

TIME: 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan): Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 25 students, Grade 5 standing, of the St. Charles Academy. These students are under the direction of Mrs. La Fleche. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here this morning.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Health.

HONOURABLE LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave of the House to perform a very sad duty and make a short statement. I haven't a prepared statement; I'd like leave of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed) The Honourable Minister.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, around seven o'clock last night when I got home I received a call from the staff in Portage la Prairie that they had a fire at the School for the Retarded. I drove to Portage and found out that, indeed, there had been a very sad fire there. It was in an old building, the information that I have there were 52 inmates; 44 of them were taken out safely. I think the death rate is five now and one very critically ill who is expected to go anytime and another one critically ill.

The Fire Commissioner and the RCMP were there. They are going to bring in a report that I hope to have maybe later on today. It was shortly after the dinner hour. There were two staff members with these people. I wouldn't want the rumours to state that these people were locked up. They were not locked up. Their staff was with them but they were about the worst at the school. The level of functioning was very poor. They were around 20 years old. For instance one of the staff took one of the inmates out and left him out to go and get another one but he followed her right back in. The firemen had trouble with the armoured plate glass window to protect these people. They had trouble breaking these windows to bring in the water. Staff, I think, showed a lot of concern. Many of the staff people, when I was there, came in and volunteered to work to help with the kids; I shouldn't say kids, they act like kids but I think they were, as I said, around their twenties.

We got in touch with the Federal Public Works Department to see if we could use the former Indian Student Residence. We received the okay today. We're going to work with our own Public Works Department to put it in shape and during the weekend we expect to move the . . . Not the same; not those that lost their residence. There will have to be some adjustment because these people, as I said, the level of functioning is quite low, we wouldn't want them a mile and a half from the school, but there will be some adjustment and they'll all be taken care of. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STERLING R. LYON (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister for his statement. This is one of those sad events that happens, fortunately rarely ' in institutions over which the province has jurisdiction. I know from experience that it is something that the supervisory staff, the administrative staff, and indeed the Minister himself live in dread of happening. In my experience, and I'm sure in his, this is probably the worst institutional I know from experience that it is something that the supervisory staff, the administrative staff and indeed the Minister himself live in dread of happening. In my experience and I am sure in his, this is probably the worst institutional incident of this sort, death or series of deaths of this sort, certainly that I can recall and we are pleased, of course, to have the Minister's assurance that a full and complete investigation will be carried out with respect to the causes of this unfortunate incident, not so much for the benefit of the staff or for the Minister and his department, but really to put at ease the minds of parents who have children and other loved ones committed to that institution and other institutions.

And so we join with him in expressing sincere sympathies to the parents and the families of those who sadly were lost in the fire last night. We pray, along with all others' that there will be no further deaths arising from this incident, and I am sure we can expect from the Minister, as and when he receives the reports when they come in from the Fire Commissioner's office, from the R from CMP and others, full reports to the House on what caused this conflagration in the building. Some of the buildings on that location, as the Minister will well know, are old; some of the new cottage structures have been built over the last 15-20 years and would not ordinarily be thought to be subject to this kind of fire. We would hope that in the intervening time, that the Minister would see fit to have the Department of Labour, and others who have responsibility, check the wiring and check any of the

other possible causes that might have led to this fire of last evening, to make sure, naturally as he would wish and as we would all wish, that there would be no danger of a similar occurrence taking place.

I suppose it is always on these occasions that these matters are brought to our attention with respect to all provincial institutions and I know that the Minister, along with his colleague, the Minister of Corrections, would want to ensure that arising out of this sad event, those examinations are made of all provincial institutional buildings where people are incarcerated, either through the operation of the law or by reason of their own mental deficiency and so on, to ensure that as much as humanly possible, and we all know that it is not always totally possible, but as much as it is possible within the powers of inspection that we have, to ensure that inmates in other institutions will not be under the fear of this kind of event occurring in those institutions.

So we thank the Minister for the statement and we will look forward to hearing further reports from him as they reach him.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed on the Question Period, since there has been some concern in respect to the Question Period, let me suggest Beauchesne Citation 171 in respect to the Question — and I hope to get the co-operation of the honourable members. "In putting a question, a member must confine himself to the narrowest limits in making a question, observations which might lead to debate cannot be regarded as coming within the proper limits of a question. The purpose of a question is to obtain information and not to supply it to the House."

And just for the first (a) and (b), "The question, oral or written, must not (a) be ironical, rhetorical, offensive or contain epithet, innuendo, satire or ridicule and must not be trivial, vague or meaningless." That's one part. The second part is Beauchesne's Citation 181 in respect to answers. "Questions must be answered briefly and distinctly and be limited to the necessary explanations, though a certain amount of latitude is permitted to the Ministers of the Crown whenever they find it necessary to extend their remarks. An answer to a question placed by a member on the Order Paper cannot contain gratuitous references. If it does, it must be expunged."

I shall try to abide by that. I hope the honourable members will co-operate with me. Questions.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister relative to comments made last evening by the Premier of Ontario with respect to the Province of Quebec.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Is that necessary to our procedures in this House?

MR. LYON: Once the question is put, Mr. Speaker, we may then be in a position to judge it.

The Premier of Ontario made the statement that separation in a political sense for the Province of Quebec could not necessarily lead to co-operation in an economic sense within the framework of a new Canada that Quebec is looking for. I was wondering if the First Minister could make comment upon that statement *vis-a-vis*

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. You are asking for an opinion. The question is out of order.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the question is in order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We will follow Beauchesne's Citation 171.

MR. LYON: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. LYON: The point of order is, Sir, that it is always in order to ask a First Minister or a Minister of the Crown the position of the government of Manitoba *vis-a-vis* a public statement made with respect, in this case, to national unity. Now I suggest, Sir, with the greatest of respect, that is clearly in order. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable First Minister.

HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER, Premier (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to answer because the question as put, as I understand it, is relevant in that it asks for the opinion of this government in relation to the matter of confederation, the attitude of other provinces relative to certain questions. In that context, Sir, I would say that I do not disagree with the main substance expressed as I heard it last evening by the Premier of Ontario, that the effects of political separation would be so unfortunate as to render difficult, if not impossible, any economic co-operation of the kind that seems to be bandied about and talked about by representatives of the current government of Quebec.

MR. LYON: A supplementary. Could the First Minister advise if he has had the opportunity of recent discussions with Ministers of the government of Quebec, such as the Honourable Mr. Morin who was here a week ago, to express that same opinion to them?

MR. SCHREYER: I have expressed that opinion, Mr. Speaker, to two Ministers of the government of the Province of Quebec, the Honourable Mr. Morin and the Honourable Mr. Giroux. In both cases I expressed the point much along the same lines, that the consequences of political separation would

be so unfortunate as to render secondary these other theories of economic co-operation and common market, etc., etc.

MR. LYON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the First Minister has had occasion, or the Minister of Finance, to produce — or will have before the House prorogues — to produce for the benefit of Manitobans a statement vis-a-vis our position in confederation in the dollars-and-cents category as is produced by the Provincial Treasurer of Ontario in his budget of last week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HONOURABLE SAUL A. MILLER (Seven Oaks): Well, no, Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to bring that today. Certainly such an exercise could be gone through. I am not sure what it would prove or not prove. Manitoba is part of Canada and I hope we remain part of Canada forever, irrespective of whether we are a few dollars up or down.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the Honourable Minister responsible for Renewable Resources, I direct my question to the First Minister. It results from a statement attributed to the Minister of Renewable Resources at the Inland Fishermen's Association meeting at the Viscount Court wherein he said that he would assist in leading the way out of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. I wonder if the First Minister could comment. Is it the government's position to endeavour to find some marketing vehicle for the fishermen outside of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would have to discuss that further with my colleague, the Minister for Renewable Resources. I might just say, Sir, that while there are reasons for having a sense of frustration with the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, that our memories are not that short as to forget that there was great misery indeed in the marketing mechanism that existed prior to the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the First Minister and it's further to the questions that have been asked with respect to the statements of Premier Davis. I wonder if the First Minister would consider the advisability of asking the Prairie Economic Council, the four Premiers, to meet and to issue a statement of support for Premier Davis in connection with the possibilities of economic association, so that those in Quebec will know the feeling of the rest of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: That matter happens to be on the agenda of the Western Premiers' Conference already, so it will be dealt with. In the meantime I don't think that the Western Premiers need take the position in support of or in opposition to anything that is said by some other Premier in Canada. There is a certain amount of emotionalism that I sense already coming, and we don't intend to play on that basis.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOBBANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would direct my question to the Minister of Tourism and would ask him if his department is studying any ways and means of getting the MS Lord Selkirk out of its present situation in the Selkirk area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Tourism and Recreation.

HONOURABLE BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): I can't see from here, Mr. Speaker . . . — (Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. HANUSCHAK: . . . but I'm told that it's still raining, so that situation's being attended to.

MR. BANMAN: With all due respect to the Minister, I think his jurisdiction in that particular area is limited.

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. BANMAN: I would ask the Minister if the bookings as far as the MS Lord Selkirk are concerned are tied in with the Gull Harbour Lodge at Hecla Island at all.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we do sell a package deal for tourists, which provides transportation on the MS Lord Selkirk, coupled with accommodation at the Gull Harbour Lodge.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if he can indicate whether the government has been able to persuade the Federal Government to allow the sale of caesium by Tantalum Mine outside of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Mines.

HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, we've never tried to persuade the Federal Government to allow the sale of caesium to any other country. What we have indicated to the Federal Government is if they, in their wisdom, feel that caesium should not be sold to another country, that they should stockpile caesium in a similar way to stockpiling uranium, when they prevented the sale of uranium. We have not questioned the judgment of the Federal Government with regard to the

export sale of caesium. I'm not saying that it's correct or incorrect. We have indicated that if they do so that they should stockpile caesium.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister is in a position to indicate whether the government knows who are the people in control of the partners in Tantalum with the government.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Tantalum Mine shares are owned essentially by four parties, Chemalloy, Kawecki Berylco and the Manitoba Development Corporation.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister is in a position to indicate whether the government knows who controls Chemalloy.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Government of Manitoba is in partnership with Chemalloy and Kawecki Berylco. We have not tried to examine the shareholding list of Kawecki Berylco or Chemalloy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights, final question.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister is in a position to indicate whether the government has attempted to try and gain audited statements of Chemalloy to determine its financial position and to determine its shareholding.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, despite any feelings by my honourable friend, I can tell the honourable member that the shareholders of Chemalloy have nothing to do with the operation of Tantalum Mine. Tantalum Mine is now operated by a board of directors which, with the Chemalloy shares, are represented by a receiver who is responsible to a court.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I have a two-part question to the Minister of Education. Firstly, can he confirm that in 1974 during the federal election, at the Kelvin School, the Conservative candidate in — I guess it's Winnipeg South, named Lyon showed a film at the school regarding the Conservative Party and Bob Stanfield. If that is the case, can he inform the House as to whether there has been any damage to the school system and to the system of education.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Education.

HONOURABLE IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, as a direct result of the Leader of the Opposition's questions in the House about the use of political material in schools, there have been a number of calls made to the Department of Education. As a result of those calls, I can confirm that the Leader of the Opposition, present in Kelvin School in 1974, during the federal election, did show a political Tory propaganda film to the students in that school. I can only say, Sir, that I hope that the students there were mature enough to absorb that kind of material without harm to them. I think that the school system has not suffered as result of it, and indeed, I would not question the use of such material. But given the false indignation that the Leader of the Opposition showed in this House the other day, I can only conclude that his remarks show how two-faced a Tory can be.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Education. In the course of his . . . — (Interjections) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. LYON: In the course of his thorough investigations did he discover that the Conservative candidate in Winnipeg South at that time was a paid Executive Assistant of one of the Ministers of this government or of any other government? — (Interjections) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, I indicated in answering the question of the Member for St. Johns that I have not conducted an inquiry. Indeed, unlike the Leader of the Opposition, I do not believe in witch-hunts, but I did receive a number of calls and, as a result of those calls, I was able to confirm that he did show a film in a school.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. (PETE) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to you, Sir. I would ask you if there is a rule on the use of sarcasm in this House, which is so often used by the Conservative Leader.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Radisson. — (Interjections) — Order please.

A MEMBER: The worms are squirming! — (Interjections) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: A question to the First Minister. Can the Minister explain to the House how the Leader of the Official Opposition came to the conclusion that Manitoba Hydro wasted some \$605 million of the taxpayers' money.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. ORDER PLEASE. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that question has been asked a number of times and I believe that the answer to that question is to be found in the close and detailed reading of all of the transcript of proceedings of the Committee on Public Utilities. Just so there is no misunderstanding, I will say

quite bluntly that whether the figure is \$600 million or \$232 million and 50 cents, that both premises are equally idiotic, and had been directly repudiated by Mr. Bateman, the chief engineer of Manitoba Hydro.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Just a question to the First Minister. Can the Minister indicate whether he has received an apology from the Leader of the Official Opposition in this regard?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister. The Honourable Member for Morris state the point of order.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Obviously, Sir, when you read the list of questions that are not permissible in this House, you stopped short of the one that is continuously being infringed upon by the Member for Radisson. There is a rule that suggests that a question cannot be asked that multiplies with slight variation to a similar question asked in the same point, or repeat in substance a question already answered to which an answer has been refused. When you rose when the honourable memr posed his question, you sai2 "O der." I want to know, Sir, if you meant that the question was out of order, in which case, if the question was out of order, it should not have been responded to. Surely, Sir, that if you are going to apply the rules relating to the question period, that they must apply on both sides of the House, not just on this side.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not going to debate my ruling, but I am going to suggest . . . — (Interjection) — Order please. I am going to suggest that the ruling in respect to repetitiveness is in one day. It does not apply on a daily basis where you are going to have another question on another day. Otherwise, I would have to rule out many questions on either side of the House which are asking for information which has been asked once before in this House.

And the other problem in respect to that is, that a chairperson would have to have monumental memory to know which questions were asked from the beginning of the session to the end, in order to make the decisions in respect to repetitiveness.

In respect to when I asked the honourable member to come to order, it is because he was starting to extend the question and I wanted it to be kept brief and direct. Now, I haven't had the cooperation even this morning from the members in respect to questions, or in respect to answers. And so, therefore, I think the honourable members will just have to have a little bit of confidence in the Chair and to see that fair play and impartiality prevails on both sides. Once a question has been floored, even though it may be out of order, in order to be fair to this Assembly, a partial reply also has to be given on occasion, or vice versa. Sometimes a question has to be heard before one can rule that it is out of order as well. We shall proceed. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I just wish you to clarify, for my benefit, whether it is not a fact in the rule of this House that when members get up to speak and make statements, they have to be responsible for those statements, and that they must be truthful statements.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a question for the First Minister. Having heard from the monkey, we'll now ask the question of an organ grinder.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I believe the honourable gentleman is versed well enough in parliament procedures . . . ORDER PLEASE, that you should not make inferences or imputations on members of this Assembly. I would ask him to reconsider what he just said and whether he really wants it on the record or not.

MR. LYON: I have always been of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, if the cap fits you should wear.

A MEMBER: That's right!

MR. LYON: The statement made by the First Minister that the statements vis-a-vis Hydro were idiotic. Would the First Minister apply that description to the statements that have been made over the years by the Honourable Douglas Campbell, by Mr. Kris Kristjanson, and by Mr. Spafford? Are all of those statements idiotic?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware that Mr. Campbell ever contended that it was \$600 million or \$232 million or whatever. But what is idiotic in this context, Mr. Speaker, is that it has been contended by my honourable friend that the precise engineering sequence of development of the Nelson River was imposed as a solution on the Manitoba Hydro and Mr. Bateman has indicated on more than one occasion now that that is precisely what was not the case. As he pointed out and put on the record several times, the sequence of development is according to the engineering Task Force Analysis as economic an alternative as any for the development of the Nelson.

That, Sir, followed by the point that the Leader of the Opposition has said he is not questioning the competence of the engineering of Manitoba Hydro, he has now then got the answer from the senior engineers of Manitoba Hydro, that there has been no imposition of a political solution on an engineering problem. Now, he can't have it both ways.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Having heard the First Minister's non-answer, Mr. Speaker, could the Minister answer this question? Is the First Minister prepared to hear Mr. Campbell, Mr. Kristjanson and Mr. Spafford

in the Public Utilities Committee on the very point about which he seems to be so tender?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it is not as though I haven't heard them. I have heard them many times. I had meetings and conversations with them years ago and in the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, it would have been a case of whether one takes the advice of a consensus of opinion, of the professional engineering opinion, or whether one takes the advice of one or two. Now, I don't know on what basis my honourable friend operates but when a consensus of professional opinion recommends and suggests this manner of action, if five members of a Board of Directors of six recommend this course of action and one recommends this, I would be foolhardy indeed to say: five say yea; one say nay — the nays have it. And that's what my honourable friend is suggesting.

MR. LYON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If my honourable friend, the First Minister, is so prepared to disregard the advice of Mr. Campbell, why was Mr. Campbell his first appointment to that Board?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister. Order please. Order please.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that question has never been asked before. It indeed is one of the more memorable events of decisions I have taken since I have been in politics. In a way, Sir, nothing has been more traumatic to me than to have an appointment — which I admit I recommended and which I was very happy about — turn out in the way in which it did. But, in the final analysis, whatever my feelings of goodwill and sentiment and nostalgia, I would have been a fool, Sir, to ignore the advice and recommendations which came in a preponderance in one way because one person said that he saw it somewhat different. In that list, Sir, I have to include such people as the late Bill Parker, such as the Head of the Faculty of Engineering at the University of Manitoba, Dean Hoogstraten, such as Tom Storey, the career engineer with Winnipeg Hydro and in later years with Manitoba Hydro and vice-chairman of Manitoba Hydro — (Interjection) — oh yes he was, at that time he was.

Mr. Speaker, the Board of Directors did place a message indicating the reasons why they sought to recommend proceeding with the sequence as developed. But what I consider to be equally important, perhaps more, at least equally important, is not only the message that was placed as public notice by the Board of Directors of Manitoba Hydro back in late 1970 or early 1971, but also the paper that was delivered to the Canadian Institute of Professional Engineers as recorded in the Canadian Engineering Journal by Mr. Bateman to the effect that the sequence of development upon analysis by consulting engineers and upon re-analysis by the Task Force, as he reported to the Institute of Engineers was as economic an alternative a course of development as any other for the development of the Nelson River. On that basis, I accept the confidence, I certainly have no reason, Sir, to say that because one other person saw it a different way, that therefore we should have just changed everything.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Minnedosa, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Let me suggest to the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, since there is no motion on the floor, I don't know what he's talking about. Order please. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask you again, what is the rule of the use of being sarcastic in this House as we have witnessed here this morning and on many other occasions.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the First Minister. I would just like to ask him whether he has had any indication from Buckingham Palace overnight, whether the remarks that the Honourable Member for Radisson during debate on the Resolution of congratulations to Her Majesty yesterday have rocked the very foundations of the Commonwealth.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, constitutional Monarchy in the United Kingdom and the Dominions has endured for several centuries; I think it can endure even that.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, in view of the ruling that questions cannot be repetitive within a day but can be from day to day, and in view of the fact that the Member for Roblin has not kept his promise to file with the House his Hydro bills which he alleged grew from 10 to \$50, my question is to the First Minister who reports for Hydro to ascertain whether Hydro can produce those bills to satisfy the promise of the Member for Roblin which has been unkept?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the question was intended seriously, Sir, but the fact of the matter remains that Manitoba Hydro's policy — which I believe is correct — is that they will release no such information without the concurrence of the householder or the individual firm, as the case may be.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

Friday, April 22, 1977

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to proceed with the Adjourned Debates on second reading in the order on which they appear on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Proposed Bill No. 5, second reading. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Stand, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 14. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 39. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 56. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Stand, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 57. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair for Continuing Education and the Honourable Member for St. Vital in the Chair for Industry and Commerce.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY
ESTIMATES - INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. D. James Walding (St. Vital): We have a quorum, gentlemen, the Committee will come to order. I would refer the attention of honourable members to Page 40 in their Estimates Book, the Department of Industry and Commerce, Resolution 77 the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, last night we were just concluding some comments on the question of the land banking and land assembly programs and during that period the Minister indicated that he was changing his priorities somewhat and was now going to be concentrating on the acquisition of land in the inner city and had described it, as I've checked in Hansard, an outline of what he intends. I'd like to know more precisely what in fact the Minister actually has in mind. Can he give us some indication of what his real targets are? Can he tell us about the number of units or the kind of acreage that he is proposing to undertake, the extent to which he has a specific target in mind in terms of the number of units that may be built or produced under this new acquisition program, and particularly the locations and places where this might occur?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HONOURABLE LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East): Well last year, I understand, we put in place approximately 900 units in the inner city and I would like to think that that's a minimum target but, as the honourable member knows, a lot of that accommodation was put in place by means of the proposal call hoping that we will be able to eventually obtain enough land that we need not necessarily use this method, or if we use this method it may be a modified method using our own land. Therefore this is one of the reasons we are stepping up our acquisition of what may be referred to as quick-start land in the inner city.

MR. AXWORTHY: I didn't hear, what kind of land?

MR. EVANS: Quick-start land. Not quicksand but quick-start land in the inner city. At the moment we're attempting to obtain as much land as we possibly can. It's not as though the supply out there is great and vast, from what I understand, although there looks to be a lot around and everybody says there's a lot around, a lot of good land or dilapidated buildings that should be raised and replaced with other housing, the fact is that it is not that easy to acquire and our own acquisition staff have had difficulties, even with lists submitted by the City of Winnipeg' and others, where they have been reviewed and found that not all of this land would be suitable for social housing or indeed any kind of housing. And therefore our target, in a sense, is almost infinity in the sense that we're trying to obtain any land that we can that is suitable and that, of course, we don't pay an arm and a leg for, so I can't quantify what our objective is and what we can obtain. At the moment, at least, it is wide apart.

We would like to put more units than we have in the past in the inner city, and it was 900 units last year. We'd like to put more than that in the inner city. I can't quantify and say that we want X acres of land in the inner city, or we want Y lots of such and such a size, I simply say we're out trying to get as much as we possibly can. And not necessarily for development all in one year but we're trying to get as much as we possibly can and for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I indicated that we've advertised twice, or will be advertising twice, for land. In effect, we're advertising for land offers, land proposal call if you wish, and therefore we're going all out to obtain as much as we possibly can. And we haven't put a limit on that because we're nowhere near meeting what I think is our need.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well' Mr. Chairman, that's a little bit of an answer. I'd like to see if the Minister could break it down into some finer detail. To begin with I believe that the 900 units he is talking about' the largest percentage of those are senior citizens or elderly persons housing, and that there is generally very few units built for families, or single people, or accommodation that would be replacements for people now in rooming houses, and so forth. And I would like to know, again, if the Minister and his staff have some indication of what the total demand for that type of housing is in the inner city, particularly in comparison to the number of units that are being demolished at the present time.

MR. EVANS: Well, we know the demand is great, you know, and the staff have come up with estimates of general demand for the province and for the City of Winnipeg based on various statistics available to us, on the condition of the housing stock in the province and in the city, also based on data on net family formation and so on, and the estimates of senior citizens population, and so on.

But, frankly, we believe that there is such a large demand, such a great need — I'm sure we can dig in the files and get some figures somewhere — but our policy is to go out and put every dollar we possibly can get our hands on in the investment of social housing with primary concentration on the inner city of Winnipeg. That is, if we're talking about the City of Winnipeg the Number One target area for family housing, and to a lesser extent for senior citizens housing, is the inner city of Winnipeg. I can assure the honourable member of that. That is a priority area. I can tell him how much money

we've got. I can tell him what our intentions are in general terms. But our problem is' as I indicated a few days ago, we haven't got sufficient land sites in the inner city to do all that building on our own land. Therefore, we may likely go, again, for a proposal call system. And, again, we will tell the proponents our emphasis is on the inner city, but I cannot say that this is what is exactly going to take place. But I just want to assure the member that this is our priority and we are proceeding forthwith. I can advise that of the 694 units of family or social housing built last year in the City of Winnipeg, 396 were located in the inner city of Winnipeg, so well over half were constructed in the inner city. I would like to see all of it, if possible, that's my personal preference; every last unit in the City of Winnipeg, inner city of Winnipeg, if it were possible. That would be my personal preference and, I think, we would like to see more than has occurred. Knowing those priorities, this is the way we are going but, again, it's a matter of land sites.

I invite the honourable member to give us any sites that he thinks that we can get ahold of; we'd be pleased to learn of this. We also put the question to the Honourable Member from Assiniboia, of any information of land available . . .

MR. AXWORTHY: And you got some answers from him too.

MR. EVANS: I beg your pardon.

MR. AXWORTHY: And you got some answers from him, too.

MR. EVANS: No, we didn't get any answers; not on the lists . . . Well, he was complaining about past events, but I'm talking about, you know, right now; where can be purchase some land that is suitable for social housing and where we can buy it, you know, within reason of course.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, one of the concerns that I would have about the Minister's statement he just issued is that it seems to indicate kind of a singularly minded objective about simply increasing the numbers of social housing units in this city and doesn't seem to take into account some of the accompanying qualities it should attach to that housing, in particular the retention and respect in part for the kind of communities in which they are going to be placed. There has been far too many housing Ministers in this province, and in other provinces, who frankly have become so mesmerized by the almost demonic need to create numbers that they begin to forget that they are also building houses in communities, and that oftentimes their acts are just as destructive as they are constructive. And that, as a result, the ambition simply to achieve a certain target or scheduling of numbers of units oftentimes results in far more serious consequences than the original problem. And I think, in particular, where a Public Housing Corporation finds itself in the business of tearing down older buildings which already provide perfectly good accommodations, simply for the sake of increasing density, but doing so at a much higher cost per unit, oftentimes at a disruption of the residents in the area and certainly to the detriment of the general ambiance or environment of that community that provides a certain degree of variety or distinctiveness to it. I would like to know from the Minister that, as he begins this search for properties, and particularly when he suggests that it is going to come in the proposal call, that is in part where the real danger lies, that by accepting proposal calls which are geared solely to the economics or engineering criteria, and had nothing to do or say about the question of neighborhood quality or in other kinds of social concerns that, in many cases, the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation will continue to repeat, in many cases, the same destructive tendencies that many private developers have of simply destroying neighborhoods as opposed to helping create them. Therefore, I would like to know what kind of guidelines the Minister is setting down in terms of instructing the way in which this new housing program that may take place in the City will be handled.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can advise the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge that our research staff does assess the communities, we do have various information on the nature of the various community sections within the City and we have certain standards, we have site planners, we have people who are indeed concerned about the way in which a particular structure may fit into, or blend into, a particular existing community environment. So it is not as though we go about blindly seeing these structures go up; we do pick and choose.

As a matter of fact, of the proposal calls, we only went for 27 out of 85 proposal calls. In other words, we don't accept every proposal call and one reason we don't accept — I mean, apart from cost or price — is because of the location and so we are cognizant. As a matter of fact, I was indicating earlier, even with our own tendering system and our own direct construction, there are a lot of sites that have been proposed to us that we have rejected because it is not suitable for social housing, for whatever reason — there are many, many reasons why — and some of it has to do with how it affects the balance within the existing environmental arrangement in that community segment of the City. So, I would not wish the member to think that we are blindly going ahead, just slapping up buildings wherever we can get a piece of land.

I know the member is concerned about certain demolitions of existing stock that take place but, you know, one has to make a judgment on these matters and, in some cases, certain existing older buildings have to go away, three or four units of a combination have to make way, in some cases

they're making way, however, Mr. Chairman, for 75 or 100 units so we are indeed increasing the housing stock in this way, where some have to go in order to make way for more. You might say, well, all we're concerned with is numbers and quantity. The member just finishing telling us or indicating not too long before, that there was a great need and, you know, what are our objectives and so forth and so on. So we were faced with certain trade-offs and I would hope that, you know, we are proceeding — I believe we are proceeding — using good judgment and locating these units where they suit the environment and where minimum of demolition of existing stock might take place. I think in the past, the site at Sargent and Edmonton, I believe the honourable member may have referred to that in the past, I don't mean in these debates but publicly, wherein that particular site, for instance, we have had to replace two houses, two dwelling units they were rooming houses. At any rate, there were two houses, I don't know how many dwelling units were contained within those houses, but we're building a large structure which we hope will fit the area which will include a mixture of families and elderly people and the numbers, what . . . about 140 suites, 140 units. So, you know, that's quite an improvement in the housing stock supply.

But I want to again assure the member that we have rejected many a site in the City of Winnipeg, or we have rejected putting up a large building because by putting up a large building on a particular site we would have created too high a density and we're cognizant of that as a problem and we do not wish to have excessive densities of family accommodation, in particular. We have tried to stay away from that, we have stayed away from the so-called Lord Selkirk Park approach, you know, the older urban redevelopment method where you bulldoze down X number of blocks and you put up a massive housing complex. We have taken great pains to avoid that.

But, you see, the member therefore brings up another constraint that we have and that is the constraint of blending into the community environment, and that's one of the many, many constraints that we have. So we are told on the one hand to get on with the job of putting up more social housing in the Inner City and, at the same time, I tell you that there are a lot of great obstacles in our course.

I want to take this opportunity, too, to say that there seems to be some impression about that I believe that it is all the City of Winnipeg's fault. By no means, I am not saying that — in fact I think in the last couple of years there has been a lot of co-operation between the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba, the staff and the councillors, well particularly the councillors who are on the Environment Committee and on the Housing Sub-committee — they are very supportive of what we are trying to do. I think we are getting good co-operation. We see eye-to-eye generally speaking and there is no problem in that area. There is still some problem in getting certain projects through community committees but that's not necessarily a problem that we have with the council, it's quite often the problem that exists in the community itself, the residents who live in that area who may be opposed to social housing.

At any rate, I want to do on record, Mr. Chairman, as indicating right now that we are quite satisfied that the Councillors in the City of Winnipeg, and particularly those on the Environment Committee and on the Housing sub-committee as well as staff of the City of Winnipeg, are most supportive of the objectives and aims of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is providing some assurances. I must confess that based upon past record I treat them with a degree of skepticism because I don't think that the kind of site planning or examination of community requirements, and certainly consultation within the community itself, has gone on and, that as a result, the Corporation has been as guilty as many private companies are of simply securing their own objectives and not making much effort to blend those objectives with those of the people in whose community they are going to locate. In fact, I would suggest that there is almost virtually no community work done and that there is very little attempt ever to try to inform and instruct and bring along a community to accept certain objectives for social housing, and I have had enough experience to know that the efforts made in those regards are minimal at best, either from the point of view of working in the community or, certainly coming back to the questions we were discussing last night, of ensuring that by adding substantial numbers of people to the population which will again put increasing pressures upon already limited recreation areas, schools and other forms of facilities which often is the cause and source of much of the reaction that you simply can't come in and say we're going to lay 300 new people on you which is simply going to lay over you know, sort of cram up your one remaining park.

That is why people begin to react against projects and there is, again, very little effort done in this area to try to blend the introduction of social housing projects in with the introduction of certain kinds of amenities. I would say, Mr. Chairman, it does go back to the point that I was trying to raise with the Minister again, it is unfortunately, I think that the housing program so far has been seen, by and large as a production of units, and has not been seen in a somewhat wider dimension of ensuring that when you build housing there are a number of things that go along with making housing important and I have used the character and quality of the services in that particular community.

Sociologists, in most studies, they find out that most people choose their housing not by the nature of the unit itself but by the neighbourhood in which it's placed and if, in fact, the building or construction of just numbers of units in a place does nothing to alleviate the pressures that new people will provide then you're first bound to get reaction, and secondly you're not doing anybody much good.

I would think that the bias certainly has been in the past, and I would hope that it would change, towards the idea of simply getting the numbers up and getting production targets made, which is always a problem as opposed balancing off the other requirements.

I also suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the problem comes down too that the technique that has been employed so far has been primarily one of simply assuming that the form of housing has got to be public housing or social housing built and constructed by the government as opposed to using other techniques, both for allowing the purchase of existing apartments and buildings by tenants either through forms of co-op or non-profit measures, and therefore being able to maintain those housing units in the area. Because I think as a number of studies have shown, both your own and those done by others, that demolition is not simply a matter of buildings being torn down that no longer have a use. Unfortunately what is beginning to take place in Winnipeg is that demolition or abandonment is taking place with buildings that have many years of use left in them simply because it is impossible for the private owners to maintain the capital costs required, for reasons of taxation, rent control, and other forms of pressures put on them.

Another concern I have which I don't think the province has answered in any way, shape or form — it hasn't begun to provide an answer, in fact seems to ignore the problem — is the question of replacement housing for those who are forced out of their existing accommodation for reasons of the fire by-law, or other orders given by the City. At the present time there is simply no assistance given by any level of government other than some federal assistance through RAPP funds, if you happen to be a non-profit corporation, to help refurbish and upgrade older buildings, particularly multiple-dwelling buildings, to ensure that they will be able to be maintained in the housing market. And as I've said in the House before, the Estimates are that in any one year 800 to 1,200 units of perfectly good housing are being taken out of the housing market simply for the lack of that kind of assistance. I would simply like to know at this stage what the province is prepared to do to answer a problem. You see it in the newspapers every day where tenants are being forced to leave reasonably good accommodation simply for lack of an owner being able to generate \$10,000 capital to upgrade them to fit the City fire by-laws or the building code by-laws. That is, frankly Mr. Chairman, a stupid situation that we're in; absolutely — to use the Premier's phrase of this morning — idiotic, that you're forcing people out of housing that, with a minimal amount of investment could be brought up to reasonably good standard. I would really like to know what position the province intends to take on this matter.

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, first of all, to talk for a moment in response to the concern about consultation with the community; consultation with the people. Perhaps we could do more consultation but I don't think the member could object to the extent to which consultation does take place in the Neighbourhood Improvement Program areas. You cannot write those off very quickly and say, "Well, there's just a few areas." There are at least four major areas that have been approved. The Centennial Area; North Point Douglas; North St. Boniface; and the Brooklands Area. And there are a couple of others, I believe, under consideration. And in that process, as the member may realize, a community co-ordinator is employed and one of his jobs is to, if you like, organize or animate the people in that area and to conduct meetings, and so on, in order to discuss how the community what should be refurbished, how the community should develop' type of infrastructure may be needed, what type of housing would be acceptable, and so on.

I know in the north end of Brandon there is another area as well and as we indicated, we're on the verge of concluding agreement with the City of Portage la Prairie and we hope also in another couple of communities in Manitoba, at least. But I know, perhaps at firsthand' that there is extensive consultation that goes on with the community in the north end of Brandon. And the co-ordinator in that area has various subcommittees, etc., and they are forever conducting meetings and discussing what should take priority, and so on.

So I think that there's a rather optimum amount of consultation taking place in the neighbourhood improvement areas and they cannot be thought of as very small ventures. These are multi-million dollar activities and they are going to involve hundreds upon hundreds of housing units in the next few years, you know, so this is a massive, a massive program of rehabilitation in this city.

MR. AXWORTHY: Not so massive.

MR. EVANS: I beg your pardon.

MR. AXWORTHY: It's not so massive.

MR. EVANS: Not so massive; well how many units are we talking about? Okay ' it's extensive, if you don't want to use the word "massive." It's not small and it is going to take millions of dollars.

I'll tell you this: that the total project budget just for the City is \$16.3 million. That's the total budget to be shared by the three levels of government but that doesn't include the housing that is to be put in place. That's just the infrastructure portion. But, at any rate, it's fine to consult with the communities but, consult as you may, in some instances you'll never build one unit if you listen to everybody. And while it sounds very admirable to say, "Well, we're going to consult with everybody in that particular district of the City, before we put up anything whether it be a duplex or a highrise," very often you're going to get objections that may be founded or they may be based on some very vested interests that those people have. If you're overly responsive — I'm not saying you should ignore concerns and I like to think we don't ignore any serious concerns that may exist in a particular area and, as I indicated earlier, we do have a research staff, we do look at the sites and we are concerned with densities, etc. But if you listened to everybody, you wouldn't build anything. You know, you'd end up building very little. We'd end up building a lot less than I submit we're building now.

And, again, the member is talking about a constraint. I would say again that we are not happy with the rate of depopulation that is occurring in the inner city of Winnipeg. At the present time, and the honourable member should know this, the rate of depopulation in the City of Winnipeg is equivalent to twice the number of units that can house people, twice the number of new units going in and so this is a very serious problem. In other words there is a greater disappearance taking place than there is a creation of new housing.

MR. AXWORTHY: That is what I said.

MR. EVANS: Okay. And so we are trying to reverse that trend. But at the same time the honourable member is saying we should be more consultative with the communities than we are etc., and I just say if we spend more time in consultation — and you know I am not knocking it — and if we spend more time looking at lovely old houses that you think should stay, what we are doing is not being able to meet the objective of trying to reverse this rate of depopulation that is occurring in the City of Winnipeg. You know you can't have it both ways but I am hoping, I believe we are using our best judgment in all of these instances. We are not perfect; we don't always make the absolute optimum decision, I suppose. But in some people's opinions, at least, and I submit that a lot of this is a matter of judgment and many of these decisions may be very, very subjective and there is no absolute right answer as to where you should locate a particular set of buildings or a highrise, there is no absolute answer as to whether or not a particular older home should be demolished and a highrise, for instance, take its place. It is not black and white and it is not a simplistic type of decision that has to be made so we are exercising, I would submit, our best judgment in all of this.

On the matter of what about the existing buildings that there is so much concern about at the present time, and indeed I think there is something of a housing crisis with regard to particularly these existing smaller walk-up type apartment buildings, some of which are rather old. I would submit to you that not all of them are easily repairable, not all of them. I think you can go to CMHC and get an opinion if you wish and in some of them you wouldn't put a nickel in them because they are over the hill. Some of them are over the hill and it would be foolish to attempt to repair them. On the other hand if these buildings are not over the hill, if they are buildings that are at all salvagable, at all looking as though they had some potential for rehabilitation and repair, then I would submit that there is some merit since the City of Winnipeg does not seem to wish to proceed in this area and since the private sector is not responding for whatever reason, that there is some merit for the Provincial Government through MHRC to look at acquiring existing buildings and repair them, renovate them, upgrade them, and in effect salvage existing stock and perhaps overcome something of a housing crisis that has been described by some people.

I might add that the City of Toronto is very active in this area. The Toronto Housing Authority, I understand, is very active in buying older buildings and renovating them, rehabilitating them with the existing tenants remaining. I think they do it under Section 15 of the NHA. I think there is a lot of merit in pursuing this course here. Therefore I can advise the honourable member that we are looking at the questions of acquiring existing properties through a non-profit housing corporation approach to deal with this housing crisis. I would say that we are actively looking at this as a new thrust by the corporation because thus far we haven't really been in the business of acquiring existing buildings, renovating them and then putting them back on the market.

We have been essentially involved in social housing which means that we are dealing with the very lowest income groups. Many of the people who live in these existing buildings don't qualify under NHA for the public housing or the social housing, but through the non-profit corporation approach we can have a mix and this is fine. I can assure the member that we will be looking at this and I am hoping that in a couple of weeks' time we will be able to give you a definitive answer, in two or three weeks' time give you a definitive answer as to how we may be proceeding. I can't tell you at the present time. I can just tell you we are most actively looking at the matter and in fact a meeting was held this morning with CMHC on the matter. There is some reluctance, I believe, on the part of the federal corporation to finance acquisition of buildings because of the nature of the exercise. The other thing, of course, the old argument is "Well, you are not adding to the stock so let's put our

money to a net addition of housing supply. Let's not waste our money on just doing something that you would have thought the private market or the private sector would look after."

Just by way of example of a bit of a dilemma, you are looking at this Mansfield Court, as it is referred to, at 626 Ellice. There are 29 units there and, as you know, the City Health Department has been involved and it is condemned and so on. And CMHC, I understand, has advised us that in their opinion it would require a quarter of a million dollars to bring that building up to standard and that is an awful lot of money. And one asks then, "Is that a sound investment, or in that case is it better that ultimately that building is demolished and a new one appear in its place? Something that is brand new, that is sound, that meets all the safety, health, fire requirements."

I suppose in acquisition of these buildings' too, there is this danger that the Federal Government, and I guess ourselves as a Provincial Government, through MHRC are putting ourselves in the position of becoming something of slum landlords in buying all these buildings because you know renovation does take time and it may take many months in some cases. And whether you can undertake certain renovations that are required with the people in them at the same time also remains to be seen. It is not simple. And then when you ask the people to leave in order to renovate, even though they may come back, you know you are causing dislocation, disruption, and all the consternation that might come. It is not a simple matter and I would shudder to think if an apartment burned to the ground after we as a corporation, having just acquired it, and for some reason it burned and then immediately we are the bad guys even though we just acquired it. It's our property; you know, why don't you do something about it? Even though we are working on it' I can just see the headlines in the papers now. So there is an understandable reluctance by CMHC to finance us into the acquisition of these types of buildings, the placarded buildings.

Having said that, I think in principle there is something to be said for acquiring existing structures and renovating them and making them more livable so that they aren't placarded in the future. Maybe some of them are not over the hill as I said and can be therefore brought up to standard and suitable.

On the other matter of emergency housing, I think the member also raised the question of emergency housing for people who are burned out in a fire and have no place to go and so on. We are again actually looking at this matter and I am hoping within ten days, two weeks, to be able to announce a program whereby we may be able to offer some accommodation for people in this category. But our supply is limited and I don't know whether all of a sudden we can become the social welfare agency for the City of Winnipeg in this respect. But we are looking at the question of supplying emergency-type housing that would be available for families, who, for whatever reason, are forced out of their existing premises and this would be for a short-term type of occupancy. And again, hopefully, we will be able to help some people in this respect. —(Interjection)— Okay. That's right. Mr. Chairman, the other problem, of course, is while we are building large amounts of social housing we still have at the present time 1,500 families who are patiently and maybe impatiently waiting on the list to go into a house or a duplex or an apartment suite, so while it may be that certain persons are unfortunately burned out or caused to be removed from their apartments or houses because of health problems or any other problem, as envisaged by the officials, at the same time these people also feel they have demands on the corporation because they expect to be housed in social accommodation. Most of them have been waiting a year. Some of them have been waiting over a year. Some have been waiting two years or more, so that is a problem. But, at any rate, we are looking at a program whereby we may be able to supply some emergency housing, and hopefully we can resolve this in the near future.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to hear that the Minister is going to do something about emergency housing needs. Our group have been asking for it for the last four years and it's nice to see that eventually some things happen to respond to those kinds of importunings' not just from ourselves, but from others. But, I think that again, it still raises some questions about the kind of program that is being introduced into the Inner City, it still strikes me that it has a fair degree of a ramshackle approach to it. There are bits and pieces that the Minister keeps mentioning that are being contemplated or that will be announced. It doesn't seem to be hanging together as any kind of cohesive strategy both in identifying housing needs and identifying the best means of solving them. I must confess to having a certain amount of reaction to some of the comments made by the Minister, because that demonstrates to me a certain, what I would suggest is a lack of appreciation of some of the conditions in portions of the Inner City. When he talked about the problem in the area being one of depopulation, I don't if anyone is too worried about the depopulation. What they're much more concerned about is the destruction of the physical environment in large part, and that's different from depopulation.

One of the reasons why you're getting depopulation, is because what's taking place in this city is not just the deterioration of housing, it's also the — I guess the proper word is the "dissaration," or the tearing out its schools and its churches and its community facilities; and that the most dominant condition of the Inner City is that compared to other parts of Greater Winnipeg is the large disparity between the access to different kinds of community services, schools and churches and recreation

Friday, April 22, 1977

areas, that the proportion of land available for recreation is about five to one between say, suburban areas and the Inner City of Winnipeg. The schools themselves are in serious condition and there is not anything, as we discussed last night, being planned to cope with that situation. So, in large part, what the Minister is talking about may be building a large number of housing units and putting people in them, but having no opportunity for those people to enjoy the kind of amenities that everyone else does, and therefore certainly would become very negative and very unhappy and dissatisfied with that immediately, because they wouldn't have that enjoyment. The fact that a number of kids have to be bussed around to Inner City schools right now is a very clear indication of the problems that are existing in that area; that you can't build housing without worrying about what kind of social, recreational, educational services and commercial services surrounding it; access to a grocery store and a dry cleaning shop, places like that. Yet the downtown Inner City area is being taken over by large office buildings, commercial structures and highrise apartments, with the elimination of those kinds of smaller scale service establishments, and as a result it ceases to become a community that is an attractive place to live in.

So I'd say that is part and parcel of the problem, and I haven't yet heard of any way of dealing with it. The neighbourhood improvement projects, I'd inform the Minister, are a very small part of the answer to it, because he may be talking about four projects, but if you take in the actual geographical area they cover, they cover a very small proportion of the Inner City. And I would suggest to him that the latest figures by the City of Winnipeg demonstrate that close to 20,000 housing units are now over 60 or 70 years old in the City of Winnipeg, and that the number of units that are being repaired or replaced through the Neighbourhood Improvement Projects may amount to three or four hundred. At the same time those other 20,000 are reaching a threshold of age and deterioration where something very serious has to be done.

Now, coming to the solution of the non-profit housing corporation, which is something I guess I've bleated about for more years than I'd care to remember at the present stage, my concern would be, whose non-profit is it? Is it going to be a Provincial Government non-profit corporation, an adjunct to MHRC? Would it be a city model, as took place in the City of Toronto, or Edmonton or Ottawa or Vancouver, where they had city sponsored non-profit housing corporations? Or will it be a community-type non-profit corporation where there'd be a joint enterprise between them, where the corporation would really be operated by a selection of people in the Inner City itself, so they will have their own nonprofit housing corporation to help solve their own housing problems?

In other words, Mr. Chairman, there are several models that they take, and I would suggest that depending upon the kind of corporation that may be set up will have an awful lot to do with the degree to which it is successful in arresting decline. I would suggest the least successful of those would be one which would be a Provincial Government non-profit housing corporation. Certainly my choice would be one in which the province would have a role, but it would be very much sponsored and to a degree managed by those who in fact reside in the Inner City and therefore feel that they have some control over what's taking place in the area, rather than simply having another corporation set up by people who they see as outsiders coming in to do it for them. So before the Minister makes up his mind finally on this new corporation, this new housing agency, I think some serious thought has to go into it, as to the terms of reference that it works under and the kinds of methods that it will employ, and who, in fact the corporation will belong to. I think that there is a certain advantage to making it a community chosen corporation, as opposed to a totally government type corporation.

I would suggest though one step further, Mr. Chairman, and that is that even though the setting up of a new non-profit corporation will certainly be welcomed, it itself will not necessarily, be the total answer to the question. And the one issue that the Minister has not responded to is the degree to which there will be assistance for private owners of properties in the Inner City to retain and upgrade their own properties. The Minister said that he can tell me of buildings that would take a quarter of a million dollars to repair. Well, I could take the Minister, if he had five minutes, across the street, show him an apartment block that has 27 units in it. It is threatened to be closed down for lack of \$10,000 capital to bring it up to standards simply because the owner who lives in the building, takes a small income off it — after he got an order for upgrading under the fire by-laws, he went to the bank — private financial institutions do not lend in these areas — so simply for a matter of \$10,000 capital, which if you ration it out per unit, amounts to a very very small sum, you can maintain an apartment block for another 20 years' use. I would suggest that there is far more of that kind of situation than the one that you mentioned, and that would be wrong simply to assume that the only answer to the problem is to have a public ownership answer to it; that it is as much an answer to the problem to provide some assistance to those who presently own properties.

I would suggest that every single study that I have seen on Inner Cities in North America demonstrates that one of the primary ingredients for neighbourhood community stability and to offset deterioration is the transfer of ownership into private hands. I'm not saying that for ideological reasons. I'm simply saying that happens to be a fact, that you can trace the degree of decline

according to the degree to which there is absentee ownership, or institutional ownership. You can trace the upgrading of a neighborhood according to the degree to which there tends to be a greater concern by private ownership. I would want to suggest to the Minister that not only should we be talking about setting up a new housing company, but that perhaps one of the jobs of that housing company would be to work out means — and I would be glad to suggest several to the Minister — by which they would act as the vehicle or the medium for transferring ownership of housing in the Inner City to the residents of the Inner City, to take it out of absentee hands and transfer into the hands of those who actually own it; not having it government owned, but in fact be owned by the people who live in the area and therefore will take a certain stake and a certain commitment to that property. I would think that one of the major strategies that should be employed is the question of the transference of ownership from absentee hands into resident hands and not necessarily have it pass to another absentee owner which happens to be the government.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, on the matter of the loans or financing landlords of existing buildings — I think that was one of the items that the member raised — I don't know, I'm rather reluctant to lend money. In some cases these are slum landlords — and you say only 15 or 10 thousand is required. I would submit that for some of these buildings that we're looking at it requires an awful lot more money than that. What's happened to the private market? What's happened to the private enterprise? What's happened to the private sector? But the point is, Mr. Chairman, that we are traditionally not a banker. We are not a financier necessarily, at least not on a large scale. We have a rural mortgage lending program, but this is done jointly with the credit unions. We, as the honourable member knows full well, obtain the bulk of our funding from Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and I would trust that the honourable member is not suggesting that we try to replace CMHC and start lending money to landlords and small buildings because that is the panacea to upgrade and repair these older apartments that are privately owned. I don't think it is, because in lending money, we have to get a rate of return. We have to charge an interest rate, and even if it was a preferred interest rate, I submit that that isn't going to be the answer. It is far more complicated than that; I think it requires a lot of money. As I said, this Mansfield Court, it was estimated by CMHC that you need a quarter of a million dollars, not 20 or \$30,000 as some people are talking about, in order to bring it up to all the necessary standards. So, I would be very reluctant to get into that.

In the question of non-profit organizations, as the honourable member knows also, probably better than I, that what we're talking about is Section 15.1 of the National Housing Act, which exists, and there's nothing under God's sun and stars from preventing anybody right now, any community group, any group of individuals, any service club from going to CMHC and becoming incorporated as a non-profit organization. In fact we were talking about this last night with regard to some smaller communities, such as Woodlands, where they are hoping to build a senior citizens' home, and they're going to use this section. They've gone directly to CMHC. We're giving them some technical assistance. We're giving them any advice we can, and we will help them, but there are provisions under the National Housing Act for the establishment of non-profit organizations for the funding of them a 100 percent loan, with 10 percent forgiveness, and there are other features. There's nothing now preventing this from happening. The legislation's in place and any community group can go to CMHC and get themselves organized as a non-profit organization. It's not that we are remiss somehow or other in not seeing that these private groups are not being organized into non-profit corporations. But I can tell the member this, that we already have in existence a Manitoba Non-Profit Housing Corporation, which is a subsidiary of Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation. It has existed for a couple of years now and we are now, as I indicated, looking at the activation of it to get into this business of renovating existing structures.

But I want to say this, that his point of involving the community and involving as much as possible the tenants' participation is well taken. Again, perhaps we can look at the model in the City of Toronto, where the City of Toronto housing authority, not the Government of Ontario, but the City of Toronto housing authority goes about with its non-profit organization approach and buys the buildings, renovates them and then spins off the management to whatever group. I would like to think that we may be able to do the same thing. We haven't done this yet, so we're talking about some new territory here.

But if we want to get on with the job of dealing with what I consider to be a crisis in housing in Winnipeg, the way to get on with it quickly is to do it with our own resources. Our own staff. But having got on with it, I would like to think that we can then achieve, hopefully, this tenant involvement, citizens' involvement, by transferring the management to tenant groups, or perhaps to a service organization or whatever; a spin-off in effect of this management. But I simply repeat what I said earlier, and that is that there's nothing now preventing organizations from going directly to CMHC and doing this. It's not our act. It's not our legislation. We're talking about some federal legislation that we are wanting to take advantage of now, Section 15.1, and there's nothing at all preventing these organizations from doing this. As a matter of fact we have had some discussions, and I think the staff have had extensive discussions with the city about the City of Winnipeg itself forming a non-

profit housing corporation and doing the same thing.

One advantage of it too is, if you're a non-profit organization, if you have that approach, you're eligible for RRAP Grants, Residential Rehabilitation Housing Assistance Program Grants. But in order to get this for certain buildings, I believe you have to meet certain standards, and these standards may require a lot more money than some people are talking about, that is for the renovation and rehabilitation of existing structures.

I understand that legislation already exists for the formation and acquisition by co-operatives of existing housing, which would provide a form of community ownership. I might add on that note, Mr. Chairman, that the government, the Manitoba Housing Corporation has a program to stimulate co-operative development, including continuing co-op development, by making land available to these co-ops and by providing some sort of interim lending money which is very essential. It may be small, but it's extremely essential to get the co-operative going in the first place, and at the moment we have about four or five continuing co-ops in the City of Winnipeg. I like to think that there's been a great increase in this activity that wasn't here a couple of years ago, and let's hope that more can occur. But I state right now, that if we want to move quickly, effectively, in this crisis area then we have to do it through — I would submit — a subsidiary of our Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation, mainly a Manitoba non-profit housing corporation.

But again, I think we can maybe achieve the best of both worlds by getting on with the job, using this vehicle, but then spinning off the management to service organizations and community groups and tenants, so that you do arrive at this involvement by the people in the continued management and maintenance of that property.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take serious issue with the Minister's statement that it is already possible to set up a non-profit corporation. It is not possible under the present economic circumstances to try to purchase land in this Inner City of Winnipeg. The legislation has been there and I know all the conditions that have been involved in trying to set several up. The fact of the matter is when it comes down to a community sponsored non-profit corporation relying solely upon its own resources to try to build in the Inner City, it can't because it cannot acquire the land. In fact, one major non-profit corporation has just gone broke in the City, or has closed down, simply because it was not able to acquire the financing for the land.

Unlike other provinces which do provide write down costs on land, the Province of Manitoba does not provide it and that's why I am simply saying, that if you're really trying to get an extension of housing activity that is not solely and completely dominated or controlled by MHRC or its subsidiaries, then you have to start examining how you would make better use of your capital to provide inducements or incentives for a variety of private, whether they be profit making or non-profit making corporations, to get into the business. Right now, it is impossible for community sponsored non-profits to operate in the City of Winnipeg because they simply can't carry the tariff on land. Until you get that down, then you're simply in trouble and I suggest that you take a look at some of the things going on in British Columbia, where land is supplied by the province to non-profits and Co-ops at a write down cost, or their lease-back arrangement; in the Province of Alberta where there is a form of grant which writes down the interest rate; in the Province of Ontario, where there is a similar of loan-grant system to provide land. Now, when the Minister says it is impossible I simply suggest to him that it is not impossible, other provinces are doing it.

My major criticism is that the range of innovation that we are prepared to operate in is very limited to what can government do, as opposed to what can government do to help other groups to also get into the business. I think that is a fact of life, so the Minister is dead wrong. It is not possible to get community non-profits. The ones that have been attempted aren't able to make it for that reason alone because they receive absolutely no assistance from either the Province of Manitoba or the City of Winnipeg in being able to get areas of land, or be able to pay the price of existing properties under the present mortgage arrangements. If he wants, I can give him documented case studies on several that have been tried in this City and have failed on that account alone. So, if you want the community non-profits or Co-ops to get into the business, then you had better start doing something to help them acquire those properties by giving them a little bit of front-end assistance in the purchase of it, otherwise, it is simply not going to work and I think that the Minister should know that.

But going beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I also feel that a serious mistake is being made in terms of the reluctance to provide a certain degree of assistance for lending purposes to private owners of downtown properties to upgrade their accommodations. If you were going to get into the business of having to buy every single walk-up apartment that comes 4 on the market, then you're going to be spending a big junk of public capital as opposed to simply having to put smaller portions of capital out for loans for improvements and upgrading. I think that that simply is an uneconomical and somewhat foolish way of approaching it. You need several approaches to it and to avoid or ignore the lending approach would be one, and again, I think that there are several techniques that would be available. The government in the past has shown no reluctance to lend large amounts of money for other purposes in this province. It is a lending institution of a variety of kinds — the Manitoba

Development Fund which the Minister knows something about is a lending institution — I would suggest that the availability of a couple of million dollars worth of capital per year to help and buy safety equipment; for example, smoke detectors and other forms of installations, would be able to maintain a large amount of these properties in the market. If they are not made available, then you're going to have to buy those properties back at a much greater cost or build public housing units at ten times the cost, or close to ten times the cost. So I think that that is a serious mistake in this approach to Inner City housing that you are making.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, I think that the question of the existence of a new housing corporation should provide us with an opportunity, not simply to deal with the conventional kinds of things, if there is any reason in part for the failure of the private housing market in the Inner City of Winnipeg, it is because so many other pressures have been put on it and I think we have stated several in this House before that there is increasing pressure from the City on terms of the upgrading bylaws, there is property taxations, there is 20 percent increases in hydro costs, there is the rent control program. All these simply mean — when the Minister asks what's gone wrong with the private market, I can tell him that there is almost virtually no cash flow coming in to small owners any more that's what has gone wrong with it. So, simply, if you are trying to maintain them in the business — and they are not all slum landlords, many of them provide very good, decent housing and you don't have to lend to slum landlords, you can make a choice and if the Minister had been listening, I suggested that the preference for that kind of capital should go to people who are owner-occupiers as opposed to absentee owners to keep these properties in business. Those who have a certain stake and commitment in the communities in which their properties reside. You can set certain conditions by which funds are given and the interest rates can also be controlled.

So I think there are a number of ways of approaching it and I just wish, Mr. Chairman, that we had a somewhat more detailed position on this thing rather than simply trying to draw it and drag it out bit by piece. I think the problem of Inner City housing is too serious to do in a kind of *ad hoc* way. It has to be done in a very co-ordinated, comprehensive way where all the pieces fit together and complement one another and are not in some cases working at cross-purposes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: Well, I don't know. I fail to follow the honourable member when he keeps on insisting that one solution is to lend to existing owners because, at best, if you're talking about a loan, at best you're talking about maybe, if we did pursue this, we might give them a one or two points preference but I don't know whether that is significant enough to make the difference and I really . . .

MR. AXWORTHY: Is the Minister aware, that for many private owners of apartments blocks in the Inner City of Winnipeg, it is impossible to get any kind of loan from any private financial institution? There is no lending. Interest rate or not, it is impossible to get those loans. Is he aware of that fact?

MR. EVANS: Yes. I see. Well, I understand if that is the case, it is because the lending value is not there and a lot of these so-called owners that you refer to are mortgaged to the hilt. They've got first, second, third mortgages and they just don't have the equity to get any more lending for repairs and that is the fact of the matter. Part of the phenomenon that you're describing is a result of greed and speculation by a lot of so-called upright citizens in this province who are trying to make fast bucks off of a lot of poor people, and it's the result of that phenomenon that's at work. People are too bloody greedy and they're mortgaged to the hilt and now they can't borrow money to renovate and all of a sudden the Manitoba Government is supposed to come on like a knight in shining armour and rescue some of these people. The member might say, well the more important thing is the housing accommodation. Indeed, it is the most important but at the same time this is a pretty big problem and there is a pretty big area out there of housing reconstruction and housing building to be done and we're straining right now at the seams, more or less, the staff is, and we're going all out doing whatever we can to improve housing conditions in Manitoba in many many ways.

But, you know, we can look at that. I'm not closing the door and I'm not saying that there may be categories, there may be areas, so let's look at that. But I really get the impression that the member is over-simplifying some of these matters and also exaggerating in some instances. I think the Member for Fort Rouge is exaggerating when he says there are many many non-profit groups who have come to the Government of Manitoba for assistance because we know of none, except one, the Winnipeg Housing Alliance, and that was well down the line, I understand, before they approached MHRC. At that point, when they did come to us, we did agree to give them some assistance. We offered to write down the carrying costs on the land.

But there haven't been many non-profit or would-be non-profit groups come to us for help. — (Interjection)— You said several, well who? Who are they? I don't know who they are, I don't know. I'm asking the staff, who has come to us for help? So don't sit there and say that there are many many groups who have come to us for help and been turned down. Maybe there are many groups in existence, I don't know, because this is under federal legislation' but we do have a program to help continuing Co-ops and Winnipeg Housing Alliance is the one organization that came to us — came to

us rather late in the game — and we did offer to help them. I say now, publicly; if there are groups that want to form non-profit organizations, we would be prepared to help them get started. When you say that the question of land, as I understand it, you don't have to own the land. If you have an option on the land, that's sufficient for CMHC purposes. You can get 100 percent financing. Well, you can shake your head. I just say that in some instances, Mr. Chairman, the member is exaggerating.

I must say this, that I find the staff of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation to be most responsive, to be most positive and very concerned with fulfilling a mandate at improving housing in this City and in this province and I just don't believe that there have been many many non-profit groups coming to us and being turned away. I have no direct knowledge of it and I don't think our senior staff has any direct knowledge of it.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, sometimes it gets to be a question of, I guess, exaggeration is in the eye of the beholder. I did not say many many many I said several. I also suggested that one of the reasons is because there has not been any real public proclamation probably until now that the MHRC is prepared to provide that kind of assistance to different non-profits. But, unlike in the Province of Ontario where they announced a specific policy, which would provide not only technical assistance but also certain funds for second mortgaging on land so that the lending value that's presently available under Section 15.1 which CMHC say will only go up to a certain limit and when you're dealing with high cost land, oftentimes the cost per units are above that and that they take a second mortgage on it and range above it and help write down the cost.

Now there are again ways of doing it but the Provincial Government has never said so; it has never indicated, never provided that offer to anybody. It may be prepared to negotiate in it but I think that the importance of stating in a public way certain policy positions so that groups will understand what's going on and we know that that kind of resource is available so that when they meet with CMHC — and CMHC by the way doesn't know that that is oftentimes available either, because when they talked about policy setting in the province they are assuming that it is going to be funded solely from their funds and that there will not be a provincial contribution of any kind right on top of it. So someone is not communicating with someone else and I would say that if the Minister is prepared to offer that assistance, great. But then let's make sure that people know about it because it has been a very well-kept secret up to this point in time.

MR. EVANS: Well, you know, Mr. Chairman, I think maybe perhaps part of the problem is that the corporation is indeed trying to do many many things and, you know, given the resources that we have, the staff, our budget, etc., I think their record is most commendable. But you know, there is a limit and we are not composed of supermen.

But I agree with the honourable member in disseminating information. I am very concerned about getting knowledge, getting information to the public on what programs are available and, as a matter of fact, only recently I asked the staff to come up with an informational pamphlet to tell the world what's available because there are a lot of programs, even our rural mortgage lending program — I am sure that there are many farmers in Manitoba that could take advantage of this program but don't know about it. Now, mind you, we're working with the credit unions, and all the credit unions are supposed to have the pamphlets but I don't know . . . there hasn't been very many takers but there may be some other reason for that. But I share that concern with the honourable member and that is that perhaps we should be doing a better job of advising the public what is available for them to take advantage of. I am not suggesting we don't do this; we do have pamphlets; we do have material; we do respond to many phone calls and letters, etc. However that can be noted.

I would just want to make this point, Mr. Chairman, and that is that when the Manitoba non-profit Housing Corporation was setup, it was set up more or less to be the role of a co-ordinator and act as a catalyst and so on, and it can still fulfill that role. We are prepared, therefore, through that organization to act as the co-ordinator and advising agency, technical consultant agency and indeed and perhaps in a sense a financing agency as we are now doing with the Continuing. Co-ops, so that we have four or five Continuing Co-ops now in existence. Sure they are funded under NHA provisions and so on, but I would submit if it wasn't for this initial capital assistance we provided and assisting them with getting land, etc., that these wouldn't even be in existence. There is no reason why we cannot, you know, fulfill that type of a role for non-profit groups, but I just repeat, to my knowledge, there has only been the one and they came pretty late in the game. But having said that, I would agree. I am a great proponent of advising the community, advising the public of what programs are available so that all can take advantage of those programs — whether they be in housing or in whatever area, education or health or whatever — Some more business.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, just a final word on that. I hope then that the Minister will take serious advisement of extending the Repair and Rehabilitation Program through provincial resources. I think that if he is looking for a solution, it's not the only solution, but a solution, that's when he would get a far greater degree of mileage out of this capital than some of the other programs he's presently in.

I just have one further question because some other members may want to get into this before we

rise. It was just simply, I have received a vast amount of correspondence from some one who is probably well known to officials of Manitoba Housing and is named Ronald Moses in Thompson, Manitoba concerning his problem which I gather has now gone to the Ombudsman and has now gone to a number of sources, it has now come to me and I would — I know the rules of the House about tabling it — I would be pleased to table this because it would sure be nice to get it out of my file which now is about three feet deep. I gather Mr. Moses believes that his rights are being infringed upon and that he has not been compensated properly by the Corporation for the fact that the Corporation moved in people next door who not only were not nice neighbors but also destroyed his house and I am wondering if, at this point in time, the Minister might be prepared to suggest how the Corporation intends to deal with this matter which is now becoming certainly of great importance to Mr. Moses but does seem to have some question of rights involved in it.

MR. EVANS: Yes. Mr. Chairman, I did not know of this matter until the honourable member just raised it now but staff are pleased to advise me and I am happy to transmit the knowledge to the member, to the committee, and that is the gentleman who was complaining — Mr. Moses? — this was a duplex unit. Mr. Moses lived on one side and MHRC apparently owned the other half of the duplex. Well, we have now sold the other half to Mr. Moses so I think the problem is resolved. I don't know when it was sold — it was about six months ago — so Mr. Moses owns both halves of the house and he will do with them as he will. So I hope that that problem has now been resolved.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, that . . .

MR. EVANS: I'm sorry. The title was only transferred a month and a half ago. Is that right? About January the title was transferred.

MR. AXWORTHY: I believe though that Mr. Moses still feels though that some compensation is required to offset the costs he incurred when his walls were destroyed previously and that those haven't yet been paid. I am wondering if the Corporation is prepared to satisfy his concerns in these respects.

MR. EVANS: Well, again, I am not familiar with this problem, Mr. Chairman, I have just learned of it now but the staff advise me that he either has been or will be compensated. Maybe he will not be satisfied with compensation to the degree we may be satisfied with it but apparently there is some possibility of compensation.

MR. AXWORTHY: Just to clarify that so I can maybe have you or I'll write him back and say, you know, has there been an offer of compensation or are you contemplating making that offer to Mr. Moses. That would be the question. Has an offer already been made that he doesn't feel adequate or is it simply that an offer hasn't yet been made and that he just doesn't know what might be acceptable or not.

MR. EVANS: I'm afraid, Mr. Chairman, I can't give the honourable member any more detail. The staff will have to check the files. As you can appreciate, it is the detail. I understand we are not going to charge Mr. Moses for sawing a particular door in half. Apparently, it's in the Ombudsman's Report but we will look into it and try to resolve this. I'm sorry I can't give you any more information.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, will the Minister or his staff get in touch with me then, when the thing is clarified and let me know. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 77(a). The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, last night when we were discussing the properties owned by the MHRC, the Minister mentioned that by 1981, I believe, around 1,800 acres would be available to come on stream for housing. Just looking at the calculations I have here, I am looking at about approximately a little less than that. I believe that I am looking at less than that because of the The Fort Garry property that was mentioned, looking at the map, shows a very small percentage of the Fort Garry property that is within the limit of the urban expansion. And there is some on the corner here, I believe at the highway and Waverly . . . your property is mostly on the other side of the highway. What is that percentage of that little corner you have there or how many acres is that little corner that is available within the limit of urban expansion on that large Fort Garry block of property?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, is the honourable member referring to a portion of the 1,263 acres that we referred to last night in the Fort Garry area?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. EVANS: Well, the staff advised me — I'm not sure of that particular small section that the member refers to, Mr. Chairman — but we don't believe that any of it is in the city plan at the present time. It's a matter of negotiating with the City of Winnipeg. I'm not directly familiar with that particular description that the member referred to.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: There's no sense in us all looking at a bunch of different things. When we come down here, the dotted line is the line showing the property within the city. (I have penned it in.) This is your property here. That appears to me to be inside the expansion area. I am just wondering what size that particular corner is. It looks to be about a third.

MR. EVANS: This is not the MHRC only held property. There is a portion out there which is both city and provincially-owned, jointly. And that's part of that.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Is your 1,250 acres in Fort Garry over and above the jointly owned?

MR. EVANS: Yes. The jointly owned is 520 acres, Mr. Chairman and that's in addition to the 1,263.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, in other words the jointly owned is within the bounds of the limit of urban expansion and your 1,250 acres is outside it. I can see where you can come on stream with the city on that particular one fairly quickly but I would have my doubts at the length of time that it's going to take to get that other Fort Garry property into line because you're sitting considerably on the other side of the highway there and there is a considerable amount of vacant lands in between the highways and Wilkes Avenue that still has to be developed.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I can advise the honourable member that some of the properties that we are now developing in the Lord Selkirk community area in northwest Winnipeg, that we discussed last night and earlier, that was outside of the city's development plan too. But through negotiations and agreement, it was brought in. So we are now developing 262 acres in that Lord Selkirk community area as well as 59 acres in the Assiniboine community area for a total of 321. But that 262, as I am advised, was not in the plans. So it doesn't mean that because the line has not been drawn around it, that it's impossible to have it brought on stream.

I would like to also reiterate what I said last night or the day before, and that is, the 1976-1978 plan, while it includes the development of 321 acres that I just referred to, over and above that, we have plans to develop another 1,539 acres in the period of 1978 to 1981. And that will include 20 acres in Transcona, 59 acres in West Kildonan, 197 acres in south St. Boniface, and the 1,263 acres in the Fort Garry area, giving us a total, as I said, of 1,539. Now that is the plan and, agreed, a lot of this may not be in the present City of Winnipeg development area but we are hoping through negotiation and agreement that this will be possible.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: In your report, Mr. Chairman, you mentioned last night — I hope I can find it again — that you were leasing land back to farmers and having income on it. On Page 34, about halfway down the page, there is an item here that says, "land at cost leased." At \$530,787 is that the income you are receiving from leased land? I don't say it's all farmland, but does that take in the farmland you are leasing?

MR. EVANS: The income received is netted against costs. This land at cost leased, this is the land leased to co-operatives and condominium Pioneer Apartments is included in there. But at any rate, that also includes land leased to co-op housing.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I was hoping I had the answer to the amount of money that you did receive from leasing the farmland back from farmers but I haven't so I have to ask it.

MR. EVANS: No, it is not shown here and I can't give you that figure. We can get it for you but I can't give it to you right now.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: That's fine, thank you.

Mr. Chairman, what is the relationship of the MHRC with the Leaf Rapids Corporation?

MR. EVANS: The Leaf Rapids Corporation is actually a subsidiary of the Manitoba Development Corporation. Our relationship is one of an agreement with them whereby we have turned over certain parcels of land in west Selkirk and south St. Boniface to that corporation with the understanding that they will be bringing those lands on stream in the near future. So it is an understanding with that other government agency.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I am reading a news release here that they are working on these 435 family serviced lots in Selkirk. Do I read this in such a way that the MHRC will then purchase some of that developed land to put some of their own houses on?

MR. EVANS: The policy, as indicated last night, Mr. Chairman, in these subdivision developments is to make up to 25 percent available for social housing, co-op housing, and maybe other related special categories. That would, therefore, also apply to this west Selkirk area being developed by the Leaf Rapids Corporation.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I know it's Leaf Rapids that is developing it, but if the Manitoba Housing is going to be putting houses in that particular area, it says the average lot is 35 by 80 feet. That sounds to me as if we're looking at a type of design, zero lot lines or something of that nature. Is that what we're looking at in that particular design of the housing project?

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, zero lot lines and also a considerable amount of townhouse-type of structures. They can build anywhere. There is no setback requirement, apparently. This is a plan that was approved by the various levels of government including the Town of Selkirk. It's a rather innovative type of community design, I understand, and what they're doing with the other land, you know the difference between 35 and 50 feet frontage, they are using some of that property to develop parklike areas in the centre' so that these houses look out on to a common green space. I think there are some examples you can see, maybe in the Norwood area. Now that's not necessarily a good comparison. Wildwood. But where there is an opportunity to have a large, green common space and that's what their plan is in that area and that's why they're at the zero lot line.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time being 12:30, I understand there is another matter coming before the House at 2:30 this afternoon. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

Friday, April 22, 1977

HONOURABLE SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet): Whether there could be agreement to extend the sittings so that you might complete the department, if it appears that we are near completion. Then, we won't have to come back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: It would take a little longer than the members would like to sit. Mr. Chairman, I am as anxious to get those men there back to work as anybody, but I do have some more questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report.

ESTIMATES — CONTINUING EDUCATION

CHAIRMAN'S RULING

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. William Jenkins (Logan): The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I think that when committee rose yesterday, there was a process taking place with regard to a ruling that was being made . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. GREEN: . . . and I wonder whether the Chairman would, before dealing with the matter, whether he would be willing to see whether it could be resolved or whether he would be willing to accept the submissions by various members in the House with respect to the ruling, because I understand when the matter was being dealt with yesterday, that there were no suggestions given by Members of the House as to how the matter could be resolved and it might be a problem to make a ruling under those circumstances. I wonder whether the Chairman would hear members out on the position or to see whether the matter could be resolved as was suggested during the submission yesterday so that it would not be necessary to have the matter dealt with by any type of definitive ruling when it could possibly be agreed to by Members of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I had intended to deal with this matter with the Speaker. I made a ruling last evening. I made it in conjunction with Citation 158 subsection 3 of Beauchesne which states as follows: "An unsigned letter should not be read into the House. On the 16th of May, 1928, a member stated during the debate, a letter which he had been quoting was not signed. The Speaker said, "Such a letter should not be read into Hansard and all letters when read must be signed and they become part of the documents of the House." Canadian Debates, 1928, Page 3003.

Last evening, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa read into the record — I asked him if he would table the document which he agreed to do. Upon examination of the document, I find the document is not addressed to the honourable member; it is not signed. There was a postscript addressed to the honourable member with a signature. I ruled that the first portion of the letter was not admissible by virtue of Citation 158, subsection 3. I stated that the postscript which was addressed to the honourable member and signed by the constituent of the honourable member was permissible to be put into the record. The Honourable for Minnedosa stated he would bring a signature tomorrow, which was today. I stated that that was not the spirit of the citation. The citation is such that unsigned letters shall not form part of the records or documents of this House. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry challenged my ruling and that is the way that the matter stands now, honourable members of this Assembly. And therefore I cannot accept a letter that someone brings here unsigned and maybe brings a signature two or three weeks hence or something like that. You have rules of this Assembly and if you are not prepared to live with them, then I suggest to you that you better look for a new Chairman.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that it is the intention of any honourable members to reflect on the Chairman. Certainly the ruling as you have given it would commend itself to many. I understand that there was a suggestion that the reading of the letter in Hansard be struck from Hansard. Someone suggested that this was so. I don't think that there is any provision for the striking from Hansard and if that is not a feature of your ruling, then as I understand it, you are ruling that the unsigned letter is not admissible, should not be tabled. The honourable member, if he wishes, can get the letter tabled by getting it signed and then bringing it in, which would be acceptable. If, as I understand it correctly, there is no question of Hansard being deleted, that it is merely your judgment that the letter is not signed and therefore cannot be admissible under Beauchesne, then I don't know whether that is what is being challenged. And if it is not being challenged, then I don't know whether you would permit it to proceed as I have suggested, that your ruling that the letter in its present form is not admissible; that to be admissible it would have to be signed, which could be done at any time, and that Hansard would merely record that you found it inadmissible although there would be nothing stricken from Hansard. If that is as I understand it, then I am not sure that there is any challenge to your ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted to speak on the point of order, I think what the House Leader on the government side has said is essentially correct. A document, according to the rules as you have read them, Sir, must be signed to be admissible for tabling, but having been read into the record, it remains a part of that record. And for the Chairman or any officer officiating in this Chamber to take it upon himself to remove a portion of the record is indeed a dangerous precedent — the latest of which we have recollection of was in 1956 during the pipeline debate and we all know the consequences of that action. However, Sir, you did not make it clear whether or not the letter was not admissible only as a document to be tabled, and if you have ruled that it is not admissible as a document to be tabled, I have no quarrel with that particular ruling. The only

question that is raised in my mind is the advisability of declaring that what has been put on the record now can be struck from the record. I contend, Sir, that that cannot be done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, this is precisely the point where I believe that we can remove all of ourselves from a difficult situation because I gather what the Honourable House Leader of the Conservative Party has said is that there really is no challenge, as he sees it, to the question of admissibility on the basis of signature because the Honourable Member for Minnedosa can reintroduce it if he gets it signed. And if that is your ruling, I gather, although I am not certain, that there is no challenge but that Hansard would merely record what had occurred, that there would be removal, and perhaps you never intended to say that because you did not say that in your ruling this morning. If that's the case then I gather that it's possible that the challenge to the ruling will be withdrawn and the letter will be dealt with when it can be tabled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. The instructions I gave to the recorder were as follows: that the letter that was read in by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa was to be translated by the Hansard staff, held out of Hansard pending a decision of this House. And that is where the matter stands at the present time.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is the issue, I guess, that we are faced with. I believe that all honourable members, or at least I believe that most honourable members accept the fact that you can make a ruling that the letter not be tabled and I gather that the only question at issue is whether Hansard should have a deletion. I am not aware of any provision for a deletion from Hansard, and I again say that if that is not your ruling, if you are ruling that the letter be not admitted, I gather there is no challenge to that and that what will appear on the record is the reading in of a person — just as Hansard does not strike out inadmissible questions — they are merely ruled as inadmissible and shown on the record as having been made inadmissible — and I believe, Mr. Chairman, that that would be satisfactory to all parties concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, there is one further point that I think perhaps has not been mentioned and maybe should be taken into consideration, that the letter, as I understand it, is not a personal letter. It's a public document now since it is in the hands of the Ombudsman. Verification of whether or not it is an authentic letter can easily be made by checking with the Ombudsman, or alternately, having the Member for Minnedosa have the signature attached to it. But that is really a minor point as far as I am concerned. I don't think that's at issue. The concern that I have is whether or not there is authority by anybody in this House to strike something from the record or prevent statements that have been made in this House being placed on the record, whether or not they are subsequently ruled admissible for tabling. I think that is a very serious point that we want to make sure we don't make any improper decisions on at this point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to take one minute to clarify my challenge. I believe that it is important that we determine in this House, and perhaps it should be done by the Rules Committee, what constitutes a signed letter and what doesn't. I believe the question over the authenticity of the signature or whether the letter was properly signed or not could be challenged. I don't believe that we were challenging that. My challenge was to a ruling, Sir, which I may have misinterpreted, but I understood your ruling to be that the letter be stricken from the record. That was what I was challenging. If you could clarify your ruling, Sir, I am sure we could arrive at an amenable solution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that the matter be resolved as follows: that you have ruled the letter to be inadmissible and that the House accepts that ruling; and that if the letter is to be reintroduced and put on the table, that will not be a problem for the Member for Minnedosa; and that the matter stands there and that ruling is accepted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair is amenable to the suggestions that have been put forward by members of this Chamber, and instructions will go out to Hansard that this letter purported to be such will be part of the record. But I think that this House has to decide one way or another that letters, when they are introduced in this House — and I am going to make sure in future that when an honourable member stands in his place and starts to read what is a purported, genuine letter, that there is a signature on it before I am going to let him proceed.

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, just on that point of order' I don't want to get into some debate on whether there was a legal signature on it or not, but there are some legal opinions on what constitutes a signature. If it is typewritten by the person who is writing that letter, it doesn't have to be initialed. That typed signature purports to be the mark of that person writing that letter whether it be by seal or whatever, so I don't want to get into that. But it is going to be a very, very grey area to decide whether it is a signed letter or whether it isn't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that I gather that everybody in the House is satisfied to proceed as we are now proceeding. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for Minnedosa that what has just happened will not prevent an argument as to whether a letter should be placed on the table at a future date and whether the Chairman is right in having received it or rejected it. In your case it is a moot point because you can get the letter on the record by dealing with that as you suggested. I suggest that that will clarify the matter and that the challenge is withdrawn and the Committee should proceed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, in those circumstances I am prepared to withdraw the challenge.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would then refer honourable members to their Estimates Books, Page 17, Resolution 44 (a) Student Aid (1) Salaries \$501,300. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have to leave to go into the other committee and I wanted to ask the Minister a question before I left in regard to Student Aid. I would like to know if the list of those applying for student aid is available as public information and can these names be obtained by the members of the Legislative Assembly?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Continuing Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, Mr. Chairman, the lists of the student aid applicants and recipients, that is not a matter of public information to the best of my knowledge.

MR. ADAM: The Minister seemed to be hesitant on that point and I just wonder if he could ascertain if that is indeed correct. But since he finished his remarks by saying "to the best of his knowledge," I would like to know whether these lists are available because it is public funds that we are using and I would like to know if indeed these lists are available or not.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, if I may have sounded hesitant, the reason why I did so is because I would have to seek legal advice as to whether or not it may be possible to obtain an order of the court or whatever to produce information relevant to a particular student aid application. It has not been the practice of my department to make such information public. It's always been regarded as being one of a confidential nature as between the Student Aid Branch and the applicant for student aid' because if we were to make that type of information public then not only would we have to disclose the level of student aid, but also the assets and the liabilities and the income of the applicant, of the parents supporting him, you know, a type of practice, as the Honourable Member for Minnedosa was suggesting yesterday that we should venture into. It is not the intention of this government to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, one more question to the Minister. . . his reference to the Member for Minnedosa.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would be very happy to clarify my answer, the reference to the Honourable Member for Minnedosa. I was about to do that. I wish to thank the honourable member for giving me the opportunity to clarify that point. — (Interjection)— I'm sorry the honourable member has a question?

MR. BLAKE: . . . the divine light up there that you were seeking assistance from.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I am happy to say that I have many divine lights up there. They're all very very competent. Many of my staff are there and they are doing a first rate job, and I'm very proud of them. In fact everyone in the Province of Manitoba who has, in any way, been associated with any of them is very proud of their ability and competence. — (Interjection — No, Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Honourable Minister for Health, I'm not clapping myself, I'm telling the Committee what a good staff I have, and I'm proud of it.

Mr. Chairman, you will recall yesterday evening the Honourable Member for Minnedosa asked the question, "Why must we insist upon the release to allow us to examine income tax returns?" And then he went on to say, particularly if a student is applying for nothing more than a loan, surely we should be able to arrange for the loan if we approve it and allow him to have the loan without an inquiry of that kind.

Well, you know, Mr. Chairman, it surprises me that the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, with his background, with his experience which he claims to have, would ask such a question. He prides himself on his many years of banking experience. If he has that many years of banking experience, as he indicates that he has, then I would think that he must have been in the banking business at the time that the Student Loans Program came into being. And, you may recall, Mr. Chairman, that that goes back well over 14, 15 — yes, getting onto 15 years, 1964. In fact at that time, Mr. Chairman, you may recall that the bursary program was very modest. It used to run in the order of — I don't know if it ever exceeded a half million dollars for quite some time, so the major source of student aid support was student loan. I'm sure that at the that time there must have been student loan applicants who had obtained loan certificates and came to his bank, and converted those loan certificates into cash, which his bank advanced the students. Here is what surprises me, Mr. Chairman, because the end of

the year rolls around and the honourable member was able to balance the books for the branch of his bank. The interest on that loan was paid by someone. The interest was paid by someone and he ought to recall, that the student loans are interest free for the time that the student is enrolled in an educational institution. He doesn't commence paying interest until after graduation. In the meantime his bank received interest paid by the state' paid by the state, Mr. Chairman. And even after graduation, when he commenced to repay that loan, he paid a preferred rate of interest. He paid the best rate of interest that anyone could obtain, he paid the rate of interest that the province pays.

A MEMBER: It's called prime rate.

MR. HANUSCHAK: It's called a prime rate. I wish to thank the honourable member for his assistance.

A MEMBER: Is he one of your divine lights?

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, he is not one of my divine lights, because it doesn't surprise me that he doesn't really understand that the Student Loan Program is in a sense a form of student aid. It does have a bursary component built into it in the sense that the recipient of a student loan is receiving public assistance to some degree. It's true that he will have to repay the principal, but the interest is waived for the time that he is enrolled in an institution, and the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, and I, and others contribute toward the payment of that interest to his bank, or to what other money-lending institution advanced the loan. He ought to be aware of the fact that after graduation, as I mentioned a moment ago, that he pays a prime rate of interest and if there is any difference to be made up, then he gets that benefit, to that extent, which really is a form of student aid. Therefore, even a student loan program, being a form of student aid to that extent, being subsidized to that extent out of the public purse, hence it is a matter of concern in the case of student loans, to the Federal Government, which guarantees the loan to the bank, which guarantees the loan, because the bank isn't going to be out of pocket.

Mind you, the Federal Government doesn't have to put up all that much money because the honourable member said yesterday, that the track record of repayment of student loans is very dismal. I would like him to produce those figures which show — I forget what percentage default he made reference to — but it was a fantastically high percentage default, which is much less than what it is and the records show it. Perhaps that is the type of information that the honourable member is unable to obtain for himself. Perhaps a similar description ought to apply to him as was made to the Honourable Member for Roblin about a year ago, which he didn't quite understand. I don't know whether the Honourable Member for Minnedosa would understand it, but I would think that it would also be applicable to him, if he cannot understand, with his banking experience, that student loans are in part a form of student aid, and hence the type of information which we require, which the Canada Student Loans Act requires, is necessary in the interests of protecting the public purse. Perhaps the honourable member isn't interested in protecting the public purse, and that may well be.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, I really do not know what the real point was that the honourable member attempted to make last night when he said, because I'm so stupid. Well, you know Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to take exception to that. As I indicated to him I would, then maybe I should remind him of the manner in which the Honourable Member for Roblin was described when it was said that the honourable member's brains were an enema they wouldn't be sufficient to physic a flea. If he's going to dish it out then he'd better be prepared to take it too. I think that's only fair. I hope that settles that matter and if it doesn't we'll find a way of resolving it.

I'm really at a loss to know what the position of the Opposition Party is on student aid. He went at great length reading out of a letter last night, a copy of a letter listing a series of complaints which one student aid applicant had; one out of tens of thousands, and I want you to remember that, Mr. Chairman. I'll admit that from time to time an application will go astray. From time to time, an applicant may run into certain problems in the processing of his application. I am glad to say that those instances are few, far between, but they do arise from time to time, as I am sure similar incidents had arisen in the experience and the career of the honourable member when he was in the banking business, that from time to time an application may have gone astray, may have been delayed in being processed in head office or whatever. But that does happen from time to time.

I admit that unfortunately, the individual to whom the honourable member made reference to last night, that there was some delay on our part for which I'll accept the blame and apologize; some on the applicant's part and this I'm sure the applicant understands. Because if the Honourable Member for Minnedosa would re-read that letter carefully, which he had read to the Committee last night, he will find that what was at issue was not the entire amount of student aid which consisted of a bursary and loan mix but really of a very small percentage of it, well over 75 percent of the amount the applicant had received within a normal course of time, within the normal course as applications are processed and he had received over 75 percent of that. Then there was a small portion that was in dispute between our Student Aid Branch and him. So his real complaint is the length of time that it took to resolve that portion of it.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I want to tell you, that last fall, last November, the applicant to whom the honourable member made reference to, in a letter to the Student Aid Branch, expressed his thanks to the Student Aid staff for the prompt and special attention that his application received. So he was quite happy with the service that he received up to that point in time.

Then of course, there was the Workmen's Compensation issue that surfaced and the assessment of the benefits that he received from it which, at one point in time, were projected on an annual basis and then this had to be revised and brought in line

with what, in fact, happened and so forth. That led to the time delay.

So what I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that this does happen, on occasion, and it happens rarely. And you know, for every letter of the kind that the Honourable Member for Minnedosa read to the Committee last night, we receive letters of another kind, too.

For example, I have a copy of the letter—this is not the original letter, this is a copy of a letter—and I am not quite certain of what the rules are for a signature to appear on a copy of a letter, or whether a copy of a letter must be signed or not. I would have a bit of a problem because from time to time, I have read into the record copies of my own letters that I may have sent to others. And as a rule, I do not sign the copy of a letter written by me which I keep in my own file. I sign the original. So that may present a bit of a problem. Therefore, I will refrain from tabling such letters and hence, I would not wish to burden the Committee with such a problem. —(Interjection)— However, I will refer to it. Yes. I wish to thank the Honourable Member for St. Johns. But here I have a letter which is signed which I would like to read into the record.

Addressed to Mr. F. R. Kleiman, Director, Student Aid Branch, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

"Dear Sir: I would sincerely like to say thank you for the assistance I have been granted for the school term 1976-1977. It is greatly appreciated. I was unemployed for part of this summer and had doubts whether I could meet the financial requirements here in Ontario. You and your department have given me the opportunity to pursue my education within a very unique course: sports administration." He is writing this letter, by the way, from Sudbury, Ontario. I am digressing from the letter, Mr. Chairman, because I would just wish to remind you and the Committee that student aid is available for Manitoba students to enroll in educational institutions outside of the province, if the course which they wish to pursue is not offered within the province. This appears to be one of them. I am continuing reading from the letter, Mr. Chairman.

"It is the only course of its kind offered in Canada so I hope you see my reasoning for attending university here in Sudbury, Ontario. I would just like to reiterate my earlier statement and say thank you very much for your assistance. I consider myself very fortunate in being given the opportunity and I realize many others are less fortunate attempting to continue their studies. Thank you. Sincerely, Ken Dewitt." So there we are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that document signed?

MR. HANUSCHAK: This document, Mr. Chairman, is a handwritten document and there's a name written, Ken Dewitt, in handwriting, which I have every reason to believe is the signature of the author of the letter. I am prepared to table it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Johns has a point of order?

MR. CHERNIACK: I am under the impression that a letter which is read need not be tabled unless it is so required by a member of the Committee or in the House. I am not aware that anyone asked for it to be tabled. Is it a fact that every letter which is referred to must be tabled? Because we get all kinds of petitions. I thought it's only on request. I have been trying to get some Hydro bills that I can't get. —(Interjection) — That's not so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, perhaps we need not take up the time in the Committee now to check that out. I think it's something that could be dealt with at a later date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would refer the Honourable Member for St. Johns to Citation 158 (3) (4) and (5). If the honourable member wishes, I will read them to him. The Honourable Minister.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if I may continue. My only reason for reading that letter into the record, Mr. Chairman, is to indicate to the Honourable Member for Minnedosa that as I have admitted, on occasion, an applicant — and I underline the phrase "on occasion" — on rare occasion, an applicant may experience a delay, but the percentage of students experiencing delay is very very minimal. But this brings me back to the question which I asked earlier. I still really do not know what the honourable member's real concern is. If he is concerned about the administrative procedures, if that is what he is talking about, well then that's one thing. I can assure him that 98 or 99 percent plus of the 10,000-plus student applications are processed very very expeditiously and in some cases as I have indicated, in rare cases perhaps through some oversight or inadvertence on our part, on many occasions coupled with some contributing factors from the applicant, a delay occurs but the vast majority are processed expeditiously. So if that is his concern, that is my answer.

But I really don't know whether he is concerned only about the administrative procedures or whether he is concerned about the Student Aid Program in general. I rather suspect, Mr. Chairman,

that he may be opposed to the principle of student aid. I think that that is what his real concern is. That is one point.

Number two, he takes a very strange position, you know, when he questions the request that the applicant sign a release to give us access to income information. Mr. Chairman, if you analyze carefully what the honourable member said last night, he is not concerned about the privacy of the student aid applicant. What he is really telling us is let's drag in all the student aid applications into this Chamber. Let's drag them in here one at a time and let all of us take a run at them. That is what he has been saying, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjections)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. HANUSCHAK: That is what he has been saying.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member.

MR. BLAKE: That is absolutely the most ridiculous statement I have heard that Minister make, and I have heard him make a lot of them. That is the most ridiculous statement I have ever heard him make.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, you sat here last night and you heard the honourable member go through an applicant's application point by point by point and he wants me to respond to it. Like hell I will! Like hell I will! No more than I would want to drag in the application of the honourable member's child for student aid into this Chamber and discuss the details of it. —(Interjection)— Like hell I will! But the honourable member wants us to go through the applications here in this Chamber and have us review the assets, the liabilities of the applicant and determine the level of aid. That, Mr. Chairman, I will not do. That I will not do. And that is exactly what the honourable member is asking us to do. Or, if he is not asking that, then I must repeat again I rather suspect that he probably is opposed to student aid in principle because you will recall . . .

Now I don't know what consensus of opinion there is within the thinking of the Tory caucus, but you will recall some time ago the Honourable Member for Swan River, when he told this House — he was addressing his remarks through the Chair, I believe, either that the House was in session or it may have been Committee, perhaps through you, Mr. Chairman — when the Honourable Member for Swan River in addressing his remarks to the First Minister said that the people in his constituency are complaining about receiving too much money. They are receiving more money than they know what to do with. You know, that they are having money coming out of their that, oh, they are receiving money from all over the place and far too much money.

Well, you know, Mr. Chairman, I did a quick check this morning and it was rather interesting. You know, Mr. Chairman, our Autopac insurance rates are very favourable in comparison with those charged in jurisdictions wherein there is not a publicly-owned automobile insurance plan and so I would think that one who thinks in these terms, that he would not want to reap the benefits of any social program that redistributes income or keeps costs at a certain level. He wouldn't want that. He would want to pay his full share that he would expect in a type of economic-political system that he would like to see occur. In other words he would not want to be satisfied with paying the automobile insurance premium that we charge. He would want to pay the automobile insurance premium that would be charged in Ontario and Alberta, wherever else, and I checked with Autopac to see whether he paid the larger premium — you know, what he would have to pay elsewhere. The answer was no. I checked on his property taxes and checked with the Department of Finance to see whether we had received a cheque back from him for the tax credit, after all he was one of the beneficiaries too. He didn't send us a cheque, Mr. Chairman. He took advantage of all the benefits which accrue from this government's programs, from our income redistribution program, that are extended to other people. He takes advantage of the Medicare program, of the Pharmacare program, he doesn't say to hospital, "No, if I must have a bed, I don't want this bed to be paid for out of the public purse. I want to pay the full shot myself." He takes advantage of that, too. And in fact, Mr. Chairman, I cannot find anyone in Swan River who is complaining about receiving too much money from this government.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I would like you to know that I have received a letter and I have a copy of a letter that I would like to refer to from a Miss Marlene Primrose, Box 1227, Swan River, Manitoba, so that must be in the constituency of the honourable member. And what did she say in her letter to the Student Aid Branch? She thanks us for classifying her as being eligible for the \$500 bursary which she had received over the last two years. From the Swan River constituency — she did not say to us, she did not say to me, "Mr. Minister, look, there is too much money that is being given to, or loaned, or advanced to students. We don't want all of it. We don't know what to do with it," as the Honourable Member for Swan River would have us believe. She thanks us for the assistance. She says that it means a great deal to her to be able to finish her education with our co-operation, and with our co-operation she will have an opportunity to graduate. But the Honourable Member for Swan River, and — he is part of the same caucus and I would think that the Honourable Member for Minnedosa thinks in the same manner, they are of the same political party stripe — if he says that the people are receiving more money under these various programs than they know what to do with that he would also support that. So therefore I would think, Mr. Chairman, that he basically is opposed to student

aid and if student aid is to be offered, then let's drag out all the applications onto the Chamber floor, onto the Committee of Supply floor, and let's review them here and let's make a decision here, let's review the assets of all the applicants here in public in the presence of everyone. That is what he is saying, Mr. Chairman.

But then of course, maybe he doesn't quite agree with the Member for Swan River and that wouldn't surprise me, either, because you will remember that in 1974 when the Honourable Member for Roblin ran for re-election and he tried to be all things to all people . . . Remember that advertisement that he ran, "Rossmere — Schreyer; in Roblin — McKenzie; and in Dauphin — Dunlop," so perhaps the Honourable Member for Minnedosa is trying to do much the same thing and not really identifying himself with the Honourable Member for Swan River if he feels that it is not to his advantage, and identify himself with him if he feels that it is to his advantage.

You know it is indeed regrettable, and I am thinking primarily of constituencies such as Swan River, such as Roblin in particular, and Minnedosa, wherein many interesting projects are under way in the area of continuing education, in the area of post-secondary education. It is regrettable that as fine as the constituents of those constituencies are, that each and every one of them is handicapped and disadvantaged. All of them are handicapped and disadvantaged, every one. It is regrettable. They are handicapped and disadvantaged to the extent that unfortunately they do not have a member in this House who is capable of understanding and appreciating what is being done in the area of education, what is being done in the area of education in their ridings for their people.

Well, perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I should not be merely singling out those particular honourable members of the House. In fact when that thought came to my mind, I thought, "Well, perhaps what I should do is check the most recent gospel according to Sterling, or whatever it is called." It is a document entitled "PC 1977 Annual Meeting, March 31st, April 1st, 2nd, Policy Papers" and reference was made to this document earlier in debate, in Committee of Supply. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that at that time the Honourable Member for Swan River, I believe it was the Honourable Member for St. Johns who made reference to this same document, and the Honourable Member for Swan River from his seat attempted to point out to the Honourable Member for St. Johns that these are policy papers for discussion purposes only.

Well, it is true that is what the cover page says, but you know in their leader's opening statement, in the fourth paragraph, and it reads as follows. He says, "But while we may change some of the emphasis in some of the policy outlines contained here, the general direction of these policies reflects the kind of government we will be in Manitoba after the next election." Well, I hope he doesn't hold his breath until that date.

But what he is really saying, Mr. Chairman, to those attending this policy conference of three weeks ago, he says, "Okay, fellows, we can talk about this," and you know he limited the discussion to half an hour per topic, "You have some comments to make, some suggestions to make. Yes, we will sit down; we will listen to them; we will talk about them." But he is saying, "I want you to know that what is contained in here, this is going to be our election platform come the next general election."

Now he said that that will become the policy of the election. Well, Mr. Chairman, you know if I were him, I would not be all that optimistic because, as you know, he is even having difficulty in finding a riding to run in. Nobody seems to want him. He thought that Charleswood extended an invitation, only to discover that the inviters did not have the authority to invite him. Well, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the — if there is a Conservative Party Association in Burrows — I would like to extend a similar invitation to him. It will be as valid, I suppose, as the one that . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: I can't, they have already nominated someone.

MR. HANUSCHAK: The Honourable Member for St. Johns would have done likewise, but they have already nominated in his riding. But I will extend an invitation to him.

You know there is a declining base of Conservative support. It is down to about 1,000.

A MEMBER: Fort Garry is opening up.

MR. HANUSCHAK: And Fort Garry is opening up. So perhaps that is one he could look at. I would think, Mr. Chairman, as Leader he would want to accept a riding such as Burrows. You know it would be a challenge. After all, is a man of whatever a leader ought to be, he would want to accept that challenge to build up party support which has been declining and I would welcome him. I think the Conservative Party would do very well if they would nominate the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition to run in Burrows. So I am extending the invitation, the same type of invitation as he received from Charleswood.

So I proceeded to look through this document to see what is the position of the Conservative Party with relation to education and in particular with relation to post-secondary education, with relation to education needs of our native people, with relation to education needs of the disadvantaged, with relation to education needs of the north and so forth, with relation to education needs in general. Mr. Chairman, you know what I found? What this position paper had to say on matters of native education, post-secondary education? It says absolutely nothing. It says absolutely nothing which

means one of two things, either it means that the Conservative Party, and the people of Manitoba should know it, either the Conservative Party it doesn't give a damn about education, is not even concerned about it, not a word mentioned in here; or if it is concerned about it — because you will recall their Leader's reply in his participation of the Speech from the Throne, when he tried to be all things to all people, what he had to say about Autopac and about Medicare and so forth, that he would not reinstitute the premiums and Autopac is here to stay, etc. — or in the meantime, in his hunger for power he chooses to remain silent on matters related to post-secondary education with the hope of being elected and then — which is very very doubtful, but this I suppose is his plan, his scheme — if he is re-elected then we would return to the status quo of a decade two or three ago in matters related to education, in post-secondary education. Go back to the status quo and let our community college, our university programs, be available only to those, open only to those who can afford to pay for it and close the doors to all others.

It becomes very obvious, in their objectives they talk about educational programs, to provide necessary support to handicapped young people and then I look at the program and there is no reference to handicapped people. But what there is reference to, Mr. Chairman, interestingly enough, is "to provide clear and direct communication between schools, universities, community colleges so as to prevent any misunderstanding of the roles and responsibilities of each."

I would like the honourable members to go and read this to each and every school board, to each board of governors of each of the universities of Manitoba. I would like the Honourable Member for Minnedosa to go to Brandon, go to the two universities of Winnipeg and say to them, "Look, fellas, it is our feeling that there is not a clear and direct communication amongst yourselves, between you and the school trustees. There is misunderstanding in your role. You don't understand your role and your responsibility."

I would like the honourable member to tell the chairman of our boards of governors that they don't understand their roles, their responsibilities, because, Mr. Chairman, this is what his party says in this policy paper which their Leader said is going to be the policy come the next election campaign.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Minister's time has expired. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, I want the record to show that the Minister took his full 40 minutes, the 30 minutes that he is allowed to answer a simple question or two that he had been asked and he missed the whole point of course of the questions. It seems pretty obvious now that he is not anxious to finish his Estimates, he doesn't want to get them through because it gives him an opportunity to parade around in front of his staff like a peacock and preen his feathers and say, "What a great, grand and glorious Minister am I." Mr. Chairman, that is not going to serve the purpose that we're supposedly here for, but apparently it does something to the Minister's ego. He didn't touch on any of the problems I don't think and he missed the whole particular point. He seemed more concerned with carrying on with my previous employment record and I'll say to the Minister, and for the record, Mr. Chairman, that during my employment record I was never relieved from any position for incompetence or being unable to carry out my duties, but apparently the Minister is happy to drag all these in, instead of attending to his Estimates. I would suggest to the Minister that he has lost one portfolio, and he might very shortly lose another one.

Last night I hadn't intended to read that fairly lengthy letter into the record but it was the Minister's cocky attitude and his smart-alec remarks that he is prone to make whenever he is asked an honest and simple question when members on this side of the House are seeking information, that prompted me to read that letter into the record. I said last night I had dealt with many of his staff and had received complete co-operation and I had no complaints whatsoever with the staff, but I'll tell you, Mr. Chairman, that when a member of the Legislature calls one of the people in Student Aid, I am sure that we are given every courtesy, and we might get a little faster action than a student does and many many students become frustrated, and don't tell me that there's only one or two.

This particular case that I brought to your attention last night, I think is an exceptional case. There were many many circumstances with lost files, and certainly I know that files can be lost, but the Minister missed the whole point on the thing. I was merely asking him was he convinced and could he assure this House that the Student Aid department administratively was operating as smoothly and as efficiently as he felt was humanly possible with the amount of applications and whatnot that they received.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I answered that before, do you remember?

MR. BLAKE: Yes, 40 minutes, you did, and you still haven't answered it. He ridiculed my statement that a student should be able to go and borrow money. They should be entitled to a student loan without having it tied to a bursary. If they wanted to borrow money because it would teach them fiscal responsibility, I don't see anything wrong with that Mr. Chairman, and when I was in the banking business, certainly I made thousands of student loans, and I see nothing wrong with them. The banks at that time were charged with granting these loans, certainly they were government guaranteed loans and they received interest on them. It would be foolhardy to put out money without getting

some type of return on it. That's why banks make money, and operations such as this government gets into loses millions of dollars every year, because we use some business sense and financial responsibility in our financial dealings.

I see nothing wrong with a student being able to borrow money to fulfil their education and finish their education. There are many many students that have to borrow money outside of what they are able to get in bursaries and in student loans. There are many of them that have received money from banks and credit unions that they pay back later on when they are able to enter the work force. But, Mr. Chairman, what the problem is is when a youngster comes out of high school and applies for aid, then the financial resources of their families must be attached and must be disclosed. A student can leave high school and enter the work force for a year and come back and receive twice the benefits that one going right out of high school into the education field receives.

A MEMBER: Did you know that the Minister is ignoring you.

MR. BLAKE: I can see that, he's got the big smoke stack going again. Mr. Chairman, the letter that was read into the record last night illustrated a particular case that required a simple answer, not a 40 minute tirade that was more of an election speech than anything else, but the Minister is happy to stand around and stick his chest out and gaze up in the galleries where he has all his staff here and they'll be here for another three or four days if he continues to give us answers like he has given us this morning. There is absolutely no need for it. We're seeking simple quick answers to questions that are of concern to us and are of concern to people in our constituencies, and to suggest that I am opposed to student aid is the most stupid statement that he made this morning. He made many of them, but that had to be the stupidest one, because I realize what the education responsibilities and the costs are. I'm going through them myself. And the Minister just completely missed the point of the questions on this side of the House, but he's just happy to walk around and show off in front of his staff and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that that doesn't serve the purpose of this Committee and of these Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: On a point of order, I think that the members of the Committee have heard enough. This is the fourth time. This is being repetitious. They've implied motives, the fourth time that the same member is accusing the Minister of wasting time, and he's doing the same thing. It's all right to get something off your chest, but you don't have to repeat constantly the same thing and do exactly what you're accusing the Minister of doing. If we're going to get together fine, let's get it from both sides of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member from Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: I haven't taken my 40 minutes. I've maybe had five minutes and that's about all that I'm going to take. If I have to say that the Minister is happy to parade around and show off and preen his feathers in front of his staff well, I've only said it four times, but it's going to sink in sooner or later, because I'm certain his staff is well aware of what type of a Minister he is. I know many many of the people throughout this province are. That's why he's not in the portfolio that he had for awhile before and I doubt very much if he'll be in this one very much longer. What I'm saying is that when questions are asked of this Minister, we don't need 40 minute answers. The Minister of Health is pretty good at that himself. He stone-walled his department with 40 minute answers all the way through. But it's not necessary, if we're going to serve the requirements of this committee in getting answers to questions on the Estimates, and that's all we were seeking on this side of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to get on the record to correct some of the impressions that the Minister had implied and suggested that those of us on this side of the House were not in favour of student aid, that we were opposed to this and we were opposed to that and it's utter nonsense. We certainly feel that some of these programs can be streamlined in some way and the Minister hasn't assured us yet that the Student Aid Department is not without problems, that it's operating smoothly and efficiently and serving all the students to the best possible ability. I suggested there were some students that would be better off to get a full loan rather than a bursary.

It happened in the case of my own daughter. She applied for a student loan, applied for \$600 and I think she was granted a \$180, a loan. And come the end of the first semester, in January, the guidance counsellor says, "Why don't you apply for a bursary?" They gave her \$250 cold cash

that she doesn't have to pay back. She was willing to borrow \$600 and pay it back, but she got an outright gift of \$250.00. Certainly she appreciated it, — (Interjection)— certainly she took it.

This is what I'm saying, the idea can be modified and they can provide more assistance in some cases, and less in others. This is what gets the students frustrated. One student will be turned down on a loan, and I know one particular case where the two girls were rooming together. The one girl got \$1,000, the other girl was turned down because her mother was out working trying to get her through school. The first girl that got the \$1,000 wasn't even going to finish the course. She was getting married. This is what upsets students, and these are the things that I'm asking the Minister. Can he assure us that these things are very very rare? But, we don't need a 40 minute answer.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I hope that we can get down to discussing some of the

underlying basic principles of our Student Aid Program. In answer to the first question put by the honourable member, "Is the Student Aid Program operating as efficiently as it should be?" My answer is yes. There have been a number of changes instituted over the past 12 to 24 months — a reversion to a certain measure of manual processing of applications during the initial stages. One can rely on a computer to do many things much more rapidly than a person can, but there are matters of judgment which have to be exercised from time to time, which a computer can't and the application is kicked out and is delayed, because it's programmed to operate within certain guidelines, and it's kicked out and this causes a delay. Whereas if the initial processing, a certain degree of it were done manually, then that could be avoided, and that has been done. So I do not wish to be repetitious, I want to assure him that I'm satisfied that our program is operating very efficiently. In fact, from checking across Canada, I would say that we have one of the most efficient Student Aid Program operations in the whole country.

Now the honourable member is still concerned about — oh yes, to acquire independent status for Student Aid purposes one must be in the work force for two years. It's not one year as the honourable member stated. However, that's a minor point. But, the honourable member is still — (Interjection) — Under Manpower it is one year. If the honourable member was referring to Manpower assistance, yes, then it is one year. But if it is to acquire independent status for student aid purposes, it is two years.

Now the honourable member is still concerned about our Student Aid Program being tied into needs and this of course is a requirement under the Canada Student Loans Act and that is a requirement across Canada, not only in Manitoba. It is also a requirement in the Province of Ontario and what political party is the government there? — (Interjection) — The honourable member says maybe we should change it. Now, I am glad that the honourable member raised that question. Change it to what? Change it to what? I would like to know whether the honourable member would support a program whereby all students enrolled in post-secondary institutions would receive assistance regardless of need, pay everyone a stipend, and then You see, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member isn't even interested in listening. — (Interjection) — Well, I am responding to the question that the honourable member asked me just a few minutes ago.

Mr. Chairman, I wasn't aware that the Honourable Member for Minnedosa has the power and the authority of Chairman. I think if anyone has the authority to tell me to sit down, it is you and not the Member for Minnedosa.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Now I would like to know what he would suggest as an alternative, if he would do away with the means test simply to make student aid available upon application. On what basis, to anyone who applies? Allow them, grant them student aid. In other words if the son or daughter of a wealthy Tory friend of the honourable member should make application, whose father earns \$100,000 a year — (Interjection) — I know, many between their ears. Yes, suffering poverty between their ears, a lot of them, many and that is probably the reason why they are Tories.

I would like to know whether the honourable member is suggesting a student aid program that would be granted whereby assistance would be granted strictly upon, that all a student would have to do is make application and just give him a blank cheque, as it were. Is he suggesting that? Is he suggesting a universal student aid program? Maybe he is that because I would, like to see that, budget permitting. But, Mr. Chairman, I am asking the honourable member

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order has been raised. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Yes, on the point of order, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has already answered my question. I asked him a question, if he thought student aid was operating efficiently. He has already answered that question. Now as far as I am concerned he can sit down and let the Member for Assiniboia or Virden ask another question and we can get on with the Estimates. He doesn't have to carry on with this nonsense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please.

MR. HANUSCHAK: On the same point of order, Mr. Chairman. The honourable member asked me two questions and I believe that the Committee is entitled to a response to both questions and I think, Mr. Chairman, that the questions that I am asked, I am entitled to the right to respond to them. And I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, is the honourable member suggesting a universal student aid scheme without a means test, available to all, and then have the repayment tied at the other end, upon graduation, to the student's taxable earnings?

In other words the student who, upon graduation, and this has been proposed, this is nothing new, in fact this is being considered by the Council of

Education Ministers, a program similar to that, not that any approval has been given or any decision made, but we are looking at the possibility of universal aid to all and then the student upon graduation who gets into a \$35,000, \$40,000, \$50,000 a year job, he pays more, he pays off the student aid quicker. The student who enters into an occupation which pays less, he will pay less, and thus equality could be brought about in student aid. But initially everyone will be eligible for aid who asks

for it without a means test.

Now perhaps that is what the Conservative Party is suggesting when it says that student aid should not be tied to income of the applicant. If it is not going to be tied to the income of the applicant, then we have to give it to everyone. And if that is what the Conservative Party is suggesting, I would like to hear that because it in fact would strengthen my hand. Maybe that is what they are suggesting. I don't know. I haven't heard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions to the Minister. In one of his answers that he took 30 minutes, I believe he suggested or indicated why should universities be talking to high schools or vice versa, or something to that effect, that that was one of the policies in some paper that he was reading. —(Interjection)— I think there is a point in that paper. I think they should be talking. I think they should be talking and they are not, because at the present time you have indications from some of the staff at the university who are saying that the high schools are sending them a product that is not very good. And on the other hand' most principals in the secondary schools, in the high schools, they are saying "We are turning out a better product than we were turning out 20 years ago." And I believe they're right.

The only thing is that the staff at the university, instead of dealing with a small percentage of three or four percent of the top students in the province, now they're probably dealing with thirty percent and instead of 5,000 or 6,000 students, they have 20,000 in the universities or higher than that, and perhaps now the staff at the universities have to do a little more teaching than they used to do 15 years ago, so I think that it is time that there was some communication between the high schools and the universities. If the Minister feels there is no requirement, I disagree. I think there had better be some because, right now, you know, all you have to do is read the reports in the newspapers what some of the — (Interjection) — okay.

So, I have a question for the Minister. There has been some inconsistencies and problems with Student Aid and I know every year I get students come to see me with some difficulties, and I'm not saying that we should have a universal program but I do feel that in some instances, perhaps somebody may be treated harshly because a student has moved out of his home and is living by himself and perhaps, in some instances, almost no communication with his parents and in that case, you know, the parents income has no relevance to what the student requires and I think it would be sad that he would be turned down because the father is making some certain figure of money and he is not giving any to his children. In those cases, —(Interjection)— well, sure because I think that student should be . . .

A MEMBER: What do you bring people into the world for if you don't want to do anything like that?

MR. PATRICK: Well, I think that in that case the consideration should be given to the student. If he's living on his own, and he can't get any assistance from his parents, then I think that consideration should be given. Sure. —(Interjection)— Well, what other way are you going to get this student to pay his tuition? If he can't get it at home, he's not living at home, so how can you he pay his tuition? So there is a problem in those instances when they're not living at home.

The other point is, I think that the Minister himself indicated that there was a student aid consulting committee set up a year ago because there have been problems. I would like to know what kind of a report he received from the Student Aid Consulting Committee that has been in effect since last year? Have they made recommendations as far as the student aid program and the plan is concerned and have there been any changes in the plan instituted or implemented? I would like to hear what changes were brought about as a result of the Student Aid Consulting Committee. I know that we have bursaries in the secondary school system; we have bursaries for post-secondary; we also have, I believe, bursaries for the handicapped people and you know, I don't disagree, there are, I believe, special bursaries for teachers, for doctors and dentists and so you get into a whole variety of aid and bursaries and so on.

What I would really like to receive from the Minister because we have contact with the students continually coming to see us with some problems and this year you are going to have the Minister and all of us will have a greater difficulty dealing with students because they are having a difficult time finding jobs and I will tell the Minister that's the fact. You know, I have got two in my own house that worked for the last two years — university students— this year they are finding it difficult finding something, so as a result, in some instances where they will not be able to make any income, some of the students will . . . Perhaps the regulations will have to be relaxed to make sure that if they want to continue that they should continue.

But with the variety of bursary and student aid programs that we have, I think that the members in this House should be supplied with the application form. I'm not saying the applications of the applicants that have applied, and I am not interested in those applications, I think that the Minister should table with every member in this House an application that is used, what kind of an application is used, some kind of a pamphlet or booklet that describes all the bursaries and the kind of student aid

so that when I have a student come in to see me with his problem, you know even as an MLA, I think I should have something in my hand what's up to date, the most recent. I know the Minister can probably indicate and say, well you can phone the Student Aid Program and they'll send you something. Well, I think he will make it much easier for himself and for every member to deal with this problem if he can supply us with the kind of applications that are used, table with us some kind of booklet describing all the bursaries, all the aid programs that are available and I think that that would be easier but that has never been tabled in this House for quite a few years now and the programs have changed, so let's get something up to date. I would hope very shortly, before the next two weeks that the Minister would do this because I am getting calls and some of the problems that were pointed out, some of the other students have the same difficulty, they don't know why they're denied and they feel they are living on their own. Maybe their parents have some income, some of the students probably don't communicate with their parents. It happens, in many houses they move out and live on their own and they want to continue their education.

So I think it would make the Minister's job easier but it would certainly help us to help some of the students that come to see us if we have the information, the type of application total what's available. I would like to hear from the Minister, what has happened with that Student Aid Consulting Committee that was supposed to review the whole student aid program last year and, incidentally, apparently did a review and what have they recommended and what has happened?

So, the only other point that I would like to make is that I think that this year, this summer, I am sure that many students will have much greater difficulty in finding jobs than they did last year and, as a result, I just hope that as far as the Student Aid Program is concerned, it is not going to be hard and fast rules in every case that if somebody wants to continue, that we cut him off because his parents are making money and, in some instances, these students are not living at home and they are on their own or have been on their own for several years and I think that there should be consideration given in that instance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, with respect to students who, under the normal application of the guidelines criteria for student assistance, would have to be classified as dependent students but who, for reasons as the Honourable Member for Assiniboia indicated, there could be some extenuating domestic problems in the family and hence make it necessary and in the best interests of the student to move out, then that is taken into account by the Student Aid office and if that state of affairs is not caught in the initial stages of the processing of the student's application for aid, there is the opportunity for the student to appeal to the Student Aid Review Board and this happens and, in fact, if any students in the honourable member's riding or any that are brought to his attention that that should happen, then if I were the honourable member, I would encourage them to appeal to the Student Aid Review Board, and they have every right to do that and there they have an opportunity to present their case, to appear personally and to state, "Yes, I had been dependent on my parents up until recently; they had supported me but such and such happened in the home and I just cannot continue living and I find that it is essential, is necessary, it's in my best interest to move out. And cases of that kind do occur and I will — yes, I will be coming back to another . . . because this is related to another question that the honourable member put to me — But the student aid applicant in receiving his application, also receives a handbook which sets out the guidelines and the explanatory information related to the completion of the Student Aid form and in it is stated that the student's claim that there is a complete family breakdown and hence no family assistance is available — I'm sorry, to put it in its proper context, it is set up in question and answer form and I should read the question first to make this meaningful. The question is, what do I do if I feel the results of the assessment do not reflect my financial situation? How do I appeal? And it makes reference to the Student Aid Appeal Board. And among the kinds of cases the board is called upon to review are, and one of them is the student's claim that there is a complete family breakdown and hence no family assistance is available. Again, the Appeal Board must satisfy itself of the validity of the claim. The Board realizes that some things are painful to reveal and holds all personal information in strict confidence but, recognizing that, nevertheless it is a process that we and the Student Aid applicant must go through. I'll be coming back to that question in a moment.

Now, perhaps instead of dealing with them in order because the other is related to this, I thank the honourable member for drawing to my attention the desirability of distributing application forms to honourable members of the House. I apologize and regret for not having done so; it would be an excellent practice and it should be one that is followed annually because I do agree with the honourable member that all members can be of tremendous assistance to the Student Aid Branch and to the applicants for student aid if they can offer whatever advice and explanation that students may require in the completion of the forms. I agree that a member of the House would be handicapped if, in attempting to respond to an inquiry, if he is not familiar with the application, if he is not familiar with the nature or type of questions that are asked, the type of information that is being sought.

I would also suggest to all honourable members, and I will distribute a complete student aid application kit to every member of the House at the first opportune moment — I am not quite sure whether I have an adequate supply in my office at this moment but certainly either before the day is over — at the next opportune moment, either later today or on Monday, I will provide everyone with a kit. But what I can do in the meantime Mr. Chairman, I have three copies, perhaps they should be tabled for the record. I can table three copies at the moment and there is one for the House and one for the Official Opposition and one for the Liberal Party. I am giving honourable members the assurance that at the next opportune moment, every member will receive a kit.

The Student Aid Consulting Committee, it has made a number of recommendations to me particularly concerning Canada Student Loans criteria which are a matter of continuous revision on the year-to-year basis and recommendations from the Student Aid Consulting Committee, which consists of representatives from the post-secondary institutions, that is the students from the post-secondary institutions and staff and those recommendations are, in turn, submitted to the Canada Student Loan Plenary Committee, which is a Canadian Committee, for its consideration.

Now at a later point in time, I can certainly table the complete list of all the recommendations that the Consulting Committee has made. I should indicate that from year to year as changes are made in the Canada student loans criteria, that the recommendations of the Consulting Committee are taken under advisement and many of them eventually find themselves embodied in the regulations and the criteria.

The Honourable Member for Assiniboia also made mention of the fact that it appears that students are finding it more difficult this year to find employment. In setting the appropriation for student aid, which we have for this year, the determination of the level of support has been made, taking a number of factors into account, amongst which certainly was the matter of the anticipated employment opportunities, fully recognizing the fact that if a student's earning capacity will be zero dollars, then the level of student aid support will increase. In other words, the fewer dollars that he is able to earn, the higher the level of support that he would have to be offered. So therefore, the appropriation was set with that point in mind.

I do not wish to stray from the resolution which is being debated at the present time, Mr. Chairman, because we are dealing with student aid. Later in the Estimates we will be able to deal with student employment programs and determining the level at which we operate and assist student employment programs. In making that decision, we attempt to get a reading on the employment situation in the labour market in general in order to determine the level to which employment opportunities for students ought to be provided for or assisted out of the public purse as it were. But that is another resolution that we could debate more properly when it comes up for consideration by the Committee.

I want to assure the honourable member that the question of employment opportunities is certainly one of which the Student Aid Branch is mindful, and of which my department the government is mindful, in determining the level of support that will be available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR: Mr. Chairman, I would like to express appreciation for the book that has just come here. It does outline some of the questions that I was going to put. But firstly, I must say that in some of my constituents coming to me with problems that they were turned down or some hangup, and I think from Day One I have always received a very good hearing and I have been thinking here all morning, and I do not know of one that was turned down. That would go back into to the mid-Sixties when I think that the gentleman in charge was Mr. Gray and in recent years, the gentleman on the floor, Mr. Davies, and I have always found him in his executive power to use it right and generally the student was the beneficiary.

Now the question of whether we should show our income tax forms if some of our family is, or for some, a parent, I happen to really agree with this. Next year, it is very conceivable I will have three of my teenagers in either universities or colleges. I don't suppose I will go that route, but if I do, Mr. Chairman, I do think that the least I can do, if I am asking for tax dollars, whether it be in a loan because some of the interest there is really tax dollars, the least I can do is show my income tax forms. And I don't like showing my income tax form to anybody including the income tax people. But that's the law. And likewise, if I am using the tax dollars to my family or any other parent, I think the right attitude is that, that if you're getting money, tax dollars, you better show. I don't really quite agree with the Honourable Member for Assiniboia because if that was carried out, what he was suggesting, then wouldn't it be that every student would know of the game to play. And again, instead of a bursary and loan total in the last year of about \$13 million it would indeed go a good deal better.

I think in many areas, possibly there is room to tighten this up. I have a daughter in the University of Winnipeg this year and she continually tells me of her friends that are running around with so many thousands of dollars of bursaries and loans. I would like the Minister, if it could be possible, to put, if not today, in days ahead, give us a report of the ten largest loans, the ten largest bursaries. So then,

maybe these kids are picking up this talk at the university halls and maybe it is not right. But as my honourable colleague from Minnedosa did indicate, this is causing dissension. And I'm sure it is causing dissension if one is getting and one is not. I want my children to be brought up knowing that if I foot the bill, they're responsible to me and that's fine. But if the day comes that I cannot afford all of the things and when I say next year three, two years hence, probably I will have four in my family in universities or colleges. There may be a strain enough that I do have to go for help. I hope not. I don't think I will. But if I do, then I should own up to everything I have got, because I know there are people who I know very well, who have come to me for advice and I have looked at them straight in the eye and said, whoever they were, knowing their wealth, "I don't want to be associated with it. If you want to apply for your son and daughter, fine. I am not a stool-pigeon, but I'm not also going on your behalf."

Personally, what I would do, I would call this bursary award what it really is, a poverty award. If your parents are poor, you get an award. If your parents are not poor, you should not get an award. But we go along with the bursary and everybody often thinks a bursary and a scholarship are the same, in the public eye; and we know they're not. And I kind of somehow like the Member for Minnedosa's approach. If my son or daughter wanted a little help and wanted a loan, and I was willing to show all my finance, why not give them a loan. But it's true in many cases when they apply it comes, in most cases that I am aware, half a bursary and half a loan. And everybody is happy. Golly, if I was asking for a loan and the bank gives me half cash, surely I would smile knowing in my heart it's maybe wrong. But that's dollars and we're all a little selfish with these great non-payback type of grants.

So I would just like to register my support in whatever they are doing to tighten up the bursary system, the loan system and indeed, if they even got to go further than the income tax paper. . . Now I am not clear whether when they apply they actually do send a copy of their income tax papers or just put the figures that is on the income tax papers. But I guess the student aid people can find that fact out. I just say there's got to be a mechanism when we're using \$13 million to educate, that's \$13.00 for every nose or thereabouts in Manitoba and it seems like a pretty large sum, when indeed we're all trying to cut tax dollars. I think in this area, this could be cut down in some areas indeed I find out what the largest loan is, what the largest bursary is, or indeed, maybe ten or twelve of the largest and also the largest loan and bursary combined. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HANUSCHAK: It was indeed refreshing and pleasing to hear that there are some on the other side of the House who do favour the types of checks and balances which we do apply in . . . I'm sorry. — (Interjection) — Well, some are, some are. And amongst that number, I would include the Honourable Member for Virden.

In response to one of the main questions put to me by the Honourable Member for Virden, approximately six to seven percent of the applicants have needs in excess of \$3,200.00. The maximum level of support that we offer, that is a bursary and loan, is a total of \$3,200, which is \$1,800 loan, and \$1,400 bursary. That's the maximum. It will be about 700-plus. It is between six and seven percent of the 10,000-plus. So it would be about 700 who are at the maximum level. And then the others, I suppose I could . . . yes, I could give a breakdown of that because it's public information. I know that it is at the national level and so it certainly can be made known at the provincial. In fact I can give a complete breakdown of the distribution. Five percent have a need of \$600; another five, up to \$750; another ten, up to \$1,050; another five, over and above that, up to \$1,200.00.

Or let me read it as it is presented here, and this is the cumulative frequency, starting from zero percent and up to 100 percent, which is the maximum: 5 percent, \$600; 10 percent, \$750.00. So to make these figures meaningful, that means that 5 percent of the students have a need of \$600 or less; 10 percent have a need of \$750 or less, which subsumes the 5 percent that I have previously referred to, and so it goes; 20 percent, \$1,050; 25 percent, \$1,200; 30 percent, \$1,300; 40 percent, \$1,500; 50 percent, \$1,650.00. So about half of the students have a financial need of \$1,650 or less; 60 percent, \$1,800; 70 percent, \$1,950; 75 percent, \$2,100; 80 percent, \$2,250; 90 percent, \$2,700; 94 percent, \$3,200, and the remainder, over the \$3,200.00. So that is the distribution.

Now, in operating any program based on a needs test, on needs criteria, I must admit that one does run into problems or runs into situations where one student aid recipient may receive assistance at one level, his neighbour at another level, and perhaps at a lesser level, and the one receiving less may feel that his neighbour is not entitled to the additional number of dollars that he received, because in his opinion he has the impression that he and his family are economically better off.

Well, on occasion comparisons of that type and assessments of other people's incomes that we make in that fashion are not all that accurate because as all of us know, how can, and to what degree of accuracy, can any one of us assess or determine the level of income of our neighbour, of his net income? Which one of us knows what expenditures our neighbour has? We may have a general idea of his gross income, particularly if it is a person deriving the bulk of his income from a salary and the salary may be public knowledge. The salary of a civil servant is public knowledge. The salary of a school teacher is public knowledge. We have a general idea of the salary range of various occupation

groups so we may know what the gross income is, but we may not know what expenditures that particular individual has that are not public knowledge. There might be certain medical expenditures, drug expenditures, there might be a host of other expenditures that that family may have. I am talking about the person deriving his income from a fixed salary.

It becomes even more difficult for the bystander to assess the income of the self-employed person, of the farmer. It is true that from outward appearances, I don't know, I have never had the pleasure of visiting the Honourable Member for Virden at his home, at his farm. He tells me I am welcome and I hope I would be welcome to visit many members of the other side. I suppose if I were to visit him, if I were to visit another member, I may look around his property, his home, and it may create a certain impression. I may formulate a certain impression that on the basis of the manner in which the Honourable Member for Virden dresses, what he eats, how he eats, what he drinks, I may form the impression he is a very very poor man. Or I may visit another and he may create an impression upon me that he is an extremely wealthy man and I may be wrong on both. And you know, it is this type of assessment that the Honourable Member for Virden is an extremely wealthy man. Now he well may be; I don't know. —(Interjection)— I believe the Honourable Member for Fort Garry is trying to tell me he is a multi-millionaire or something. I don't know. But these are types of judgments that are often made and on the basis of judgments made in that fashion, complaints are relayed to me, complaints are relayed to honourable members of this House on both sides and in turn relayed to me, or a member will call me up or write me a letter and he will say, "I received a complaint from a constituent of mine and he had received X dollars of assistance and he knows that his neighbour, who drives two cars, who has a bigger combine, who farms an additional half-section of land, who obviously must be earning more money, but his son or his daughter received \$300 or \$500 more." Well, as I have said, one cannot assess his neighbour's income on that basis.

So what I am really saying is that what may appear on the surface to be unfair or inequitable, in fact one would probably find is very fair because upon our assessment of the applicant's income, — though it is true he may farm an additional half-section of land or an additional section of land — but after looking at whatever expenses he may have, his net disposable income may be much less than that of the farmer who appears to be poorer. And that is the problem that often arises.

And of course I will admit, as I have in past years, that there is a certain amount of leakage and hence we have the 5 percent audit. Now we have stepped up the 10 percent audit to do a double check, to make sure that there aren't applicants receiving additional dollars out of the public purse that they are not entitled to, and the audit does uncover that from time to time. I would suspect, Mr. Chairman, that it is absolutely impossible to devise a program that will be absolutely foolproof, absolutely leakproof, no more than it is possible to write and administer the Income Tax Act so it would be absolutely leakproof. From time to time people find a way of getting around paying their share of income tax that is properly due to the State and the Crown and they do that.

But what I will say, Mr. Chairman, is this, that for every dollar or two that some student receives, which perhaps if we had a massive policing mechanism devised he would not receive, for every dollar or two received in that fashion it gives me satisfaction to know that there are thousands of dollars paid out to tens of thousands of students receiving student aid who are able to continue their post-secondary education with the benefit of student aid. If there were no Student Aid Program, they would not be enrolled in our schools today. And I think that is far more significant. So for every dollar that may slip through, there are thousands of dollars paid to legitimate claimants, to legitimate recipients who are entitled to each and every cent of each and every dollar that they receive and they are able to continue with their post-secondary education. They appreciate it, as honourable members will recall from a couple of letters which I read earlier this morning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 12:30, Committee rise. Resolution 44(a)(1)—pass. Resolution 44(a)(2) Other Expenditures \$151,400—pass. Resolution (3) Assistance \$4,450,400—pass. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that the report of the Committee of Supply be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 12:30, I am now leaving the Chair to return after the noon recess at 2:30.