on them in their community and say, "You know, all the community residences are in my area" and so, therefore, nobody wants it in their area.

Now, I'm just suggesting that if the Minister is really sincere and says I want to co-operate with the city, I hope that we don't have to pull out the club, but I insist there's got to be flexibility that if we want to go ahead with our programs and if the councillors or different municipalities say, no, we must have the last word, that's exactly what we're saying and that's exactly what this legislation will do. You don't have to cancel this legislation and wait and see if they'll co-operate and then in three years bring that legislation back, this is permissive legislation. You don't even have to take advantage of it. If the city says "no, we don't want it there," you don't have to use your authority, you can say, "okay, we won't do it until you want to go ahead," but that legislation is there. Don't cancel it and ask for it in a few years, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that this would be right.

Now, as I said we want to discuss this further, not necessarily those two, I think we exhausted that, but the population of certain institutions and we'll discuss that under another item, another division, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Robert Anderson: (j)(1)—pass; (2)—pass; (3)—pass; (j)—pass; (k)—\$682,600—pass — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could give us the grants to the organizations that are being funded, to the agencies that are being funded, both the breakdown of last year and this year?!

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The grants to agencies include the following: Canadian

in Support of Native People was \$800 last year and it's \$800 this year; Canadian Council for the Blind was \$100 last year and it's \$100 this year; the Canadian Council for Social Development was \$8,500 last year, it's \$9,300 this year; The Last Post Fund was \$200 last year, no grant this year; Social Planning Council of Winnipeg was \$35,000 last year and \$35,000 this year; Winnipeg Council of Self Help was \$10,000 last year and there's no grant this year; The Canadian Diabetic Association \$1,000 last year, \$1,000 this year; Indian and Metis Organizations \$366,900 last year, \$419,900 this year; Luncheon After School Programs \$61,000 last year, the same amount this year; Community Projects \$20,000 last year, there's no grant this year; Manitoba Indian Brotherhood was \$130,800 last year, it's the same \$130,800 this year. The old Grace Hospital Mortgage \$28,100 last year, \$24,600 this year. Last year there was a substantial amount in for research support funds, those are the grants to agencies. Winnipeg Council for Self Help, no grant this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the Community Council of Self Help which had been receiving support, I gather has been discontinued and I'm wondering whether the Minister could tell us why in his opinion the Council of Self Help doesn't warrant the support because they're an organization that is trying to meet the needs and to deal with people who don't have the sophistication and knowledge of where to go and how to organize and how to get their views put across. They are people really at the lower end of the scale, lacking the education and sophistication and this is one group that thought their own endeavours organized themselves and became a very vocal group, an important group to bring forward to government and to other agencies in Winnipeg the needs of people living in the core city and, you know, I'm absolutely convinced that without the grant they will simply fold because these are not people of means, they cannot raise the money themselves. They don't have the means in which to do it because the clientele there they're catering to is an element that don't have the funds. It seems to me that if the Minister can find funds to help the Sports Federation, surely he can find funds to help an organization of this kind which as I say, came into being simply out of desperation as a means of marshalling the few resources they have to highlight the problems of their particular clientele, which as I say are people of the lowest end of the income scale, the people who lack the sophistication and knowledge and this organization acts as their advocates and have successfully brought the attention of governments of all levels and agencies in the City of Winnipeg, the needs of this particular group in our society.

So, I regret to see this cut, the elimination of a program and I'm wondering why the Minister could feel justified in going along with this kind of slashing of the program. It's not just a matter of cutting a few dollars off, it's really eliminating it.

MR. SHEAN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the honourable member's patience on that question and assure him of an answer later today. I can't give him the answer on that. There are some thoughts in my mind which suggest to me that I know the explanation and it's a logical explanation, but I would want to check it out rather than suggest it at this point in time. I could get him the answer later in the day.

MR. MILLER: And what about community projects, \$20,000 last year and it's zilch this year, is that a number of projects? Was it one? Could the Minister enlighten us on that?

MR. SHERMAN: That particular appropriation, Mr. Chairman, was provided to take care of emergencies or contingencies or unexpected projects, problems, proposals, submissions that came up during the year. It was designed specifically to operate as a kind of a contingency allowance to deal with unexpected items, proposals that had not been scheduled or anticipated. We don't feel that we have sufficient resources available this year to budget for unexpected or unanticipated community project proposals. We have none that confront us at the present time and we don't feel we can budget for that kind of proposal, or that kind of possibility in the current fiscal year.

MR. MILLER: All right, Mr. Chairman, that is an explanation and I suppose if something does come up the Minister can always go to Cabinet with a special warrant.

The other item is the Luncheon After School Program which is identical in amount \$61,100 in one year and the next. In light of the fact that costs of food have gone up, the cost of milk has gone up, the most recent increase just the other day, doesn't the Minister recognize that, in fact, this means diminution in the program, or less food, or less enrolment because the same dollars cannot possibly serve the same number of students with the same standards of food and lunch they were offered in the schools themselves. So how does the Minister justify maintaining the figure

because, in fact, by maintaining it it means a reduction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: These particular programs as the honourable member recognizes are the ones that operate outside our Day Care Program. It is true that the amount of money is the same and it may mean a slight reduction in enrollment in those centres, or it might mean a reduction in either the amount of food or the amount of milk that is made available. That decision would be left to the operators of those programs themselves. It might be that they would prefer to do it through a slight reduction in enrollment.

The decision was made, Mr. Chairman, obviously to fund them simply to the same level in 1977 dollars, 1977-78 dollars that they were being funded last year, and they might be able to come into the Day Care Program. These certainly would be individual enrollees who we would hope could come into the Day Care Program. Whether the full unit in each case were able to come in is another possibility, but that's another question. But we would hope that some of the enrollees in those individual units would move into the Day Care Program, which would reduce the pressure in terms of enrollment at the Lunch and After School Unit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is very interesting, the two things. The Minister says, "Well, it is up to the groups to make the decision whether they will offer less food or reduce the number of children that are going to be served." You know it is consistent with his idea of flexibility and autonomy. The group has the right to make the determination. I say they don't have much choice. If you don't give them the dollars then the flexibility you are offering them is, "Do I shrink it by so much or do I shrink it by a little more?" That is not much, that is a Hobson's choice.

So to say that they have the flexibility to make their own decision is pretty ludicrous. They have no choice. They are going to have to make a very hard decision, either increase the number of children they are serving or decrease the food or the milk that they are supplying.

Insofar as using the Day Care Centres, that has always been the objective that perhaps the Lunch and After School Program could meld into the Day Care operation. But, Mr. Chairman, the fact is the Day Care Program has been frozen too. So with the Day Care Program frozen and the Lunch and After School Program therefore still having to operate, they are getting it both ways. They can't expand the Day Care Centre Program by inclusion of this program into it, even if it is possible and it may not be possible because the location of Day Care Centres may not conform with the needs of these particular children who are attending school. These are school children, school-age children.

So I frankly find that the Minister's explanation of, "Well, we made this determination and now they have the flexibility to make the determination themselves," is really begging the question. He didn't really give them any choice in my opinion. By freezing the amount that was available to them, he in fact forced them to decrease the program. The matter of flexibility is just words, it has no meaning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (k)—pass — the Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. DESJARDINS: After (j) I think the Minister was going to give us the Research Support Fund now, a breakdown of the Research. . . Oh, I am sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: I will be brief, Mr. Chairman.

At this juncture I wasn't going to speak on this, but I feel compelled just to put some statistics certainly on the record, and perhaps ask a few questions.

My research indicates that there are some 29,000 working mothers in the City of Winnipeg. Apparently there are only five partially subsidized Lunch and After School Centres in the same area, and I think this is a matter of considerable concern. These five centres I mentioned I am told have space for only approximately some 200 children, leaving 28,800, whose parents presumably are either finding alternate care for their children, or children that are in a sense subject to the possibility of neglect.

In this province, I feel compelled to mention as well, that in this province that sort of neglect under Section 38 of the Child Welfare Act is an offence punishable on summary conviction in our

courts. I wouldn't want to put parents in that predicament and I think it is incumbent on government to do whatever it can to resist that sort of situation in our province.

I would be interested in knowing whether or not the government will be assisting outside agencies, such as these particular centres, to communicate and liaise with Child Development Clinics and Community Health Clinics and Family Life Education organizations on a cost-free basis in order to upgrade the standards of care that would be available to them?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the subject matter raised by the Honourable Member for Wellington one could only say I suppose that that's a worthwhile suggestion. We have not initiated or made any determination to initiate a particular study or exercise of that kind. As he appreciates these Lunch and After School Programs that we are looking at operate independently of the government's Child Day Care Program. We more or less inherited them when the province put its Child Day Care Program into place. We certainly encourage their continuation and are continuing the funding of them, but we are not at this juncture actively promoting either their expansion or the concepts expansion so that I haven't contemplated the kind of initiative to which the honourable member refers, but it is certainly a suggestion worth looking at and I will look at it.

The point he raises about the numbers of working mothers and working parents in Winnipeg, perhaps in Manitoba generally, who do benefit to some degree from the existing program and who could benefit from an expansion of this type of concept, is not debatable. Certainly that is a truism, but we have to measure our approaches in the whole field of Health and Social Development in terms of priorities and it is not an intended priority initiative of the government in fiscal 1978-79 to expand the Lunch and After School concept. As the taxpayers of Manitoba find themselves in a position to fund additional growth and expansion in the field of Health and Social Development and programs for services across the spectrum of that field, there will be, as there are now, many competing priorities and they will have to be judged as equitably as possible, and certainly the Lunch and After School Program will be given fair consideration. But it is not an intended priority initiative for 1978-79. The best we can do is do what we are doing to help those that are in existence remain in existence, continue in existence.

The Member for Seven Oaks questioned the position I took with respect to the autonomy of the units and the requirement for them to have to make their own decisions as to how they are going to live with their budget, which includes no increase over 1977-78, and as he points out finds them facing, as we all do, additional costs. I would simply remind the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that this has always been the situation for the Lunch and After School Programs. They weren't established by the province, the province inherited them, the province has provided some assistance, some funding in order that they can continue to operate. They operate outside the Day Care Program. They have always set their own ground rules. They have always set their own budgets and determined the components and the make-up within those budgets. They always make their own assessments in terms of needs and priorities of needs and they operate autonomously and independently. So there is no change from the environment to which they have been used to in the past. They will simply do this year what they have done in the past, make the decision themselves as to how they will allocate the funds available to them — \$61,100 of those funds being the funds stipulated here in this particular appropriation.

MR. CORRIN: I am pleased to hear the remarks of the Honourable Minister, Mr. Chairman, but with due respect I don't think they suffice. Surely the Minister is aware first of all that there is, I think, very little distinction that can be made as between the user groups of the Day Care Programs and the Lunch and After School facilities and programs. It just so happens that children as they get older graduate from the former to the latter. Other than that they still have the same parents and their parents still have the same socioeconomic situations. Right now I am concerned because there is a situation where there is discrimination as between the funding being accorded to groups. Now I am also that it is true that the former government created that situation, but it is also true that the former government was in the process of evolving a whole system of day care or out-of-home service to provide care for children of working parents. The programs they had begun were evolving. As a matter of fact, this particular grant under this item, the \$61,000 that we have been referring to I believe, is essentially the grant that was the seed money to the five centres that are funded in Winnipeg on an experimental basis and that experiment was, I believe, commenced in the year 1974 with a view towards recommendations emanating from that, with a view, I think, towards expansion, great expansion, of the program and its funding.

I would ask the Honourable Minister whether he can now indicate and presumably there is considerable data from which to do that, whether or not he and his colleagues — he can't speak for his colleagues, but whether or not he will recommend to his colleagues that there be no

as between day care, lunch and after school care and that subsidies would be given to needy parents in this program, and maintenance grants awarded to the centres participating in the program?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, all I can do is say to the Honourable Member for Wellington once again that it's certainly a subject that I will continue to think, the government will continue to think about it. We will move in it as we can and as we can afford to. Perhaps after five, six, seven or eight years in office we will have been able to make expansions, undertake initiatives, put programs and services of this type, and others, into place that will reflect very favourably on us and compare very favourably with what the honourable member feels the previous administration did in this field. But we're dealing here with a program that was operated independently within its own ground rules, within its own parameters. We inherited it. We have attempted to maintain support funding, which is not seed money. The program has been in place for some time. It's ongoing annualized funding.

He talks about the Day Care Program, as such, and the similarity of the families that desire programming in these two areas but the fact of the matter is that the Day Care Program is dealing with children up to school-age and we're looking here at a program operating among certain children in certain areas, that was put into place by those areas or those communities or those neighbourhoods some time ago, having to do with children of school age, which we simply have said, "All right; we accept. They were there. We have inherited them. We are happy to see it operating and we will provide this kind of ongoing support." But our essential programming interest is at the day care level. The school system itself provides meals in many instances, provides support of this kind in many instances for children of school age. These particular units operate in neighbourhoods or communities where the decision was made some time ago to provide this kind of service for school-age children. It's not part and parcel of the Day Care Program, the day care approach that the province has taken, it's something, as I said, that the province inherited.

We intend to continue to monitor the whole Day Care Program and legitimate needs in that area very closely. We are not contemplating any initiatives, any new thrusts, in the Lunch and After School Program in the immediate future.

MR. CORRIN: I am interested in that response, Mr. Chairman, because I have to place that in juxtaposition with a letter to the editor I read, I believe on Saturday, in the Winnipeg Tribune, and it was written by the Member for St. Matthews, basically trying to repudiate remarks that were apparently allegedly misinterpreted by certain members of the press and certain members of this Assembly, stating a position that he says he did advocate in this House respecting the need for greater equality of opportunity for young children, particularly, of course, those children parented by underprivileged persons. \$

I pointed out, Mr. Chairman, that there are only spaces in the city for some 200-odd children and yet in the face of the fact that there are some 29,000 children of working mothers in the City of Winnipeg, presumably some of which may well live in the constituency represented by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, certainly some of which reside in my constituency which adjoins that, the honourable member's constituency.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, if we are to look forward to the day when there is in fact and indeed greater equality of opportunity for all our children, greater access to higher education as advocated by not only the Member for St. Matthews but I think one can safely say all members of this House, then certainly there has to be something done with respect to programs like Lunch and After School. Those children are not being given the incentive and advantages accorded to children raised in families where there is more affluence. Not necessarily wealthy families but families that at least have the wealth of being able perhaps to afford one of the parents the opportunity, if one of those people does choose, to stay at home in order to maintain the children's welfare on a full-time basis.

These children are forced onto the streets. Very often, as I found out in my own area because I have taken pains to visit one of the Lunch and After School Programs in my area, very often they find themselves on the doorsteps of the schools tragically at 7 a.m., at 7:30 a.m., on cold winter mornings. I might tell you that the rules of the Winnipeg School Division do not allow the doors of the schools to be open before 8 a.m. for some reason unknown to myself — best known, I believe, to the staff and trustees of the board. I think if they are asked they will tell you it's because of a shortfall in terms of funding. They don't have the staff to open the doors earlier. It costs money.

But in any event, these children find themselves in precarious circumstances on the streets at lunch time and after school. I don't think that enhances a child's opportunities. True, I'm sure many of us in this Chamber were in that situation and did, in our youth, probably spend a great deal of our time on the streets. Some of us, I suppose, might say that it didn't hurt us but I think realistically we all appreciate that it probably did us little good, little tangible and substantial good, as well.

So I must, in these circumstances, encourage the Minister and I suppose encourage the Member for St. Matthews inasmuch as he has evinced a real concern, a sympathy and empathy for children in these circumstances, to enhance the funding to this experimental program initiated by the former government. Enhance the funding in order to afford a greater equality of opportunity to all the children, and the parents of those children as well, who must find it most distressful to, by force of circumstance, to have to leave their children in those sorts of situations, to assist those children in enhancing their prospects for the future.

I note that I have a short brief, which I believe was presented to the Honourable Minister by the Manitoba Child Care Association several months ago, and that brief did indicate and does indicate that random sampling by the Association of Principals of all the school divisions in the Winnipeg area found that over 80 percent expressed need for lunch and after school programs.

In view of that, I would suggest to these people with immediate experience in the field — people who on a day-to-day basis have to deal with problems that emanate from lack of proper attention to this sort of need — I would suggest that there is a demonstrable and proven need for after school care and I would recommend to the Minister that he take immediate steps to provide it.

I would ask, in view of my remarks, whether the Minister now can tell us whether or not he foresees any expansion of the program, whether he envisages any integration of that program with day care? And I think that's important, frankly. And in so integrating the program with day care I would encourage him and ask him whether or not he intends to put it on a like basis with proper maintenance grants and subsidies to needy parents.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, first of all, a correction for the record. This experimental program, so-called and so referred to by the Honourable Member for Wellington, was not introduced by the previous government. It was inherited by the previous government, just as it has been inherited by the new government from the previous government. It was in place and then the particular units, the particular facilities, most of them related to churches —(Interjection)— It was before day care. And came to the government for funding because they found that they had difficulty maintaining the operations that they had initiated themselves. They received funding support from the previous government outside the Day Care Program, and they are receiving funding from the present government outside the Day Care Program. But they came into being before the Day Care Program and on their own initiative.

The honourable member refers to what he sees, or what has been reported to him, as a demonstrable and proven need for lunch and after school care. Well I suppose that professionals in any field — and school principals and school teachers would be no exception — have particular perspectives that one could expect them to take with respect to the kinds of events, the kinds of persons and personalities, the kinds of lives and the kinds of activities that they come in contact with every day and they would, I expect, conclude naturally from their exposure throughout most of their working day to school children that there are demonstrable and proven needs in that area that far exceed and far outweigh the demonstrable and proven needs that another professional, another person of experience, would identify as being a top priority in a different area.

I can only repeat what I said about the range of programming and service areas that all commend themselves to the attention and the study of a government. But a government, a Legislature has to try to make a determination on the basis of equity and equitability and resources, and policy intentions and put everything on the basis of priorities. We do not have plans in 1978-79 to extend or expand the Lunch and After School Program.

I don't quarrel with the honourable member's contention that many children on the streets in the City of Winnipeg, and other municipalities, could benefit from a Lunch and After School Program, but those children could benefit from many things and the answer does not necessarily lie in simply providing them with a Lunch and After School Program. I think that there are pitfalls in a kind of a universal or doctrinaire, or one-sided approach, to problems and questions of that kind. Certainly a Lunch and After School Program has benefits for some people; it also can be exploited by some people. It also can provide a relatively easy escape-hatch, escape route, for people who wish to avoid their responsibilities.

I think that if we are going to get down to the question of discussing the problems of children on the streets that there are a number of things that we should be doing and a number of programs and institutions that we should be considering funding, and expanding, before necessarily concentrating either our resources or our energies on Lunch and After School Programs.

Certainly, the concept is worthy of support and continuation, and that's what it's getting, but I'm not under any illusions that the problems of children on our streets are going to be solved by providing them with lunch and with an after school program. Part of the problem stems from the whole sense of responsibility, or lack of responsibility existing among many families, among many parents, among many adults, and I think that we have to take a pretty comprehensive and eclectic kind of approach to a question of this kind rather than just to recommend to the 57 members of the Legislature that the solution to a social problem of this kind can be found in a limited or isolated program such as the one we're considering here. We don't have any plans to expand it in the current year, nor do we have any plans to link it with the Day Care Program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: I am pleased, Mr. Chairman, to hear the Minister suggest that there is a need for a comprehensive and eclectic approach when confronting these particular types of very difficult and thorny problems. And I agree, they are very difficult; they are not ones that readily lend themselves to solutions. And Mr. Chairman, it's for that reason that I earlier asked the Honourable Minister whether he would be willing, before he made any decisions, before his government took any decisions with respect to this type of program, whether his government would be willing to communicate and dialogue with outside agencies, organizations that have considerable knowledge through experience, both professional and lay experience in this field. I suggested that they could approach child development clinics, community health clinics, Family Life Education Centres, with a view towards finding out, assessing and evaluating their opinions. I think it's incumbent upon the government, as a matter of fact, before making any decisions in this area, to communicate with these types of organizations in order to take the opportunity to gain insights derived from that sort of interface that would otherwise be denied it. So I would strongly suggest and recommend that the Honourable Minister avail himself of this opportunity in order to supplement what is undoubtedly a considerable amount of knowledge already on file, on deposit with his department.

I must note, he indicates that, and I think it was a somewhat intemperate remark and not well-considered, he indicates that parents have to take greater responsibility in this area, and that government — and I'm now only roughly attempting to paraphrase what he said, and I admit that — it wasn't the responsibility of government to look after all the children of the province. Well, that's true, but I surely hope that he wasn't addressing himself to the problems they might be confronting, for instance, the single parent family, where a working mother has little or no choice. Surely, we can't tell that lady, that woman, that she's been negligent in the upbringing of her children? Circumstances well beyond her own control have perhaps conspired to require her to bear an additional burden of being both father and mother to her children, sole income earner, sole source of sustenance for the family, and I would suggest that it's unjustifiable and unfounded for the Minister to suggest that people in those sorts of circumstances can control in any meaningful way, their destiny. And I think that those people do need government assistance. I think that some sort of supplement is required. It's provided for those people when their children are of the age to attend day care facilities, and I see absolutely no reason why that type of programming can't be extended to lunch and after school. I think the alternative is obvious; the alternative is to ask people in that situation to leave their jobs, go on welfare. I think the burden to the people of this province tax-wise and to the public purse will be considerably greater if that alternative was sought out, and I would suggest that it's not a very innovative or creative solution.

So, I would ask that the Minister give consideration to — not to retracting his statement, because I don't think that he meant to disparage people in those circumstances, but to give consideration when he's making decisions in a comprehensive and eclectic manner — the Minister's words, not mine — to have reference to child development clinics, community health clinics, and Family Life Education Centres, in order that he be well apprised of all the facts before his government takes any course of action. And I would ask whether or not that will be the case; I'd be very interested in knowing whether that will or will not be the case.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can give the Honourable Member for Wellington an undertaking that I will do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e)—pass. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: I had asked the Minister to give us a breakdown of the Research Support Funds. I think you were about to give us that when we . . .

MR. SHERMAN: General Purpose Grants and Research Support Funds, (k). Mr. Chairman, we're looking at a reduction here in this funding to the extent of \$270,500 —(Interjection)— Yes, 1978-79 over 1977-78. What's being asked this year is \$682,600 as against \$933,000 last year. The reason for that is that there were a number of research projects that are completed that don't require any commitments from 1978-79 funds. There are a number of Health and Welfare Canada research funds grant requests that used to be channelled through the province but that are now forwarded direct to Health and Welfare Canada by the investigators, and the federal funding on them is direct. There was \$20,500 that was voted last year for Research Administration to cover operating costs of the administration unit, but these costs are now absorbed by divisional administration, and there was a grant that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is familiar with, of \$100,000 to the St. Boniface Hospital Research Foundation. That was a special one-time grant; actually, it was made over two years — \$50,000 and \$50,000.00. The idea was undertaken by him, under his ministry, but as I think I have assured him earlier, we followed through with the second half, the final half of that commitment last year, which was 1977-78.

Now, those items to which I have referred, or the kinds of items to which I have referred, add up in total to \$270,500, which accounts for the difference in the appropriations as between this year and last year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (k)—pass. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, this was a different item, and it was \$275,000.00. Maybe it would be a lot simpler if the Minister gave us all the information on (k). I wonder if we can go through — I think there were three, four different areas; I think if the Minister would break it down. I think he told us that No. 4 was St. Boniface Hospital; that is curtailed now; it's finished, but what about the others? I wonder if he could tell us?

MR. SHERMAN: I may have to get back to that question in half a minute, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps I could explain it this way, that when we were looking at (k) originally, a few moments ago, when we were looking at the explanation of grants to agencies, in responding to the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, I cited the grants to agencies down to and including the old Grace Hospital mortgage. Now, the next item in that list was Research Support Funds, and they totalled \$270,500 in 1977-78; \$270.5, \$270,500 in 1977-78; and we show "nil" —(Interjection) — Yes, nil for 1978-79. So the total appropriation, the total line that we're looking at was \$933,000 for 1977-78 and is \$682,600 for 1978-79. The difference is that \$270,000 that I've just referred to, plus the three others that the Member for Seven Oaks questioned me on — well, one of them he didn't question me on, the Last Post Fund — — you'll recall that there were three grants that I cited in which I gave the amount for 1977-78 and said "nil" for 1978-79. If you add those, plus this \$270,500, that makes the difference between last year's total vote for that line and this year's requested appropriation for that line.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't quarrel with this. The Minister told us actually that money's not all gone; some of it was 100 percent recoverable from Canada, and now this is going direct from Canada. My only concern is what he refers to as my project of St. Boniface Hospital. Now, Manitoba wasn't doing anything in this field of research, and it was felt by the opposition of the day that something should be done. This was mentioned many times; it was felt by the community here, the teaching hospitals and so on, that something should be done. We were quite emphatic last year in saying that we didn't intend to pick up what the Government of Canada had dropped. They had a reduction in their research, but then they reinstated that.

Now, it was very humble, but it was a beginning. The idea was a first step; it was the two teaching hospitals, they'll go from them because of lack of an umbrella organization here in Manitoba, and it was felt that the \$100,000 that we had for the last two years, it was underspent by \$100' by \$50 a year Well, my honourable that St. Boniface received the second fifty last year. And the government figured at the time that there would be a request, and there were requests from a lot of different people for research funds. If I can finish, we can leave this — I'll take a minute, and then we could pass that, if it's the . . . and then we can go back in the new division.

Now, the intention, as I said, was to have \$50 for one teaching hospital — \$50,000 — and \$50,000 for the other. That was never requested; the Health Sciences Centre never really had that. But the department then had asked the — I think it was the College of Physicians, and certainly Dr. Naimark,

Tuesday, May 30, 1978

to look at a possibility, to make the suggestion to the Minister to see what could be done — not necessarily large amounts, but a certain amount of money that could be done but, instead of going, of the Minister who was not an expert in that, of having to decide where the money should go, they would be kind of an umbrella group. And it was felt, especially in view of what the other provinces were doing. . . Ontario had started through their lottery, they wanted an excuse to run their lottery and fight with the federal lottery, and a lot of that money went for research, and it was felt — I still feel that most of that money for research should be coming from the Federal Government. It was felt that we might have a start in that direction of showing that we were interested, although it was very humble, and I don't know what happened to that, but Dr. Naimark, and I don't remember exactly who else was with him, they were going to bring in a report, a recommendation to the government. Now it might be that the government feels that this is not the year to do that, but I think that the intent and the idea was a good one, and I would hope that the Minister would, at least, follow through even though there is no money in the Estimates at this time, that the Minister would follow through with Dr. Naimark, to see if there's something. You see, the main thing is — I think I mentioned that last week — that if there's any discovery anywhere you're all going to profit by it.

But there's another point also, that if you lose some of these researchers like Dr. Cherniack, who left not long ago, I think that's a real loss for the province, because they feel that they have to be close, there has to be some funds available. Either we've got to make representation and try to get more, a bigger share from Ottawa, or maybe we'll have to start — it might be voluntary money, it might be a little bit from the province — but I don't think we should abandon that at this time. I think it's still very important.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I agree with my honourable friend on the subject of research and the need for research funding, Mr. Chairman. I have had conversations with Dr. Naimark. That concept is still very much alive. But also I don't want to open up a new jungle at this juncture, but I would appreciate suggestions from my honourable friend as to whether or not it might be possible to consider, to take a look at the whole structure, or the distribution of lottery funds, and what his opinion is in that field, because it's something I'm looking at very closely.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (k)—pass. Resolution 59 — Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$54,780,000 for Health and Social Development. Community Operations Division, \$54,780,000— pass.

The hour being 5:30, I am now leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m.