

THE HUMAN ELEMENT IN HOUSING

An Evaluation of

The Manitoba Remote Housing Program

MANITOBA METIS FEDERATION

James N. Kerri

Consultant-Human Resource

Development & Research

SEVEN TRUTHS FOR HUMAN CONSERVATION

Some people accept conditions as they are.

Some people ask why conditions are as they are.

Some people accept the reason why conditions
are as they are!

I ask why conditions cannot be changed?

I accept that conditions can be changed.

I accept that our people can change these conditions.

I predict that our people together will change
these conditions.

Marvin W. Hunt
Manitoba Metis Federation
August, 1971

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

FOREWORD

Acknowledgement

List of Tables

1. THE PROBLEM OF HOUSING IN REMOTE COMMUNITIES: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- Introduction

Why a Special Program

The Remote Housing Program

2. DESCRIPTION OF HOUSING CONDITIONS

- Characteristics of Sample

Space

Utilities

Convenience of Location

Shower, Toilet, Garbage Disposal and Pollution

Repairs, Maintenance and Other Expenses

Development and Improvement

Respondents' Conception of the Remote Housing Program

Major Defects, Maintenance, Use and Other Physical Conditions

Changes in Life Styles

3. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- Summary

Recommendations

LIST of TABLES

Table I	page	9
Table II	page	10
Table III	pages	16 & 17
Table IV	pages	19, 20 & 21
Table V	pages	22 & 23
Table VI	page	24
Table VII	pages	26 & 27
Table VIII	page	28
Table IX	page	29
Table X	page	31
Table XI	page	31
Table XII	page	32
Table XIII	page	33

STAFF and COMMITTEES of the PROJECT

STAFF

Marvin Hunt	- Project Co-ordinator and Committees' Chairman
James N. Kerri	- Research Consultant
Alex Sim	- Associate Consultant
Joe Sawchuk	- Research Assistant
Sharon Smith	- Secretary
Alan Ross	- Field Worker
Napoleon Bernardin	- Field Worker
Steve Lavallee	- Field Worker
Ovide Mercredi	- Field Worker
Russell Houle	- Field Worker

STEERING COMMITTEE

Marvin Hunt ,	- Committee Chairman and Remote Housing Evaluation Project Co-ordinator
Campbell McCallum	- Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation
Freeman H. Compton	- Community Development Services
J. Angus Spence	- President, Manitoba Metis Federation
J. I. Keeper	- Department of Health & Social Development
James N. Kerri	- Consultant, Remote Housing Evaluation Project

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Marvin Hunt	- Committee Chairman, Co-ordinator of Remote Housing Evaluation Project
R. N. Clarkson	- Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation
P. Thompson	- Manitoba Northern Affairs
S. Fulham	- Executive Director, Manitoba Metis Federation
A. V. MacDonald	- Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation
J. Cels	- Health and Social Development
J. C. Scott	- Union of Manitoba Municipalities
A. Koerte	- School of Architecture, University of Manitoba
J. N. Kerri	- Consultant, Remote Housing Evaluation Project

COMMENTATORS ON FINAL REPORT

Dr. Raymond E. Wiest	- University of Manitoba
Miss Yvonne Lozinski	- Winnipeg

A C K N O W L E D G E M E N T S

We wish to acknowledge the valuable assistance of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for completely funding this project, as well as the constant advice of its field staff and representatives in Winnipeg.

We are grateful also to the Manitoba Departments of Health and Social Development and Northern Affairs, the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, the Center for Settlement Studies of the University of Manitoba and the various locals and Regional Offices of the Manitoba Metis Federation for their assistance and co-operation throughout the length of this study. To all those in the various communities we visited, sincere gratitude is expressed, and for those who were asked to open their doors to us, often at very short notice (in fact, sometimes without advance notice) we wish to express our recognition and appreciation of their patience. There are innumerable people who gave us helping hands; to these we are also grateful.

F O R E W O R D

The housing conditions in Metis communities across the country are without question the most deplorable in Canada.

We look around and can truthfully say a home is not a privilege but a right. A right with regards to equality of living and equal opportunity for development to all Canadians in our Western society. A just Society — just — regardless of ethnic origin? A Canadian Welfare country? No, a country that must be made aware, and given the opportunity for improvement and the resulting awards that follow.

People talk of social problems! We all should talk about causes of social problems. Never should one attack the problem. It is the cause that we should attack if we want to solve or minimize the problem. Most problems are a product of causes accumulated over a period of time, hence these problems cannot be easily forgotten or put aside.

The need for the creation of communication and understanding of such problems must be done by our people for our people.

The findings of this report bear out the fact that houses being built under the Remote Housing Program are totally inadequate and sub-standard in terms of design, size, construction cost and location.

The Manitoba Metis Federation expects this report to be the prelude to meaningful housing programs providing more homes of a higher standard, comparable to the standard enjoyed by the majority of our Canadian society.

by:

J. Angus Spence, President
Manitoba Metis Federation

C H A P T E R O N E

THE PROBLEM OF HOUSING IN REMOTE COMMUNITIES:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

INTRODUCTION

The problem of better housing for Manitobans in remote communities has been under discussion by the various governments for a long time, but it was not until the 1950's that it received its first significant consideration. Remote areas, because of the smallness of their populations, their transient character and their apparent lack of strong economic base (except for some old and relatively new industrial centers) were not considered stable enough communities to justify large investments in housing. This view was not significantly changed by the emergence of industrial towns in the North, before, during and immediately after the World Wars. However, with the acceleration of the development of previously unexploited resources in the North, new towns began to spring up in places where there were no sedentary populations or where there were only sparsely settled communities. With the exploitation of these new resources there arose the need to provide for houses to accommodate the workers and their families as well as all those who were attracted to these new centers. It is estimated that about 46 such new centers sprang up in Canada between 1945 and 1957.

The need for housing in these new industrial centers like Thompson, The Pas, Lynn Lake, etc., brought to the attention of policy makers the need for consideration of housing programs for less fortunate remote communities lacking the strong economic base of those like the new industrial centers. But this attention did not assume any meaningful direction; even in the new towns most of the accommodations consisted of camps and bunk houses. Thus the problem of housing still remained acute in most remote communities.

It was not until the late 1950's when the Indian and Metis Annual Conferences began to put pressure on the governments that some indication of positive results began to emerge. The introduction of a housing program on Reserves by the Federal Department of Indian Affairs served to lend support to the need of adequate housing in the remote communities not covered by the Reserve housing program. As most of these communities outside the reserves are predominantly inhabited by Metis (non-registered people of Indian ancestry) the Metis groups in remote areas began to form housing associations. These housing associations, working through the Indian and

Metis Conferences, continued to apply pressure on the Manitoba Provincial Government to set up a special housing program aimed principally at remote areas. It was argued that the then existing housing programs did not take into consideration the special difficulties present in remote areas, especially since the Reserve housing program does not cover predominantly Metis communities or even Metis living on reserves. When in 1966 the Provincial Government of Saskatchewan introduced the Remote Housing Program, the Metis Housing Associations seized on the Saskatchewan example to bring further pressure to bear on the Manitoba Government.

To strengthen their arguments these housing associations, now amalgamated under the Manitoba Metis Housing Associations, initiated housing surveys in the various communities. With the incorporation of the Manitoba Metis Federation in 1967, the Manitoba Metis Housing Associations became the Housing Committee of the Manitoba Metis Federation. It was this committee of the Manitoba Metis Federation that concluded the housing survey that was started earlier by the housing associations, and made a representation to the Hellyer Task Force on Housing in the fall of 1967.

Not until early in 1968 did the Manitoba Government begin looking at ways and means of initiating and implementing a remote housing program and form an Advisory Committee on Metis housing. This Advisory Committee was composed of representatives from the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, the Department of Health and Social Development (Community Development Branch) and the Housing Committee of the Manitoba Metis Federation. The committee was never intended as a substitute for any action which Metis people and Metis settlements in consultation with each other would wish to take. The Advisory Committee was not intended to take the pressure off the government, it was claimed, but was intended as an additional resource to be utilized by both the Metis people and government agencies to formulate concrete proposals for solutions to the housing problems.

The various housing associations and the Housing Committee of the Manitoba Metis Federation made significant contributions towards establishing the urgency for a remote housing scheme. In a report on housing presented to the Manitoba Government by the Manitoba Metis Federation in July, 1968, the Manitoba Metis Federation demanded a positive remote housing program that would combine job training, employment, family involvement and community development with a realistic housing program. Such a program, it was felt, would assist

in achieving better standards of living, and hence make for improvement in health, education and community participation.

In this report, the Manitoba Metis Federation identified its concern for several thousand families of Metis and enfranchised Indians in rural Manitoba, most of whom were in desperate need of adequate housing and did not share in the Federal programs legally belonging to the Treaty Indians. These people were found in deplorable living conditions stemming mainly from a sub-standard economic situation. The report briefly describes what it referred to as the "deplorable living conditions:"

In many areas houses are so worthless that residents seldom bother to spend money on improvements or make an effort to repair them. Broken windows are patched with cardboard boxes. Rusty cream cans are used for water storage. It is rare if there is more than one bed and more than one or two chairs. When a visitor eats at home, he usually is given the few dishes and silverware, while the family eats out of the tin pans or even tin cans.

Most homes have no electricity. Kerosene lamps are the only source of light. In many communities, water is scarce and has to be hauled long distances. Often it is unfit for human consumption.

Bed bugs and lice swarm over the cracked walls and floors and are a plague to everyone, especially infants.

Most of the roofs leak. If the floor is dirty, as most often they are, it becomes soaked and muddy everytime there is rain. Windows are small and few. To contain heat during the winter, walls are plugged with mud and cardboard. Tin heaters are often the only means of heating the shacks. It is a log, cardboard and mud ghetto that spells fire traps.

It was conditions such as those described in the above quotation that the Manitoba Metis Federation demanded immediate rectification. The Manitoba Metis Federation recommended that the Manitoba Government, with the other two Prairie Provinces, request a Federal-Provincial Conference to develop a housing program for people living in poverty areas. It was also recommended that both senior levels of government recognize human needs and give adequate consideration and priority to the needs of all economically deprived peoples. The Manitoba Metis Federation suggested that a low cost housing program could be designed and developed that would fulfill the present expectations of low-income families with respect to space, privacy and a healthful environment, and which would not overburden the families with high cost for operation and maintenance.

Various local housing committees also took serious steps towards helping to identify possible solutions to the housing problem. The people from the predominantly Metis settlements of Big Eddy, Umperville, Young's Point and The Pas formed "The Pas Metis Housing Association." They sent ten of their members to Cumberland House in Alberta to study the Saskatchewan Government's remote housing project. On the basis of this study they asked the Federal and Provincial Governments to establish a similar program in Northern Manitoba. In a letter to the Premier of Manitoba, dated February 11, 1968, The Pas Metis Housing Association states, "in our attempts to have our housing conditions improved, we have been investigating possible housing programs for The Pas. The possible program which has the support of all our members is a program similar to the Metis Housing plan in Saskatchewan. We feel that this would best meet the needs of the Metis people in The Pas." Similar pressures also came from the Dauphin area.

It was through the assistance of such contributions by the locals and the Manitoba Metis Federation and other various meetings and discussions that the Advisory Committee on Metis Housing was finally able to reach a decision to advise the Government to adopt a plan similar to that of the Saskatchewan Remote Housing Program. In that same year (1968), an agreement was signed between the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation of the Province and the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for the financing of 100 homes for a two-year period. The Manitoba Metis Federation was asked to select ten communities and rank them in terms of priority. Over a two year period (1969 - 1970), ten houses would be built in each of the ten communities at the rate of five communities per year. It is this housing project, more appropriately referred to as the Remote Housing Program that is the sole concern of our evaluation. Before the purpose and rationale of this evaluation is spelled out, a brief examination and explanation of the contents of the program is given. A discussion of why housing is a problem in these remote communities and why it calls for a special government action is also briefly presented.

Why a Special Program

The deplorable housing conditions existent in remote communities have been alluded to in the preceding subsection. In the same place it was also explained how such problems gave rise to the peoples' demands for better housing and how eventually a remote housing program was set up. At this juncture, we

need to look into the factors that brought about such poor housing conditions and a relatively low economic base, and why a special government action is therefore deemed necessary.

Remote communities in the North have basically been exploited for various resources used to run the diverse industrial units in the South. The case briefly stated, indicates that the dominant industrialized South moved very abruptly into remote communities to extract resources for processing and use in the South. In this export exploitation move, previous populations of remote communities (predominantly Indians and Metis) were contracted as labourers with no sharing of profits outside payment of wages which were sometimes too low and involved short employment periods. As this export of resources from the remote communities, that served as areas of extraction, was going on, new life styles were simultaneously introduced, resulting in new needs for technological gadgetry. Hence, increased costs of living which inadequate wages could not meet.

In addition, these populations were also displaced from their original forms of livelihood (i.g., trapping, fishing, etc.)

One of the resulting new life styles involved new housing standards of the dominant industrialized sector, which are only obtainable through the expenditure of cash, construction by specialist builders, and use of materials mostly processed in the factories in the South. Since these populations lacked the cash, the specialists and the materials and since they have been displaced from their original means of livelihood, their housing conditions and other affected aspects, gradually depreciated into a deplorable state. They became in other words, victims of circumstances that enriched the South while depriving the North. It meant therefore, that if the people are to continue to live in these communities, a special government action is called for, to rectify such injustices (intended and unintended). This is why a special housing program is justified, and in the next section, we briefly discuss the scope of such a program.

The Remote Housing Program

Under the agreement establishing the Remote Housing Program, the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and the Province of Manitoba provide the funds required, on a shared basis, with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation providing 75% and the Province 25%. The purchasers of the home are charged an

annual or monthly payment based on a schedule of "family income" (see Appendix I). The difference between the scheduled payments and the amount required to cover amortization of the capital provided over a 15-year term, plus taxes, fire insurance and other approved costs, is shared as a subsidy at the ratio of 75% Central Mortgage and Housing and 25% Province. Any losses incurred are shared on the same basis.

The purchaser of a home is required to make a downpayment of at least \$200. This payment could be made by way of labour provided towards the construction of a home by a recipient. For example, the recipients were allowed to deduct \$100 if they assumed the responsibility of external painting of the house. The agreement provides that the houses can be constructed only in designated areas — in this case, in remote communities outside organized municipalities and cities in the North. The families are responsible for the maintenance of their properties. The Government does not provide assistance for this purpose.

The purchaser of a home cannot negotiate a private sale to another person as long as the mortgage remains in effect. The house reverts to the Province if the purchaser moves out or vacates the property for some other reason. The title and ownership are both held by the Province but these revert to the purchaser at the end of the 15-year period if the purchaser satisfies all the obligations including payments.

The construction of the first 100 houses during the years 1969 and 1971 was undertaken by the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. Prior to construction, the Housing Committee of the Manitoba Metis Federation was presented with house models prepared by the Architects Consortium. From these models, two were chosen as being the ones most suitable within the price range provided by the program. Through the co-ordinated efforts of the Manitoba Metis Federation, the local housing committees in the ten chosen communities were asked to select those they considered to be most in need of housing, on the basis of criteria set by them.

Since each community set its own criteria for selecting housing recipients, a wide range of factors were considered. In Camperville, all 13 applicants were interviewed individually. After the interviews, the executives of the local met to decide on who should be approved for housing. They decided that no Welfare recipients would be accepted during the first year of the

Project, and that all recipients had to have a job and enough income (earnings) to pay the rent or make the mortgage payments. In addition, they agreed to favour large families, and to keep all applications of applicants not accepted in the first year for another year, in case more housing became available then. The local executives expected some approved recipients to drop out either before or during the construction phase, so they set up a list of alternatives.

In Pelican Rapids, however, the selection committee based their decision on four factors, namely, (i) those who had sufficient income, (ii) those families who were on permanent Welfare, (iii) those families with a large number of dependents, and (iv) those with very poor housing. In Grand Rapids, a three-point system for selecting recipients was used. Each applicant was awarded points as follows: (i) If they were a resident of Grand Rapids they received two points, but if they were from elsewhere, they received one point. Also, if their spouse was from Grand Rapids, they were awarded two points and one point if from elsewhere. (ii) Applicants were awarded two points if they were steadily employed (for example, as a fisherman). (iii) Applicants were awarded one point for each child.

In Berens River, people living common-law were considered ineligible, irrespective of the degree to which they satisfied other requisite conditions. This was not a disqualifying factor in other communities.

Since most of the criteria used were arrived at through a general consensus of each of the communities concerned, there was little or no complaint about their use. Nevertheless, it must be pointed out that the absence of any grievances does not necessarily imply perfection. In some of these communities the residents are gradually beginning to realize that need rather than economic ability to pay should be the primary factor. In fact, they are beginning to argue that houses should be provided in remote communities regardless of the lack of a strong economic base.

In recommending the ten communities that were covered under the first two-year program, the general housing conditions in these areas were taken into consideration by the selection body, the Housing Committee of the Manitoba Metis Federation. The decision and arrangement to allow the Manitoba Metis Federation to recommend the communities proved expedient for two reasons. First, the Manitoba Metis Federation, because of its organizational structure (an affiliation or federation of various local associations of Metis all over the Province) was in a far better position to involve the people in the setting up of

priorities than a single government agency could hope to achieve. Second, the presence of the Manitoba Metis Federation in this selection gave some credence to the wisdom of the selection and hence minimized the complaints that would have emerged from the communities that were left out. Moreover, the awareness and co-operation that were created by MMF involvement are additional advantages. As indicated in the preceding subsection, the Manitoba Metis Federation had done a lot of ground work in getting the Remote Housing Program started in Manitoba and in exposing the deplorable housing conditions existent in these communities. The government is better off planning such programs through such non-profit organizations. Such organizations may not have the best experts available but they are usually more in touch with the realities of the situation and have more contacts with those who live with the situation. Obviously, the old saying: "He who wears the shoes knows where it pinches" has some unavoidable truth in it.

At the beginning of the construction of these units there was a general understanding that local labour would be utilized as much as possible to provide the homeowners not only with employment but also some experience and training. Employment in construction was to provide a source of income to enable them to make the initial \$200 downpayment.

This understanding and some other factors discussed in Table I have significant bearings on the actual cost analysis of the project, compiled by the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. In Table I, these costs are given under several subheadings.

The cost of materials for both Berens River and the Pas is comparatively higher than that in other locations. For Berens River this is easily explainable because access to it is mainly by steam boat. Air transportation could not have been used for transporting such heavy material. Unlike the other places, Berens River is not accessible by road, the cheapest way of transporting building materials to remote communities. In The Pas, the high cost of materials was the result of mismanagement which resulted in the change of foreman and consequently most of the crew members. In the course of these changes, various materials were lost due to theft or duplication of use. In fact, it is difficult to separate the cost of transportation from the cost of materials because the materials were bought through separate tenders and the prices quoted included on-the-spot delivery.

TABLE 1

COST ANALYSISREMOTE HOUSING

January 31, 1971

<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>MATERIALS</u>	<u>LABOUR</u>	<u>LAND</u>	<u>SUPERVISION</u>	<u>SUNDRY</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Amaranth, Bacon Ridge (10 Units)	\$ 48,399.50	\$ 28,207.26	\$ 2,293.61	\$ 1,968.39	\$ 3,662.12	\$ 84,530.88
Berens River (10 Units)	54,248.79	41,627.71	5,000.00	2,124.41	5,161.17	108,162.08
Camperville, Duck Bay 6 (10 Units)	49,291.69	29,158.26	1,131.82	2,773.91	3,176.29	85,531.97
Wabowden (10 Units)	49,907.95	48,955.96	1,203.00	2,124.42	4,391.98	106,583.31
The Pas (Big Eddy, Young's Pt.) (10 Units)	54,190.14	72,863.98	3,085.82	2,124.39	8,980.95	141,245.28
Totals	<u>\$256,038.07</u>	<u>\$220,813.17</u>	<u>\$12,714.25</u>	<u>\$11,115.52</u>	<u>\$25,372.51</u>	<u>\$526,053.52</u>

TABLE 2
SCHEDULE "A"

1. In this Schedule:

- (a) "Family income" means the aggregate gross income in whatever form received by all members of a family, whether earned income or transfer payments, except family allowances.
- (b) "Family" means a natural family consisting of a family head and one or more persons related by blood, marriage or adoption and in addition to a natural family may include other persons known to have lived regularly as an inherent part of the family group and whose earnings and resources are available for use in meeting and living expenses of the group, but shall not include a group of unrelated persons living together, lodgers or persons living alone.

2. Each "Family" occupying each of the houses will be charged in accordance with their "family income" as listed below:

<u>Monthly Family Income</u>	<u>Monthly Payment</u>	<u>Monthly Family Income</u>	<u>Monthly Payment</u>	<u>Monthly Family Income</u>	<u>Monthly Payment</u>
\$ 50-54	\$ 5	\$ 170	\$ 34	\$ 290	\$ 63
55	6	175	36	295	64
60	7	180	37	300-304	66
65	8	185	38	305	67
70	9	190	39	310	68
75	11	195	40	315	69
80	12	200-204	42	320	70
85	13	205	43	325	72
90	14	210	44	330	73
95	15	215	45	335	74
100-104	17	220	46	340	75
105	18	225	48	345	76
110	19	230	49	350-354	78
115	21	235	50	355	79
120	23	240	51	360	80
125	24	245	52	365	81
130	25	250-254	54	370	82
135	26	255	55	375	84
140	27	260	56	380	85
145	28	265	57	385	86
150-154	30	270	58	390	87
155	31	275	60	395	88
160	32	280	61	400	90
165	33	285	62		

- 3. In no case will a "family" be required to pay more than that required to meet the full operating costs of the house occupied by it.
- 4. In order to provide for families receiving income at irregular intervals, adjustment will be made annually at December 31st to ensure payments are related to total annual income.

For example, one tender gave a higher transportation cost and a lower material cost, while another gave just the opposite on bids for identical location. The Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation accepted the tender for the lowest total cost, regardless of how this was broken down according to materials and transportation. This method seemed to be the most expedient one to adopt under the circumstances.

With regards to the labour, the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation recruited the carpenter/foreman while the rest of the crew were recruited locally or brought in from outside where qualified labour could not be obtained locally. The foreman was brought in from outside in most cases because in most of the communities, a local foreman could not be found. However, in Camperville, Duck Bay and Wabowden, the entire work force was locally recruited. This worked well except in Wabowden where the foreman had to be changed because he was found incapable. In The Pas, a few set-backs did occur and this accounts for the excessively higher cost of labour in this area. In The Pas the foreman was changed twice and the entire crew was changed once; they were found incapable by the MHERC.

In recruiting labour for the construction, preferences were given to recipients of the Remote Housing Program, who wanted to work and were qualified for the jobs they sought. Recipients were employed to work on the total project in the community, not necessarily on their own houses. However, not that many took advantage of the opportunity — three were accepted in Amaranth, one in Camperville, two in Grand Rapids and one in Thicket Portage (although he was later fired for incompetence). It was only in Amaranth that one person requested Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation to deduct the payments for the house from his salary. The Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation also offered to pay \$100 of the \$200 down payment if the recipients painted the house themselves. In many places this offer was taken up and subsequent inspection proved that their performance, except in a very few cases, was satisfactory.

The training aspect of the program was a failure. The nature of the job, i.e. its short duration, did not allow the workers enough time to learn enough of lasting value. Working on a few houses obviously does not make a beginner a carpenter. As a minimum it takes time, effort, training and experience — and these did not result from the participation of the Natives in the

construction. Also, the use of inexperienced men, as part of the training objective, drove the costs up because of the resultant lowered efficiency. For the same reason, the idea of hiring local labour also contributed to the high cost of these houses.

There is a conflict of interests and objectives in such a program aimed at providing training, employment for local labour, and cheap houses. Training necessarily involves relatively high costs and time, and local labourers are not always the best candidates. Hence, houses at low costs could not be attained, in spite of the fact that the average payment for the lots was about \$100 per lot, and this included the cost of clearing the bush. Extra costs also resulted from other sundry sources such as expenses on the board and room and travelling of the workmen, local small purchases, bulldozer and other equipment rentals. On the whole, a crew of six took about one month to build a house. Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation also hired a part-time supervisor who was responsible for liaison with foremen at the building sites and the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. There was also periodic inspection by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and MHRC and a final inspection as well.

Towards the end of 1970 and beginning of 1971, the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation entered into agreement with the recipients of the homes, authorizing their occupancy of these houses as they became available. Two aspects of the agreement are considered here (the full text of the agreement appears as Appendix I). The first of these is the clause which stipulates that the monthly payments which the purchaser agrees to make shall be based upon his estimated total family income for the year in which the agreement came into force, and shall be adjusted as of December 31st of that year and of the 31st of December every year thereafter on the basis of the purchaser's actual total family income for that year. The payments are based on schedule "A" which appears below in Table 2. If at the time of adjustment, the family income has increased or decreased, adjustments to the payments will be made, but will become effective only for the oncoming calendar year. This has some advantages in that if the income increases after the adjustment, the recipient's payment will not necessarily be automatically increased, until the end of the year when the income is reviewed. There is therefore, a safeguard in this clause.

The other aspect of this agreement that is discussed here deals with the subsidy involved in the project. A purchaser makes payments for the house on a basis of the family income for over a period of fifteen years, at the end of which he assumes title and ownership to the land and house respectively. The difference between his total payments over this period and the actual costs of the house including taxes and interests is made up by the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation and the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation (see preceding subsection) by means of a subsidy. However, this subsidy does not become part of the purchaser's equity to the house if he pulls out of the agreement before the end of the fifteen-year period or before the full payments are made.

In spite of these advantages and subsidization, various problems did arise. A source of dissatisfaction was the complaint of some of the residents of the affected communities that they were not adequately involved in the planning and actual construction of the units. The Wabowden Metis Association Local, in a note to one of the Provincial Ministers, plainly pointed out that

"Progress on the homes has been slow and exceedingly erratic with no evidence of activity for days on end. This lack of progress was blamed on wet weather but other homes under construction were not held up and this produced much comment...."

Apparently the approved recipients of the new homes, expecting to move into these units before the winter, did not undertake to repair their old homes for the coming cold season. They were therefore naturally worried that they would have to spend another cold winter with inadequate accommodation.

In Amaranth there were a substantial number of complaints. In this area they claimed that the people were not adequately involved in the decisions pertaining to the site locations and the setting up of the three alternative house models. The only involvement, they claimed, was that the head of the household was able to work on the construction of the house. Of course, in some communities, none of the people now living in the houses were involved in the building of the houses and this was due to the fact that those who originally applied backed out.

Some of the residents complained about inaccurate information about the total cost of the house, the implications for the seasonally unemployed and Welfare recipients, and for the fate of those fishermen who have been permanently rendered unemployed as a result of the mercury contamination of the lakes and river. They were also not sure of the title to the land on which some of the houses were built, land originally owned by the recipients. They even went further to point out that the Remote Housing Project had led to a series of side effects, such as larger distances to relatives, places of employment, recreation and shopping centers, schools and offices, as well as churches and other places of interest. Increased cost of living resulting from both the rental scale and cost of utilities were also mentioned. The individuals in areas under municipal boundaries, who were not covered by the Remote Housing Project, also voiced their dissatisfaction. Because it did not take into consideration the number of dependents in each family, the rental scale was considered a poor measuring rod of ability to pay. This proved equally a source of complaint in many quarters. Dissatisfaction with the physical aspects of the units resulting either from construction or plan deficiencies were also strongly expressed. The exclusion of Welfare recipients in some communities led to the question of the benefit of the program to Welfare recipients, those most financially in need of assistance.

It was these sources of dissatisfaction, some of which are further elaborated in the next section, that led to the setting up of the Remote Housing Evaluation Project, the purpose of which we will briefly examine in the succeeding subsection.

The Remote Housing Evaluation

The scope and objectives of the evaluation were based on the assumption and contention that the Remote Housing Program was set up

1. to provide adequate private housing in remote areas of Manitoba for families at prices they could afford, since these families could not afford housing through the normal channels of house financing.
2. to involve the people in the various phases of the project, including preliminary planning, construction, and post construction.
3. to alleviate the problem of poor and inadequate housing that has been predominant in remote areas.

Given these objectives of the program, the evaluation project was consequently aimed at achieving the following.

1. to determine whether the Remote Housing Program is really doing what it was and is intended to do,
2. to identify the side effects of the Remote Housing Program on the individual, the communities, and the total target population (predominantly Metis),
3. to find out how the program could be improved from the point of view of the Metis people themselves and individual householders,
4. to ascertain alternative methods that can better achieve the program goals of the Remote Housing Project,
5. to identify specifically the peoples' understanding of why the project has been a success or a failure,
6. and finally, to justify with sound and adequate supporting evidence the reasons for an ongoing program in either the original form or in a modified or completely new direction.

Given these six groups of objectives, regarded as the task of the project the implementation took several directions, summarily grouped into three:

1. Collection of the relevant background information on why and how the Remote Housing Program was set up, including an attempt to account for the problems that necessitated the evaluation.
2. Administration of questionnaires (see Appendix II) to all the household heads of the families currently residing in the Remote Housing units, and to an equal number of other family heads in communities so far covered by the program. The questionnaires were also given out to a third group of heads of households in communities not yet covered by the Remote Housing Program. The questionnaire served as an instrument through which we were able to identify the residents' perception of the effectiveness, advantages and disadvantages of the Remote Housing Program, as well as the physical and social impact of the program on the individual and the community. The information obtained through the use of this instrument was substantially supplemented by the field reports and assessments of the field workers who were involved in extensive observation, participant observation and informal interviews (written and tape recorded).
3. Consultations with various governmental agencies at the Federal and Provincial levels were also held to help clarify the implications of the project for people in various categories, for example: Welfare recipients and senior citizens.

It is through the above directions that we were therefore able to carry out the evaluation in the preceding sections of this paper and in the subsequent sections. In the next chapter, following a brief examination of the characteristics of the sample obtained through the questionnaire, an analysis of the physical aspects of the program is given some consideration.

C H A P T E R T W O

DESCRIPTION OF HOUSING CONDITIONS

Characteristics of Sample

The survey and field work covered forty-eight communities (towns, villages, etc.). In these communities we had divided the houses covered by the questionnaires into three groups:

1. Type A: Houses built under the Remote Housing Program
2. Type B: Houses not under the Remote Housing Program
but in communities where such a house was built
3. Type C: Houses in communities not covered by the Remote
Housing Program

T A B L E I I I

Type and Name of Community (covered by Questionnaire and visits)

<u>Type A & B</u> <u>Communities with RHP Housing</u>	
Duck Bay	Wabowden
Amaranth	Big Eddy
Cormorant	Bacon Ridge
Cross Lake	Grand Rapids
Camperville	Young's Point
Berens River	Thicket Portage
	Pelican Rapids

T A B L E I I I

Type and Name of Community (Covered by Questionnaire and visits)

<u>Type C</u>		
<u>Communities Without RHP Housing</u>		
Lundar	Traverse Bay	Vassar
Hodgson	Manigotogan	Barrows
Sprague	St. Laurent	Mallard
Pine Dock	Shoal Lake	Brandon
Anama Bay	St. George	Churchill
Fairford	Binscarth	Flin Flon
Fisher Bay	Oak Point	St. Lazare
Umperville	Deerhorn	Crane River
Easterville	The Pas	Stoney Point
Great Falls	Selkirk	Lac du Bonnet
Seymourville	Arden	St. Eustache
Portage la Prairie	Vogar	Victoria Beach

In Table III, a list of the communities covered is given. In Table IV, the location, population, type of ethnic composition and economic base of each of these communities are given. (See Table IV below)

All of the communities of the "A" and "B" type are located in remote areas (that is, they are covered by the Remote Housing Program's designation of Remote Areas). With the "C" type communities, however, we covered places not necessarily designated as remote areas. Hence, we find a significant difference in the range of population.

In remote type communities (Type "A" and "B") the community populations range from 250 to 2,000, whereas, in others (Type "C") the range is from as low as 27 in Anama Bay to as high as 32,000 in Brandon. Type "A" and "B" communities are predominantly Metis in ethnic composition, with Indians making up the greater portion of the remaining population. In Type "C", the ethnic composition, while remaining predominantly Metis in some cases, is in most cases constituted of

Metis, Indians and Whites. Over 80% of the Type "A" & "B" communities have either a predominantly agricultural or Welfare economic base. Only in 20% do we find some type of industrial economic base. In Type "C" communities we covered communities that are of mixed economic base (i.e., industrial, agricultural) and those that are either predominantly agricultural or predominantly industrial as well as those that are regarded as being predominantly dependent on Welfare subsistence.

A total of 237 completed questionnaires were returned, covering:

- 73 houses built under the Remote Housing Program (Type "A")
- 80 houses not under the Remote Housing Program but in a community where such a house was built (Type "B")
- 84 houses in communities not covered by the Remote Housing Program

Table V (see Table V below) gives details of some characteristics of the 237 respondents, in terms of age, marital status, length of residence in community, annual income, number of dependents and education. Briefly, a few outstanding features of the respondents are discussed. The respondent in each case is the person recognized as the head of the household. The majority of the respondents are between age 30 and 49. None are under 20 years of age and very few are more than 60 years of age. The exact numerical distribution is indicated in Table V. Over 83% of the respondents are married and over 85% of the sample have been resident in their respective communities for over 10 years. There are two important implications that can be drawn from these statistics. First, these are not transient populations with an unstable character, but rather permanent populations of people who by all indications do want to live in these communities, irrespective of the economic shortcomings. Second, the households consist largely of stable single-family units. More than 85% of the respondents had an annual income of less than \$2,000. This level of income is alarming when we realize that over half the respondents have more than six dependents each, and that the average number of persons in each household is 7.8 for Type "A", 6.3 for Type "B" and 7.3 for Type "C".

Relatively low levels of education and a high rate of unemployment are also significant features of the respondents. About 45% do not have either any formal schooling or less than grade five education. Approximately 45% of the sample individuals have between grades 5 and 8 education. Only 3 had some technical education, one had some university education and another is a university graduate.

T A B L E I V

Communities Covered by Questionnaire

Types A & B

NAME	LOCATION	POPULATION	ETHNIC COMPOSITION	PRIMARY ECONOMIC BASE
Berens River	Southern Region	250	Metis, Indian Others	Welfare, Other
Cross Lake	Norway House	2,000	Metis, Indian Others	Other
Grand Rapids	Interlake	571	Metis, Indian Others	Welfare Other
Duck Bay	Dauphin	800	Metis, Indian Others	Agricultural Industrial Welfare
Camperville	Dauphin	800	Metis, Indian Others	Welfare
Bacon Ridge	Dauphin	300	Metis	Welfare
Amaranth	Dauphin	324	Metis, Indian Others	Agricultural Welfare
Pelican Rapids	Dauphin	241	Metis, Indian Others	Welfare
Wabowden	Norway House	650	Metis, Indian Others	Industrial
Thicket Portage	Norway House	350	Metis, Indian Others	Welfare
Young's Point	The Pas		Metis, Indian Others	Industrial

T A B L E I V

(continued)

TYPE C

NAME	LOCATION	POPULATION	ETHNIC COMP.	ECONOMIC BASE
1. Vogar	Interlake	290	Metis, Indian Other	Other
2. Fairford	"	180	"	Welfare
3. Lundar	"	800	"	Industrial
4. Oak Point	"	450	"	Agriculture
5. Deerhorn	"	—	"	"
6. Shoal Lake	"	100	"	"
7. Fisher Bay	"	50	Metis, Indian Only	Other
8. Pine Dock	"	108	Metis, Indian Other	"
9. Hodgson	"	300	"	Agriculture
10. St. Laurent	"	1,200	"	Mixed: Agriculture & Industry
11. Selkirk	"	10,000	"	"
12. Easterville	"	500	Metis, Indian Only	Other
13. Anama Bay	"	27	Metis, Indian Other	"
14. Binscarth	Dauphin	55	Metis Only	Welfare
15. St. Lazare	"	450	Metis, Indian Other	Agriculture
16. Barrows	"	300	Metis Only	Welfare
17. Arden	"	300	Metis, Indian White	Agriculture & Industry
18. Crane River	"	300	"	Welfare
19. Mallard	"	200	Metis Only	"
20. Vassar	Southern	250	Metis, Indian	Other
21. Stoney Point	"	100	Metis, Indian	"
22. Great Falls	"	300	White "	Agriculture & Industry
23. St. George	"	300	"	"
24. Lac du Bonnet	"	200	"	"
25. Portage la Prairie	"	13,000	"	"

T A B L E I V
(continued)

TYPE C

NAME	LOCATION	POPULATION	ETHNIC COMP.	ECONOMIC BASE
26. St. Eustache	Southern	450	Metis, Indian White	Agriculture & Industry
27. Brandon	"	32,000	"	"
28. Seymourville	"	125	"	Other
29. Manigotogan	"	225	"	"
30. Sprague	"	400	"	Agriculture & Industry
31. Victoria Beack	"	300	"	Other
32. Traverse Bay	"	125	"	"
33. Flin Flon	The Pas	14,000	"	Industrial
34. Umperville	"	100	Metis Only	Other
35. The Pas	"	5,000	Metis, Indian White	Mixed & Welfare

Of the 73 who are residing in the Remote Housing units, 36 are either employed or self-employed, 24 are on Welfare and 10 are unemployed. Thus the employed are just slightly more than the unemployed. This is a significant factor to bear in mind when drawing up such programs. In most of the communities without any substantially stable economic base, more than half of those in need of housing are to be found among Welfare recipients and the unemployed. Even given the 237 respondents, we find that 100 are employed (including self-employed) and 115 are either on Welfare or unemployed.

Space

In response to a question, "What is your view about the adequacy of the total space in the house where you now live?" not one (see Table VI) of the 237 respondents agreed that it was excellent. Five respondents currently living in the Remote Housing Program units (Type "A") felt that the space was totally inadequate and another six in the same type of units regarded the space as below average. In Type "B" units, 23 considered the space below average and another 32 as totally inadequate. In Type "C" we have 34 and 9 respectively.

T A B L E V
PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

		Type A		Type B		Type C		TOTAL	
		Absolute		Absolute		Absolute		Absolute	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
AGE	Under 15								
	15 - 19								
	20 - 29	13	18	6	7	11	13	30	13
	30 - 39	26	36	18	22	22	27	66	25
	40 - 49	22	30	24	30	20	24	66	25
	50 - 59	6	8	15	18	23	27	44	19
	60 - plus	6	8	17	21	8	9	31	13
	No answer								
	Total	73	100	80	98	84	100	237	95
MARITAL STATUS	Married	61	83	60	75	72	86	193	81
	Single	2	3	2	3	1	1	5	2
	Divorced								
	Separated	4	6	4	5	3	4	11	5
	Widowed	5	7	7	9	2	2	14	6
	Common-Law	1	1	7	9	3	4	11	5
	No Answer					3	4	3	1
	Total	73	100	80	101	84	101	237	100
LENGTH OF STAY IN COMMUNITY	Under 1 yr.					4	5	4	2
	1 - 2 yrs.	1	1			4	5	5	2
	2 - 3 "	2	3			2	2	4	2
	3 - 4 "	3	4			5	6	8	3
	4 - 5 "	1	1			3	4	4	2
	5 - 10 "	4	6	3	4	9	10	16	7
	Over 10 "	62	84	77	96	57	69	196	84
	No answer								
	Total	73	99	80	100	84	101	237	102
ANNUAL INCOME OF RESPONDENT	Under 1 thousand	3	4	9	11	9	10	21	9
	1 - 2 "	9	13	29	36	18	21	56	24
	2 - 3 "	23	31	17	21	25	30	65	27
	3 - 4 "	20	27	14	18	16	19	50	21
	4 - 5 "	8	11	1	1	8	10	17	7
	5 - 6 "	2	3	5	6	1	1	8	3
	Over 6 "	6	8	4	5	3	4	13	6
	No answer	1	1			4	5	5	2
	Total	72	98	79	98	84	100	235	99
NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS	none			6	8	3	4	9	4
	one	2	3	5	6	5	6	12	5
	two	4	6	10	13	6	7	20	9
	three	8	11	8	10	12	14	28	12
	four	7	10	7	9	12	14	26	11
	five	11	15	9	12	6	7	26	11
	5 - 10	33	44	27	34	31	37	91	39
	Over 10	8	11	6	8	9	10	23	10
	Total	73	100	78	100	84	99	235	101

T A B L E V
(continued)
PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

		<u>Type A</u>		<u>Type B</u>		<u>Type C</u>		<u>Total</u>	
		<u>Absolute</u>		<u>Absolute</u>		<u>Absolute</u>		<u>Absolute</u>	
		<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
EDUCATION	Less than Gr.5	29	39	32	40	29	34	90	38
	Grades 5 - 8	35	48	35	42	28	33	98	42
	Some High School	3	4	2	3	13	16	18	8
	Grad. " "		3	1	1	2	2	3	1
	Tech. School	2				1	1	3	1
	Prof. "								
	Some University					1	1	1	1
	University grad.					1	1	1	1
	No formal edu., skilled fr. exp.	4	6	10	12	8	10	22	9
	No answer							1	1
Total		73	100	80	99	83	98	237	102
EMPLOYMENT	Employed	32	44	18	22	34	40	84	36
	Self-Empl.	4	6	6	7	6	7	16	7
	Unemployed	10	14	11	13	14	16	35	15
	On Welfare	24	33	31	40	25	29	80	34
	On pension	3	4	13	18	5	6	21	9
	No answer					1	1		
Total		73	101	79	99	85	99	237	101

Average no.				Average =
of persons	$\frac{572}{73} = 7.8$	$\frac{547}{80} = 6.8$	$\frac{614}{84} = 7.3$	$\frac{21.9}{3} = 7.3$
in house:				

Average no.				Average =
of families	$\frac{79}{73} = 1.07$	$\frac{87}{80} = 1.08$	$\frac{97}{84} = 1.01$	$\frac{3.16}{3} = 1.05$
per house:				

Space (continued)

Given (i) the average number of dependents, (ii) the average number of families and residents per unit, and (iii) the average size of the houses and the number of rooms as shown in Table VI, it is clearly indicative that the total space is far below the national recommended average. In the Remote Housing Project, for example, several cases were found where families with more than six children were living in houses with only two bedrooms. It was known that these families had such a number of dependent children before the houses were built. This Program

is aimed at alleviating the problem of poor housing for these people; it has failed to attain its objectives in this case. All it has done is to move the people from one level of sub-standard housing to another at high costs to the recipients and the governments.

T A B L E V I
SIZE OF HOUSE AND ADEQUACY OF SPACE

		Type A		Type B		Type C		Total	
		Absolute		Absolute		Absolute		Absolute	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
ADEQUACY OF SPACE	Excellent								
	Good	23	31	5	6	2	2	30	13
	Average	39	54	19	22	20	24	78	33
	Below average	6	8	23	30	34	40	63	27
	Totally inadequate	5	7	32	40	29	34	66	28
	No answer								
Total		73	100	79	98	85	100	237	101
SIZE OF HOUSE	Under 100 ft. ²			3	4	3	4	6	3
	100 - 400 ' sq.			29	36	39	47	68	29
	400 - 800 ' sq.	56	77	43	54	36	43	135	57
	800 - 1200' sq.	16	22	4	5	5	6	25	10
	1200 & over' sq.	1	1	1	1			2	2
	No answer								
Total		73	100	80	100	83	100	236	101
NUMBER OF ROOMS	one			16	20	6	7	22	10
	1 - 3	8	11	32	40	33	39	73	31
	4 - 6	65	89	32	40	42	50	139	59
	over 6					2	2	2	2
	No answer					1	1	1	1
Total		73	100	80	100	84	99	237	103
No. of									
Residents:		$\frac{572}{73} = 7.8$		$\frac{547}{80} = 6.8$		$\frac{614}{84} = 7.83$		$\frac{21.4}{3} = 7.3$	
No. of									
Families:		$\frac{79}{73} = 1.07$		$\frac{87}{80} = 1.08$		$\frac{97}{84} = 1.01$		$\frac{3.16}{3} = 1.05$	

Utilities

In assessing utilities (see Table VII) we were interested in identifying (i) the ability to pay for their costs, (ii) their adequacy and availability, as a whole, and individually, and (iii) their source and type. In the Remote Housing Program units, over 50% of the 73 sample households regarded the utilities as adequate (i.e., average or better). However, 27 of the 73 representing approximately

30% of those in Type "A" houses, assessed the adequacy of utilities as below average and totally inadequate. When the samples of the three types are merged, more than 50% (i.e., 135 out of 235) considered the utilities as either below average or totally inadequate. For those in Type "A" houses, those who did not consider themselves able to pay for the cost of utilities number 38, as against 35 who considered themselves able. In the overall sample, including all three types, more than 50% of the sample gave responses indicating ability to pay. (see Table VII below)

Stoves (90 responses) and space heaters (97 responses) are given as the main source of heat out of the total sample for all three types. Airtight heaters and forced air are declining in use. In either Type "A" alone or all three types put together, more than half of the respondents in each case considered the adequacy of heat supply average and above. Electricity remains predominantly the source of lighting for all three types. Gas and coal oil are minimally used, and occur in very few cases (43) of our 237 samples. Hence, over 75% of all three samples indicated the adequacy of lighting as average and above. In Type "A" units, only 5 out of 72 respondents considered lighting below average.

Pipe borne water is still a rare phenomenon to most of the communities covered in the survey (available in only 28 of the 236 samples). Wells, rivers and lakes constitute the source of water for 75% of all the three types. Even in the Type "A" units they make up almost 49 of the 73 houses in this group. Needless to point out this is a sub-standard source of clean water supply. Because of the source, water storage is in most cases (over 90% of the three types) by barrels or pails. In Type "A" houses, surprisingly, all (100%) of the 73 samples store water by the barrel or pail and do not have either a pressure pump or cistern.

The supply of both cold and hot water is also rare. Where there is running water, it is usually cold water alone. More than 50% of the respondents in all the three types, in spite of the source and type of storage of water, considered it clean at all times.

In Type "A" units, 64 out of the 73 individuals responded positively to the question, "What is your view about the convenience of the location of the house where you now live with regards to proximity to places of interest — (i.e., places of employment, recreation, shopping schools, churches, offices, banks, post offices, hospital, etc.)?" In Types "B" and "C", although the positive responses were not as high as in Type "A", yet they far out-weigh the negative responses.

T A B L E V I I

UTILITIES

		Type A		Type B		Type C		Total	
		Absolute No.	%	Absolute No.	%	Absolute No.	%	Absolute No.	%
Adequacy of Utilities	Excellent					1	1	1	1
	Good	14	19	3	4	4	5	21	9
	Average	32	44	20	23	26	29	78	33
	Below average	19	26	32	40	4		91	39
	Totally Inadequate	8	1.1	23	30	13	1.5	44	18
	No answer								
Total		73	100	78	96	84	91	235	100
Ability to pay for Utilities	Excellent			1	1	1	1	2	1
	Good	8	11	5	6	6	7	19	8
	Average	27	37	28	35	35	40	90	38
	Below average	24	33	13	17	26	30	63	27
	Totally inadequate	7	10	20	25	12	14	39	17
	Does not apply	7	10	12	15	3	4	22	9
Total		73	101	79	99	84	97	236	101
Source of Heat	Stove	5	7	46	56	39	47	90	38
	Airtight Heater			6	7	2	2	8	4
	Forced Air					6	7	6	3
	Space Heater	42	58	30	36	25	30	97	41
	Other	26	36			11	13	37	16
	No answer								
Total		73	101	82	99	83	99	238	101
Adequacy of Heat	Excellent					2	2	2	1
	Good	43	60	10	13	4	5	57	24
	Average	24	33	29	37	31	40	84	36
	Below average	3	4	24	30	38	47	65	28
	Totally inadequate			16	20	9	10	25	1.1
	No answer	2	3					2	1
Total		72	100	79	100	84	104	235	101
Source of Lighting	Electricity	64	88	51	64	78	93	193	82
	Gas	2	3	5	6	1	1	8	4
	Coal oil	7	10	23	29	5	6	35	14
	Other			1	1			1	1
	No answer								
Total		73	101	80	100	84	99	237	101

T A B L E V I I

(continued)

UTILITIES

		Type A		Type B		Type C		Total	
		Absolute No.	%	Absolute No.	%	Absolute No.	%	Absolute No.	%
Adequacy of Lighting	Excellent	5	7	1	1	34	40	40	17
	Good	48	67	12	15	22	27	82	35
	Average	14	19	37	46	14	16	65	27
	Below average	5	7	17	21	5	6	27	12
	Totally inadequate			13	16	9	10	22	9
	No answer								
Total		72	100	80	99	84	99	23	100
Source of Water	Well	25	34	21	27	34	40	80	34
	River, lake	24	37	39	50	22	27	95	40
	Pipe-born	7	9	7	9	14	16	28	12
	Delivered	7	9	11	14	5	6	23	10
	Other	10	13	1	1	9	10	20	9
	No answer								
Total		73	102	79	101	84	99	236	105
Storage of Water	Barrels/Pails	73	100	78	98	62	68	213	90
	Cistern			1	1			1	1
	Pressure Pump			1	1	6	7	7	3
	Other					14	1.5	14	6
	No answer								
Total		73	100	80	100	92	91	235	100
Cold or Hot Water	Cold & Hot			2	2	18	21	20	8
	Cold water only	39	54	31	39	27	32	97	41
	None	34	46	47	59	39	47	120	51
	No answer								
Total		73	100	80	100	84	100	237	100
Health Standard of Water	Clean always	47	66	46	58	53	65	146	62
	Dirty always	6	8	3	4	8	11	17	7
	It varies	20	27	31	39	21	26	72	31
	No answer								
Total		73	101	80	101	82	102	235	100

In Type "B" units, for example, 54 out of 80 considered the convenience of the location average and above, although only one respondent felt it was excellent. Some qualitative comment on this aspect is pertinent at this juncture. Prior to the evaluation, one of the earliest sources of dissatisfaction with the Remote Housing Program was that it removed people from the "center of things" and thus isolated them from their previous neighbours and relatives, but also jammed them so close together that in the words of one of the respondents, "We could hear the breathing sound of our next door neighbour." There is some validity in this complaint, although it is supported by a minority of quantified responses as seen in Table VIII.

T A B L E V I I I
CONVENIENCE OF LOCATION

	<u>Type A</u>		<u>Type B</u>		<u>Type C</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>Ab.</u>		<u>Ab.</u>		<u>Ab.</u>		<u>Ab.</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Excellent	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1
Good	30	41	13	16	9	11	52	21
Average	33	45	40	50	39	47	112	47
Below average	8	11	18	23	29	35	55	23
Totally inadequate	1	1	8	10	6	7	15	6
Does not apply								
No answer								
<u>Total</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>99</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>101</u>	<u>237</u>	<u>98</u>

Shower, Toilet, Garbage Disposal and Pollution

Table IX shows the responses obtained with respect to shower (including bath tub) and toilet facilities, garbage disposal and pollution. In none of the 73 new homes (i.e., Type "A") built under the Remote Housing Program do we find any of these facilities. In Type "B" we find such a facility in only one out of a sample of 78. It is only in Type "C" that we find a significant sample (18 out of 66) possessing such facilities. The fact that shower facilities are lacking in all the new units under Type "A" is a clear indication of the Program's failure to offer any improvement in this direction. Such a failure is equally observable and quantitatively demonstrated in the case of toilet facilities; 72 out of a sample of 73 in Type "A" have only outdoor toilets that are neither flush nor chemically disposed. The situation remains equally deplorable in Type "B" units. It is only in Type "C" units that a minority of 19 out of 84 samples have either flush (17) or chemical (2) disposal facilities. The failure of the Remote Housing Program in this respect

is thus very easily apparent.

The system of garbage disposal in most remote communities is under-developed. This explains why in 10 instances in the Type "A" unit there is no systematic disposal of garbage; garbage is dumped anywhere the convenience dictates.

T A B L E I X
SHOWER, TOILET, GARBAGE DISPOSAL, POLLUTION

		Type A		Type B		Type C		Total	
		Ab.		Ab.		Ab.		Ab.	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
SHOWER	Yes			1	1	18	21	19	8
	No	73	100	77	99	66	79	216	92
	No Answer								
	Total	73	100	78	100	84	100	235	100
TOILET FACILITIES	Flush			1	1	17	20	18	8
	Chemical	1	1	1	1	2	2	4	2
	Outdoor	72	99	78	98	65	78	215	90
	Other								
	No answer								
	Total	73	100	80	100	84	100	237	100
GARBAGE DISPOSAL	Front yard			1	1	1	1	2	1
	Burning Barrel	30	41	13	16	32	38	75	31
	Garbage heap	15	20	20	25	14	17	49	21
	Municipal pickup	19	26	24	30	22	26	65	27
	Anywhere	10	14	22	27	15	18	47	20
	No answer								
	Total	74	101	80	102	84	100	238	100
TYPES OF POLLUTION	Water	16	24	22	28	17	24	55	25
	Air					10	14	10	5
	Other	7	10			2	3	9	4
	None	40	60	54	70	33	46	127	59
	No answer	4	6	1	1	10	14	15	7
	Total	67	100	77	99	72	101	216	100

In Type "B" and "C", 22 and 15 such instances respectively were recorded.
(see Table IXO)

Industrial water pollution (including rivers and lakes) has not affected many of the communities. However, in the areas affected (16 in Type "A", 22 in Type "B" and 17 in Type "C") resulted in the unemployment of those dependent on fishing for their source of income. Hence, it has in these cases destroyed the economic base

of some of these communities whose major economic resource is fishing. Industrial pollution has severely aggravated the problem of housing. The fishermen are unable to cope with the cost of living in such houses and unable to make the regular payments unless they are rescued through Welfare from such predicaments.

Repairs, Maintenance and Other Expenses

It was the assumption of the Remote Housing Program that the recipients will be able to afford the costs of repairs, maintenance and general upkeep of the units in which they live. In addition, the recipients were also assumed to be able to pay for other costs that may arise in relation to their occupancy of these units, such as the costs of buying furniture, cooking utensils and the like. Needless to say, these assumptions were not investigated well enough before they were made. In the survey it was found that most of the houses visited in the Type "A" units were either sparsely furnished or were jammed with old furniture in very deplorable conditions. The field workers even reported worse conditions in the other two types of units surveyed.

In answer to the question of their ability to pay for repairs, maintenance and other expenses associated with their stay in their present homes, we find that only a minority (see Table X) represents less than 20% of the total sample who indicated an ability to pay for these expenses. For example, because many of the Type "A" units do not have either concrete or timber basements (see Table XI) some of the recipients who had wanted such additions were debarred by the high costs involved. Such additions, no doubt, would have been very useful up to a point in helping to alleviate the problem of inadequate space discussed above.

Development and Improvement

In the survey the respondents were given a choice of eight different items:

1. Access to cities
2. Entertainment facilities
3. Educational facilities
4. Medical facilities
5. Housing facilities
6. Retail facilities
7. Communication facilities
8. Religious facilities

T A B L E X
ABILITY TO PAY FOR REPAIRS, MAINTENANCE
AND OTHER EXPENSES

		Type A		Type B		Type C		Totals	
Ability to pay for repairs and Maintenance	Excellent	1	1					1	1
	Good	4	6	5	6	1	1	10	4
	Average	17	23	15	19	12	14	44	18
	Below average	11	15	15	19	24	29	50	20
	Totally inadequate	3	4	38	48	18	21	59	24
	Does not apply	37	50	6	8	26	31	69	28
	No answer					3	4	3	1
Total		73	99	79	100	84	100	246	96
Ability to pay for other Expenses	Excellent								
	Good	3	4	1	1			4	2
	Average	16	22	12	16	15	18	43	18
	Below average	14	19	15	19	19	23	48	21
	Totally inadequate	6	8	22	29	14	17	42	18
	Does not apply	34	47	27	35	35	42	96	41
	No answer								
Total		73	102	77	100	83	100	233	100

T A B L E X I
TYPE OF FOUNDATION

	Type A		Type B		Type C		Totals	
Timber sill	11	15	45	56	37	44	93	38
Concrete sill	62	85	10	13	12	14	84	35
Timber Basement					1	1	1	1
Concrete Basement			1	1	8	10	9	4
Other			4	5	4	5	8	3
None			20	25	22	26	42	18
Total	73	100	80	100	84	100	237	99

They were then asked to indicate which item they considered most in need of (a) development and (b) improvement in the community in which they live. These responses are recorded in Table XII. (see Table XII). Item Number 5 Housing Facilities had the highest score in all the three types as both a factor in need of development and improvement. Item Number 2, Entertainment Facilities has a significantly high score as one of the areas in need of development, but to the question on improvement items, Numbers 2 and 4, entertainment and medical facilities respectively, almost equaled one another in the consideration indicated. Educational and communication (including transportation, radio, TV, etc.) facilities while not in the top list of priorities, appear fairly well above the other items. It is interesting to note that such items as access to cities and retail and religious facilities were not considered of great significance in our sample.

T A B L E X I I
AREAS IN NEED OF DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVEMENT

	Type A				Type B				Type C			
	Develop- ment		Improve- ment		Dev.		Imp.		Dev.		Imp.	
Access to cities	4	5	2	3	7	9	9	12	1	1	9	12
Entertainment Facilities	- 15	20	13	18	10	12	9	12	8	10	18	23
Educational Facilities	- 8	11	4	6	7	9	9	12	1	1	6	8
Medical Facilities	- 2	3	12	17	2	2	19	25	2	3	8	10
Housing Fac.	- 32	43	24	34	43	52	16	21	64	78	24	32
Retail Fac.	- 4	5	4	6	2	2	3	4	1	1	9	12
Communications	- 7	10	12	17	9	11	12	16	3	4	3	4
Religious Fac.	- 2	3			2	2			2	2		
<u>TOTAL</u>	74	100	71	101	82	99	77	102	82	100	77	101

	<u>Development</u>		<u>Improvement</u>	
Access to cities	12	5	20	9
Entertainment facilities	33	14	40	18
Educational facilities	16	7	19	8
Medical facilities	6	3	39	17
Housing facilities	139	59	64	28
Retail facilities	7	3	16	7
Communications	19	8	27	12
Religious facilities	6	3		
<u>TOTALS:</u>	238	102	225	99

To test our prediction and expectation that people in remote communities, given standard facilities and amenities would prefer to stay rather than leave for some other place, we posed a question asking them which one of the following words best describes life in the community in which they now live, on the basis of the location and general conditions of the houses in which they now live. (see Table XIII):

T A B L E X I I I
QUALITY OF LIFE IN THE COMMUNITY

	Type A		Type B		Type C		Total	
Cold			1	1	5	5	6	2
Friendly	27	35	24	30	29	30	80	31
Boring	1	1	5	6	6	6	12	5
Isolated			4	5	2	2	6	2
Barren					1	1	1	1
Gossipy	6	8	2	3	5	5	13	5
Exciting	1	1			1	1	2	1
Lonely	2	3			1	1	3	2
Expensive	8	11	5	6	3	3	16	6
Challenging	2	3	1	1	4	4	7	3
Normal	28	37	37	46	36	38	101	40
Intimate	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
None of the above					1	1	1	
No answer	1		1	1	-	-	-	-
Total	76	99	80	99	94	97	250	98

With only 3 out of 237 respondents refusing to offer an answer, it is significant that the highest scores were for items 2 and 11, "friendly" and "normal" respectively. This strongly indicated a high degree of satisfaction with their present communities, and hence, sufficiently validated our expectations and predictions.

Respondents' Conception of the Remote Housing Program

Through the (i) open-ended questions in the questionnaires (see Appendix #2), (ii) the field workers' assessment of each housing unit visited and (iii) his field report, interviews and participation and observation of various aspects and activities of the various communities, we were able to assemble a fairly comprehensive view of what is here referred to as "the respondents' conception of the Remote Housing Program." This is given general consideration in this section.

It is the general feeling of the recipients of the Remote Housing Program units that these houses are poorly built. In support of this contention, in many instances they pointed out the leaking ceilings, the loose tiles, the weak partitions, the oversize or undersize doors and windows, poor insulation and insufficient air circulation system. In addition they complained about the unnecessary clustering of the houses, lack of sufficient information about the type of houses they were getting (the blueprints did not do much good in most cases) and failure of the program to allow for the building of the houses on the peoples' lots or on other desired lots.

There was also an expression of the difficulties encountered in grasping the nature and implications of mortgages and interests. There were several conflicting views expressed, hence, the recipients felt that the MHRC should have undertaken to explain these implications, especially with regards to the consequences for the seasonally unemployed and Welfare recipients. In this connection, therefore, the evaluation team held consultations with officials of the Manitoba Department of Health and Social Development, to clarify the implications for Welfare recipients. If a recipient of Welfare is living in a Remote Housing Program unit, the payment is made indirectly to the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation by the Department of Welfare. That is, the money is given to the family who in turn pays the mortgage themselves. The only exception to this is where the Department of Welfare is administering the total budget of the family. In such a case, the Department makes the payments directly. In either case, the recipients do not have to pay the Department back. The Department of Welfare usually places a lien on the house where it has paid for downpayments, tax arrears, or improvements but it does not do this for rent paid towards mortgage payments. In other words, a Welfare recipient will still own the house at the end of the fifteen year period even if the payments had been made on his behalf by the Department of Welfare. The only items which he is expected to pay back are those involving the downpayment, repairs and tax arrears paid for by the Department of Welfare. The question of inheritance (succession) rates and cost sharing is still under consideration. For the seasonally unemployed, arrangements are made for them to pay more when they are employed, so that when they are off work they do not have to pay.

In communities not yet covered by the Remote Housing Program, some had expressed lack of awareness about the details of the Program. In other instances where the people knew about the program they were very optimistic that with time

and effort, including better organization on their part, they would be able to secure some units for those in need. However, in some instances, Crane River for example, the people were generally disappointed that they were not considered in the first phase.

Major Defects, Maintenance and Use and Other Physical Conditions

The heads of households whom we interviewed in the various communities were asked to list what they considered to be the major structural defects of the Remote Housing units in which they live. The defects given in each instance were examined by the field worker and confirmed if found valid. Through this instrument, we were able to assemble a comprehensive list. Below, a selected sample of the communities with the list of the defects found in the Remote Housing Program units are given.

Type "A" Units:

Major Defects - Berens River

1. House sinking, moving
2. Floor buckling
3. Stale water under floor
4. No air circulation
5. No running water
6. No foundation, poor foundation
7. No basement
8. Doors won't close

Major Defects -- Cross Lake

1. Foundation cracked
2. Doors won't shut
3. Cracks in floor
4. Bulges in tile
5. Windows "should be lower like modern homes"
6. Nails coming through tiles

Major Defects -- Grand Rapids

1. Hatchway should be in the utility room or elsewhere, not in the kitchen
2. Foundation shifting
3. Ceiling tiles cut out sloppily at lighting fixtures
4. Adhesive coming up through the floor tiles
5. Nails went through wall panels and now they are loose
6. Side door goes into the washroom
7. Cupboard doors not on right

Major Defects — Wabowden

1. Windows frost and leak onto floor
2. Snow got into house via air vents in roof
3. Floor cold in winter, heat should be circulated
4. Ceiling tiles leaked
5. Floor tiles coming off
6. Electrical plugs not all working
7. Condensation running down wall at side door in winter
8. Frost forms along walls (also near circuit-breaker panel, could be dangerous)
9. Walls in bedroom bulging
10. Don't like the direction the house is facing
11. Doors won't close
12. Concrete sill sinking
13. Mold along baseboards due to condensation
14. Floor joist too weak; shifts
15. Frost on doors; doors won't open

Major Defects — Pelican Rapids

1. Floors buckled after concrete shifted; tiles cracked
2. Ceiling tiles leaked and stained
3. Doors don't close properly
4. Cupboards are warped
5. No corner boards, inside or out
6. No partition between kitchen and living room
7. Some electric plugs and switches don't work
8. Glass on doors break too easily
9. No cellar in house
10. Insulation coming out from chimney
11. Door knobs are coming loose
12. Floor tiles opened up
13. The local carpenter who was supposed to repair the houses has no equipment.

Major Defects — Amaranth

1. Ceiling tiles leaked
2. Floor tiles are coming up
3. Walls are not solid enough; they move.

Major Defects — Amaranth (continued)

4. Were promised an inside toilet
5. Floor nails come up through tiles
6. Windows stuck, hard to open
7. Bedroom cold in winter, walls moist in winter
8. Walls are warping, perhaps from green lumber
9. Doors won't close
10. Adhesive coming up through tiles
11. Shingles lift up in the wind, blow over

Major Defects — Bacon Ridge

1. Ceiling tiles leaking in spring
2. Adhesive coming up through tiles
3. Walls not nailed correctly; wobbly
4. Floor not solid, insufficient support
5. Floor sagging, spaces under partition
6. Frost inside bedroom all winter
7. Floor not level
8. Floor tiles "no good"
9. Rough finishing

Major Defects — Camperville

1. No corner boards inside the house
2. Nails coming up through tiles
3. No ventilation, house always damp
4. Doors hard to open and close (especially in winter)
5. Cap on chimney too small, rainwater comes down chimney
6. Floor moves underfoot
7. No water drainage
8. Ceiling leaks, not properly insulated
9. Tiles coming off
10. Should be more than one beam under floor
11. Vinyl moulding for windows
12. Wall siding weak
13. Adhesive coming through tiles

Major Defects — Duck Bay

1. Bedroom cold in winter (because of no air-vents)
2. Ceiling tiles leaking (loose ventilation)
3. Windows won't close properly
4. No plug-in in the bathroom
5. Adhesive coming up through floor tiles
6. Plastic underneath the floor is sweaty
7. Floor is sagging down
8. One electrical plug doesn't work
9. Storm window broken, and they won't fix it
10. Doors won't close tight

When these defects listed for the Type "A" units (Remote Housing Program units) were compared with those for the Types "B" and "C" units (see below) it appears as if the Remote Housing Program had not really brought about significant changes and improvements. This is explained by the fact that the number of respondents interviewed in Types "B" and "C" far out-numbered those in Type "A". However, in spite of this numerical difference, the similarity in the kinds of defects still remain significant. The following communities are presented as examples of Types "B" and "C" and the major defects reported.

Type "B"

Major Defects — Cross Lake

1. No major defects
2. Cold in winter
3. House leaks
4. Floor broken
5. Poor lighting
6. House too small
7. Defective ceiling

Major Defects — Berens River

1. Cold in winter
2. Walls are poor
3. Not enough space
4. No forced air heat or proper heating system
5. No water

Major Defects — Berens River (continued)

6. No sewer
7. Not insulated
8. No electricity
9. Plaster keeps falling off log walls
10. Windows no good
11. No ceiling
12. Repainting needed
13. No chimney

Major Defects — Grand Rapids

1. House getting old
2. Cold in winter
3. Floor needs replacement
4. Bedrooms too small
5. House too small
6. Roof leaks
7. Windows broken
8. No foundation
9. Can't improve house because don't own the land
10. Not enough windows
11. Only one bedroom door
12. Ceiling needs fixing
13. Outside not finished
14. Bedrooms in poor condition
15. Interior needs repair

Major Defects — Duck Bay

1. Roof not solid
2. Outside rotten, wind blows right through
3. Floor is poor
4. No foundation, walls starting to rot
5. Not enough bedroom space
6. Roof leaks

Major Defects — Camperville

1. Logs getting rotten; won't last long

Major Defects — Camperville (continued)

2. Cold in winter
3. Flooring getting old
4. No insulation
5. Windows drafty

Major Defects — Bacon Ridge

1. Roof leaks
2. Roof drafty
3. Clay falls off the walls
4. Windows and doors drafty
5. House totally inadequate
6. Logs rotten
7. Flooring poor
8. Walls are poor
9. Cold in wintertime
10. House too old
11. House too small

Major Defects — Amaranth

1. House too old
2. Floor no good
3. Walls poor
4. Roof poor
5. Too small
6. House altogether no good
7. Logs rotten

Major Defects — Pelican Rapids

1. Flooring no good
2. Roof leaks
3. Walls no good (paper nailed to logs)
4. House generally inadequate
5. Windows no good
6. Doors won't close
7. Roof just covered with paper
8. Too small

Major Defects -- Pelican Rapids (continued)

9. Walls just plastered logs
10. House cold
11. Roof rotting
12. Clay washes off outside wall; you can see through the walls.

Major Defects -- Wabowden

1. Too cold
2. Too small
3. No foundation
4. Very old
5. Timber sills rotten
6. Roof leaks
7. Needs painting
8. Needs new doors
9. Windows leak
10. Foundation rotten

Major Defects -- Thicket Portage

1. Too small
2. Not fit to live in
3. Old

TYPE "C"

Major Defects -- Vogar - Fairford

1. No foundation
2. Floor not level
3. Cold in winter
4. No insulation
5. Defective ceiling

Major Defects -- Lundar - Deerhorn - Oak Point

1. No basement
2. No foundation
3. House is cold
4. Too small
5. Roof leaks

Major Defects -- Shoal Lake - St. Laurent

1. Cold in winter
2. Foundation breaking
3. No foundation
4. Too small
5. Door won't close
6. Drafty windows
7. Roof leaks
8. Roof opening at peak
9. Uneven floor
10. Not insulated

Major Defects -- Fisher Bay - Hodgson

1. No foundation
2. Cold in winter
3. Roof leaks
4. Broken floor
5. Warped floor
6. No ceiling
7. Drafty windows
8. Door won't close

Major Defects -- St. Lazare

1. Too small
2. Cold in winter
3. Poor windows and doors
4. Not fit to live in

Major Defects -- Vassar

1. Cold in winter
2. Poor heating
3. Too small
4. Floor needs repairs
5. No water

Major Defects — St. Eustache

1. Cold in winter
2. Too small
3. No water
4. No basement
5. Poor drainage
6. Rotten floor

Major Defects — Seymourville

1. Too small
2. Cold in winter
3. Beyond repairs
4. Roof leaking
5. Rotten lumber

Major Defects — Manigotogan

1. Cold in winter
2. Too small
3. Rotten floor
4. Rotten roof
5. Need money to finish new house

Major Defects — Victoria Beach

1. Too small
2. Roof ready to cave in
3. Roof leaks, cold in winter
4. Everything needs fixing
5. Plumbing is poor

In assessing the general state of the physical appearance of the three types of units covered by the survey, we relied heavily on the impressions obtained by our field workers in consultation with the local residents of these communities. The same instrument was also used in the assessment of the maintenance and use of these units.

Impressions on the physical appearance fall into two extremes — very good and very bad. In addition, the physical appearance of the units is very closely determined by the types and number of major defects identified. Hence, most of the units with many structural defects were described as in poor condition, and those with relatively few defects were regarded as fair to average. It is only in very few cases that the units were described as in excellent condition — one such unit for example, is owned by a carpenter/contractor, who, at little or no cost was able to correct the defects in his house.

In assessing the total picture, the general consensus of the team is that the majority of the houses in all the three types are poorly kept, used and maintained. There are various reasons for this. The most prominent one being the factor of overcrowding in most of the units — both in Type "A" and the other two residual types ("B" and "C"). The survey showed that there is an average of about 7.3 people per unit (see Table VI)— 7.8 for Type "A", 6.8 for Type "B" and 7.3 for Type "C". The Remote Housing Program (Type "A") did not even bring about any improvement in this connection as the above figures show. With an average of about 2 - 3 rooms per unit, and with the average of 7.3 people per unit, it is immediately clear that the space is insufficient for that number of people. Hence a situation of inadequate space and the resultant overcrowding makes it difficult for the families to keep and adequately maintain their homes in fair condition. Other factors that explain the poor use and maintenance are the lack of knowledge about use of some of the facilities in the house (e.g., air ventilation system), and insufficient income to carry out most repairs or pay for other maintenance items. Earlier it was pointed out that the recipients of the new homes had complained about the lack of orientation to the use of the facilities in these units. There is some validity in this complaint. Also above we had indicated that over 50% of the respondents in each of the three types are either unemployed or on Welfare. Therefore, it appears unreasonable to expect these people, to be able to pay for such repair and maintenance items as well as adequately furnish and renovate their homes even with Welfare assistance for minor repairs. For instance, many of the people in the new houses would like to improve the landscaping around their houses, but due to financial limitation and lack of orientation and know-how have not been able to implement such desires.

Changes in Life Styles

We had preliminary expectations that for those who are in the new homes

(the RHP units) the change in the type of house would have some bearing or effects on their general life styles. It was in order to partially ascertain this that we posed the following question in the questionnaire: "In what way does the house that you now live now affect your way of life and that of your family and the relationship you have with your friends, relatives and neighbours?" The information obtained through this instrument was also substantially supplemented by the field worker's interviews, observation and participation.

One major area of concern for some of the recipients was the change and increase in their cost of living. Hence they also contended they had to work longer hours, and stick to jobs longer in order to make both ends meet. Cost of living increased, they claimed, because of mortgage payments, costs of utilities, purchase of furniture, and costs of maintenance and repairs. It is understandable that for some of them payments of monthly rents or mortgages for accommodation is something new, as they previously lived in places where they paid nothing, including utilities. In their new position they find that not only have they to pay for the mortgage and cost of utilities but also for taxes and interest on their homes. Hence increased financial burden with little or no increase in income (be it earned or Welfare) is coupled with little if any real improvement in housing for the recipients of RHP units.

In discussing their dealings with their neighbours, there were both negative and positive responses. On the one hand, some felt that they were thrown into a strange neighbourhood with no friends and relatives around. These people complain of the disintegration of their old ties with relatives and friends in their previous location as a result of the move. On the other hand, some expressed satisfaction with their new location, saying that they have good neighbours and their children have found many others to play with and visit. There are some who complained about the houses being too close together, hence their privacy and space were curtailed, and jealousy and competition for minor things were increased as a result.

In some instances, mention was made of difficulty arising from lack of access to the road. Children had to walk some distance to be picked up by the school bus. Notwithstanding these comments, the majority of our sample felt that the RHP has not necessarily brought about any identifiable change in their life styles.

C H A P T E R T H R E E

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

We began this study strictly on the premises that conclusions reached at the end would be based solely on the ideas and thoughts advanced by the people involved and affected by the Remote Housing Program. Our main objective was to enlist these types of information from our target population, analyse the data in the light of the circumstances under which they were given, and finally, systematically present it for general use and more specific application.

In an attempt to do this we have looked into and presented a fairly extensive discussion of the housing conditions, as well as other conditions that led to the establishment of the Remote Housing Program. Unless we have a thorough grasp of the problems, we cannot really evaluate whether we have made adequate provisions for solving such problems. If there are such adequate provisions, we want to find out whether they were effectively and efficiently used, and what results, good or bad, were attained. In the examination of the pre-program housing conditions for people in remote communities it was fairly easy to point out the sub-standard housing conditions that prevailed and still prevail.

The agreement that set up the Remote Housing Program was therefore aimed at alleviating the prevailing housing problems in these communities. The program sought to do this in a number of ways involving not only the provisions of homes but a system of subsidies to make up for the adjustment of payments on the basis of family income. It also sought to provide employment and training to the local labour force during the period of construction. In the course of carrying out various facets of the Program, some problems arose, and it was these problems that gave rise to the need to evaluate the program and to this end that the present report is aimed. It is on the basis of this evaluation that we make the following recommendations:

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. We feel strongly that it should be recognized that the basic handicap of most of the remote communities is the lack of any substantially adequate economic base. With the exception of a few of these communities that are located a few miles from the newly emerging industrial centers in the North, like The Pas,

Thompson, etc., most of the remote communities are several hundreds of miles removed from any major industrial center. If houses are to be provided for these communities, the major concern and consideration should therefore be the provision of homes for Canadians who live and want to stay in these places, rather than of assessing the economic viability of the community in terms of the industrial South. Planners are already aware of the economic handicap of these communities. To bring in such handicaps as an excuse for not building standard homes for people in these places is therefore irrelevant to the issue of housing, which as a minimum should be based solely on need and the right and entitlement of every Canadian to a decent home and a clean healthy environment.

2. Steps should be taken to modify the Remote Housing Program to allow the recipient of a home to exercise more power in deciding what type of house he desires (given obvious limitations) where he wants the house located and what structural styles and facilities should be included. It is recommended that in drawing up of plans for the homes, the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation should work with the approved recipients as individuals rather than as a conglomeration of housing recipients. An adoption of the CMHC system of processing application for home financing on an individual basis is recommended. This would allow the recipient to know what he is going into. It is not fair to force people to accept very limited choice simply because their houses are being subsidized.

3. The Remote Housing Program should also be extended to cover those migrants in northern industrial centres who originated from remote communities. Many of the Native migrants in these Northern industrial centres face acute housing problems, and usually because of this they become disenchanted and go back to their remote communities, where often, because of lack of sound economic base, they fall back on Welfare for subsistence. Of course we are suggesting that good homes should be provided irrespective of the type of economic base, but it is undoubtedly more economically sound to have many more people in places where there are job opportunities, especially if they want to stay in such places.

4. In recognizing the usually large family size and the severe climatic conditions of the North, we recommend that the program ensure that housing plans and units include adequate heating, lighting, water and toilet facilities and adequate sleeping space for the occupants. These should be provided at costs within their ability to pay. The need for provision of indoor toilets, and for

both hot and cold water, is strongly stressed. The health hazards of poor toilet facilities and unclean water are very good reasons for making this suggestion.

5. It is our observation that most of the homes were poorly furnished. It is recommended that some type of subsidy, grant or interest-free loan should be arranged with recipients of homes to enable them to purchase at least the essential furnishing materials.

6. The existence of elderly people and both transient and single (unmarried) youths in these communities should be recognized. A provision should be made for the building of a special type of housing, possibly apartment blocks, to house these people on a subsidized rent basis.

7. It is suggested that the program allow for funding of individuals who may not wish to buy a new home but may simply desire money to update or repair existing units. Such funding can be subsidized. Furthermore, outright grants for home improvement are also recommended.

8. A general counselling and orientation should be instituted to accompany the program so that recipients can be acquainted with the use, maintenance, and upkeep of the units. Such a counselling should start before the occupancy of the units and should continue until it is evident that the recipients can handle these matters diligently.

9. It is suggested that where rent or mortgage payments are based on family income, the number of dependents should be taken into consideration and deductions made up to a maximum of six children per family. A review of family income every six months is recommended because of the high rate of income fluctuations in these communities. Provisions for appeal for reviews should also be made.

10. It is suggested that the program include facilities for training and employment as well as the building of homes. Since there is a liking for re-locatable mobile homes it is recommended that a government-industry-MMF venture to provide training, employment and home building be set up at a point in the North in collaboration with an existing industry or with the setting up of an entirely new outfit or industry.

11. Because of the relatively large family size (7.3) it is recommended that some counselling on family planning (birth control included) be instituted. This is to make the families at least aware of the consequences of large families,

given their relatively low income and overcrowded housing conditions.

It is an accepted fact that housing is one of the basic necessities of life. We urge you therefore to remember this very strongly in using this report. It is mainly from this premise that our basic arguments have been derived.

A P P E N D I X 2

M A N I T O B A M E T I S F E D E R A T I O N

REMOTE HOUSING EVALUATION PROJECT

HOUSING EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is being administered to a sample of Metis people in selected remote communities in Manitoba as part of the Manitoba Metis Federation's attempt to evaluate the housing conditions for Metis people. Your co-operation in answering the following questions will be greatly appreciated. Your answers will be treated as confidential.

The Project is being administered under the direction of Mr. Angus Spence, Manitoba Metis Federation President, with Mr. Marvin Hunt as Project Co-ordinator and Mr. James N. Kerri as Research Consultant.

If you have any questions regarding this questionnaire, and other parts of the Project, we will be only too glad to hear from you.

Thank you for your co-operation and assistance.

-----++-----

Is the respondent residing in

1. ☐ a house built under the Remote Housing Program
2. ☐ a house not under the Remote Housing Program
but in a community where such a house was built
3. ☐ a house in a community which is not covered by
the Remote Housing Program. _____

What is the

1. Name of community: _____
2. Population of community: _____
3. Location of community: _____

Does this community have

1. ☐ Metis alone
2. ☐ Metis and Indians alone
3. ☐ Metis, Indians and others as well _____

What is the major economic resource of the community?

1. ☐ industrial
2. ☐ agricultural
3. ☐ mixed: agricultural and industrial
4. ☐ Welfare assistance
5. ☐ other (specify: _____) _____

NAME OF RESPONDENT: _____

What is your sex?

1. ☐ male
2. ☐ female

What is your age?

1. ☐ under 15 years of age
2. ☐ 15 - 19 " " "
3. ☐ 20 - 29 " " "
4. ☐ 30 - 39 " " "
5. ☐ 40 - 49 " " "
6. ☐ 50 - 59 " " "
7. ☐ 60 years of age or more
8. ☐ declined to answer _____

Are you

1. () married
 2. () single
 3. () divorced
 4. () separated
 5. () widowed
 6. () common-law
 7. () declined to answer
-

How long have you lived in this community?

1. () less than 1 year
 2. () 1 to 2 years
 3. () 2 to 3 years
 4. () 3 to 4 years
 5. () 4 to 5 years
 6. () more than 5 years but less than 10 years
 7. () more than 10 years
 8. () declined to answer
-

Are you

1. () employed
 2. () self-employed
 3. () unemployed
 4. () on Welfare
 5. () on pension
 6. () declined to answer
-

What is your approximate annual income?

1. () less than one thousand dollars
 2. () one to two thousand
 3. () two to three "
 4. () three to four "
 5. () four to five "
 6. () five to six "
 7. () above six "
 8. () declined to answer
-

How many dependents do you have?

1. () none
 2. () one
 3. () two
 4. () three
 5. () four
 6. () five
 7. () more than five but less than ten
 8. () more than ten
-

Which grades did you complete?

1. () less than grade five
 2. () grades five to eight
 3. () some high school
 4. () graduated from high school
 5. () technical school
 6. () professional school
 7. () some university
 8. () graduate of university and/or more
 9. () no formal education but skilled through experience
 10. () declined to answer
-

How many people are currently living in this house?

(specify: _____)

How many families are currently living in this house?

(specify: _____)

What is your view about the adequacy of the total space in the house where you now live?

1. () excellent
 2. () good
 3. () average (just enough)
 4. () below average
 5. () totally inadequate
 6. () declined to answer
-

What is your view about the adequacy of utilities (water, lighting, electricity, telephone, radio, television, etc.) in the house where you now live?

1. () excellent
 2. () good
 3. () average
 4. () below average
 5. () totally inadequate
 6. () declined to answer
-

What is your view about the convenience of the location of the house where you now live with regards to proximity to places of interest: (i.e. - places of employment, recreation, shopping, school, churches, offices, banks, post office, hospital, etc.)

1. ☐ excellent
 2. ☐ good
 3. ☐ average
 4. ☐ below average
 5. ☐ totally inadequate
 6. ☐ does not apply
 7. ☐ declined to answer
-

On the basis of your income, what is your view about your ability to pay for the cost of utilities (water, hydro, telephone, etc.) in the house where you now live?

1. ☐ excellent
 2. ☐ good
 3. ☐ average
 4. ☐ below average
 5. ☐ totally inadequate
 6. ☐ does not apply
 7. ☐ declined to answer
-

On the basis of your income, what is your view about your ability to pay for the cost of maintenance and repairs of the house where you now live?

1. ☐ excellent
 2. ☐ good
 3. ☐ average
 4. ☐ below average
 5. ☐ totally inadequate
 6. ☐ does not apply
 7. ☐ declined to answer
-

Are there other expenses resulting from your stay in the house where you now live? If yes, how do you view your ability to pay for these additional expenses?

1. ☐ excellent
 2. ☐ good
 3. ☐ average
 4. ☐ below average
 5. ☐ totally inadequate
 6. ☐ does now apply
 7. ☐ declined to answer
-

In your view, which one of the following is the most in need of development in the community in which you now live?

1. () access to cities in the South and other places
2. () entertainment and recreational facilities
3. () educational facilities
4. () medical facilities
5. () housing and accommodation
6. () retail facilities
7. () communication (e.g. - radio, television, etc.)
8. () religious and other cultural activities

Why do you consider this item the one most in need of development in your community?

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no text or other markings on the paper.

In your view, which one of the following is the most in need of improvement in the community in which you now live?

1. () access to cities in the South and other places
2. () entertainment and recreational facilities
3. () educational facilities
4. () medical facilities
5. () housing and accommodation
6. () retail facilities
7. () communication (e.g. - radio, television, etc.)
8. () religious and other cultural activities

Why do you consider this item the one most in need of improvement in your community?

This image shows a single page of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or printed text on the page.

Who owns the land?

1. ☐ yourself
 2. ☐ someone else or company as landlord
 3. ☐ the municipality
 4. ☐ the province
 5. ☐ the Crown
-

Who owns the house?

1. ☐ yourself
 2. ☐ someone else or company as landlord
 3. ☐ the municipality
 4. ☐ the province
 5. ☐ the Crown
-

What is the size of the house in which you now live in square feet?

1. ☐ under 100 square feet
 2. ☐ 100 to 400 " "
 3. ☐ 400 to 800 " "
 4. ☐ 800 to 1200 " "
 5. ☐ 1200 plus
 6. ☐ declined to answer
-

What type of foundation does this house have?

1. ☐ timber sill
 2. ☐ concrete sill
 3. ☐ timber basement
 4. ☐ concrete basement
 5. ☐ other (specify: _____)
 6. ☐ none
-

How many rooms are there in this house?

1. ☐ one
 2. ☐ one to three
 3. ☐ four to six
 4. ☐ more than six
 5. ☐ declined to answer
-

What is the main source of heat for this house?

1. ☐ stove (iron, homemade or cook stove)
 2. ☐ airtight heater
 3. ☐ forced air
 4. ☐ space heater
 5. ☐ other (specify: _____)
 6. ☐ declined to answer
-

What is your view about the adequacy of heating facilities for this house?

1. () excellent
 2. () good
 3. () average
 4. () below average
 5. () totally inadequate
 6. () declined to answer
-

What is the source of lighting?

1. () electricity
 2. () gas
 3. () coal oil (kerosene)
 4. () other (specify: _____)
 5. () declined to answer
-

What is your view about the adequacy of lighting facilities for this house?

1. () excellent
 2. () good
 3. () average
 4. () below average
 5. () totally inadequate
 6. () declined to answer
-

What is the source of water?

1. () well
 2. () river -- lake
 3. () pipe-borne water
 4. () delivered from town
 5. () other (specify: _____)
 6. () declined to answer
-

Which one of the following is the type of water storage and supply for this house?

1. () barrels/pails
 2. () cistern
 3. () pressure pump
 4. () other (specify: _____)
 5. () declined to answer
-

Is there

1. () cold and hot water
 2. () cold water alone
 3. () none
 4. () declined to answer
-

What is the health standard of the water used?

1. () clean all the time
 2. () impure all the time
 3. () it varies
 4. () declined to answer
-

Is there installed shower or bath in this house?

1. () yes
 2. () no
 3. () declined to answer
-

Which one of the following toilet facilities do you have in this house?

1. () flush toilet
 2. () indoor, chemical
 3. () outdoor toilet (privy)
 4. () others (specify: _____)
 5. () declined to answer
-

What type of garbage disposal arrangement do you have in this house?

1. () front yard
 2. () burning barrel
 3. () garbage heap
 4. () municipal pick-up
 5. () anywhere (self-help -- "in the bush")
 6. () declined to answer
-

Do you have any of these types of pollution?

1. () water
 2. () air
 3. () other (specify: _____)
 4. () none
 5. () declined to answer
-

[illegible]

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

T O T H E F I E L D W O R K E R

Please give us what you consider to be your general assessment of the house of this respondent in terms of:

1. PHYSICAL CONDITIONS

2. MAINTENANCE AND USE

3. OTHERS

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

4. ANY OTHER REMARKS pertaining to the administration of this questionnaire:

[illegible]

A P P E N D I X I

SPECIFIC AGREEMENT

APPENDIX "A"

THIS AGREEMENT made this _____ day of _____ 1968,

B E T W E E N:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF CANADA,
represented by the Honourable Paul T. Hellyer,
Minister responsible under the National
Housing Act, 1954,
(hereinafter called "The Federal Minister")

OF THE FIRST PART:

- and -

THE MANITOBA HOUSING AND RENEWAL CORPORATION
(hereinafter called "The Provincial Corporation")

OF THE SECOND PART:

WHEREAS by an agreement dated the _____ day of _____ 19____
between The Federal Minister, the Provincial Corporation and Central Mortgage
and Housing Corporation, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and the
Provincial Corporation may undertake jointly in Manitoba the construction
of houses for sale to an applicant;

AND WHEREAS Clause 1 of the said agreement states: "This
agreement shall apply to housing projects designated within a period
of two years from the date hereof pursuant to specific agreements between
the Federal Minister and the Provincial Corporation, undertaken for the
construction of houses for sale to an applicant, the number of houses
not to exceed 100 a copy of such agreement being attached hereto as
Appendix "A";

NOW THEREFORE WITNESSETH that the Federal Minister and the
Provincial Corporation agree as follows:

1. The project consisting of _____ houses in
Manitoba known as _____
is hereby designated a housing project.
2. The interest rates for the purpose of this agreement shall be _____ %
per annum in respect of the share of the Provincial Corporation
and _____ % per annum in respect of the share of The Federal Minister
both rates calculated semi-annually and not in advance.

3. The interest rate to be charged in any agreement for sale or mortgage given as a result of the sale of the lands and buildings to the applicant shall bear interest at the rate of % per annum calculated semi-annually and not in advance, and the said agreement for sale or mortgage shall be retired over a period not exceeding twenty years.
4. The payments to be made by the applicant for the houses shall be in accordance with Schedule "A" attached.
1. The following items of cost are to be charged to the housing project:
 - (a) the annual amount required to amortize the Federal Minister's share of the shareable cost of the housing project over a period of years, with interest at the rate of % per annum calculated semi-annually, the factor therefore being per \$1,000;
 - (b) the annual amount required to amortize the Provincial Corporation's share of the shareable cost of the housing project over a period of years, with interest at the rate of % per annum calculated semi-annually, the factor therefore being per \$1,000;
2.
 - (a) The Provincial Corporation of behalf of the parties, will acquire or retain title to lands, which title shall be taken or retained in the name of the Provincial Corporation, and shall be so held subject to the interest of the Provincial Corporation and the Corporation but the Provincial Corporation shall nevertheless have full power to convey such lands for the purpose of this agreement;
 - (b) The Provincial Corporation shall plan, arrange for and supervise the construction of the houses upon such lands provided that before construction of any housing project is commenced, the design, plans, specifications and contracts relating thereto shall be approved by Provincial Corporation and the Corporation.
3. For the purpose of this agreement, the capital cost of any project shall be composed of:
 - (a) The actual cost of the land to the Provincial Corporation on which the project is built, including the cost of survey, subdivision and legal charges involved in the acquisition and subdivision;
 - (b) the actual cost of the construction of buildings and related site services, including cost of labour and materials;

- (c) operating expenses less gross revenues during the period of occupancy of the housing project prior to the project completion date;
- (d) such other items of cost as may be incurred from time to time if such expenses have been approved by the Provincial Corporation and the Corporation, including the cost of on-site supervisory and engineering services, the cost of architectural and engineering and other ancillary services required for the design of the project, but not including administrative charges for other services performed by regular employees of the Provincial Corporation or the Corporation;
- (e) interest on the amount of the cost of the project, including all items of cost referred to in paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d) hereof, computed from the date of each advance by the Provincial Corporation or the Corporation to the date of completion of the project, as designated by the Provincial Corporation, at the rates referred to in the specific agreement provided for in Clause 1;

less the equivalent of \$200.00 per unit constituting the applicant's equity, or such alternate amounts as may be agreed to from time to time.

- 4. (a) The capital cost of each housing project, and profits or losses thereon, shall be shared 75% by the Corporation and 25% by the Provincial Corporation, provided however that the Provincial Corporation will make payment in the first instance of all charges forming a part of the cost of each housing project and the Corporation shall pay to the Provincial Corporation quarterly on receipt of a statement from the Provincial Corporation, the Corporation's proportionate share of the total expenditures made and accrued interest thereon, at the rates referred to in the specific agreement, in respect of a housing project during the quarter covered by the said statement;
 - (b) The Provincial Corporation shall keep accurate books, records and accounts of all transactions made pursuant to subclause (a) and from time to time as requested, shall furnish to the Corporation particulars of all disbursements, and shall permit representatives of the Corporation to inspect all such books, records and accounts at any time.
- 5. (a) The Provincial Corporation upon approval by the Corporation of plans and specifications for each housing project shall award a contract or otherwise arrange for the construction of the houses in each housing project

at a price or on such terms as shall have been approved by the Corporation and the Provincial Corporation;

- (b) As each dwelling in each housing project is ready for occupancy, such dwelling may be leased to the applicant for a period which will terminate on the completion date of the project and on such other terms and conditions as may be determined by the Corporation the The Provincial Corporation;
- (c) The Provincial Corporation on the completion of each housing project shall sell and convey the dwellings comprising the housing project to the applicant at a price which shall not be less than the capital cost of the housing project and on such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon in the specific agreement referred to in Clause 1;
- (d) As between the Corporation and the Provincial Corporation, they shall receive interest on their respective shares of the sale price of each housing project at the rates referred to in the specific agreement referred to in Clause 1, which interest shall be calculated from the date of sale until their respective shares of the sale price have been received;
- (e) The sale price of each housing project and profits or losses thereon shall be credited or charged 75% to the Corporation and 25% to the Provincial Corporation.

- 6. (a) The Provincial Corporation shall in so far as possible collect the rentals paid pursuant to subclause (b) of Clause 5 and the sale price and all amounts payable pursuant to the terms of sale, set out in the specific agreement and referred to in subclause (c) of Clause 5.

- 7. The profit or loss on the housing project pursuant to the date of sale shall be calculated annually at the end of each calendar year be determining the difference between:

- (a) all collections from the applicant pursuant to Clause 6 (a) in relation to the terms of sale; and
- (b) all payments made pursuant to Clause 5 of the specific agreement;

and such profits and losses shall be shared 75% by the Corporation and 25% by the Provincial Corporation pursuant to Clause 4 (a) hereof.

- 8. (a) The Provincial Corporation shall ensure that municipal taxes on the housing projects are paid;

- (b) The Provincial Corporation shall ensure that the housing projects are insured against reasonable perils under standard dwelling policies and shall maintain an interest therein on behalf of the parties hereto. Any insurance proceeds which are not expended to restore damage to the housing project shall be shared 75% by the Corporation and 25% by the Provincial Corporation and applied against the unamortized portions of their respective interest in a housing project.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties hereto have hereunto affixed their corporate seals as witness the hands of their proper officers in that behalf.

SIGNED, SEALED AND DELIVERED
in the presence of:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF CANADA,
represented by the Honourable Paul T.
Hellyer, Minister responsible under the
National Housing Act, 1954

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF MANITOBA,
represented by the Honourable George Johnson,
Minister responsible under the Manitoba
Housing and Renewal Corporation Act

CENTRAL MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION,

President

Executive Director

THE MANITOBA HOUSING AND RENEWAL CORPORATION

THIS AGREEMENT made this nineteenth day of February 1969;

B E T W E E N:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF CANADA,
represented by the Honourable Paul T.
Hellyer, Minister responsible under the
National Housing Act, 1954
(hereinafter called "the Federal Minister"),

OF THE FIRST PART:

- and -

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF MANITOBA,
represented by the Honourable George Johnson,
Minister responsible under the Manitoba Housing
and Renewal Corporation Act
(hereinafter called "the Provincial Minister"),

OF THE SECOND PART:

- and -

CENTRAL MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION,
(hereinafter called "the Corporation"),

OF THE THIRD PART:

- and -

THE MANITOBA HOUSING AND RENEWAL CORPORATION,
(hereinafter called "the Provincial Corporation"),

OF THE FOURTH PART:

WHEREAS under Section 35A of the National Housing Act, 1954, the Corporation, pursuant to an agreement made between the Government of Canada and the Government of any Province may undertake jointly with the Government of the said Province or any agency thereof, projects for the acquisition and development of land for housing purposes and for the construction of housing projects for sale or for rent;

AND WHEREAS under Section 15. of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation Act, being Chapter 24 of the Statutes of Manitoba, 1967, the Provincial Corporation may enter into agreements with the Provincial Minister, the Federal Minister and the Corporation, respecting projects to provide housing and providing, among other matters, for the acquisition and development of land for housing project purposes and for the construction of housing accommodation for sale or for rent;

AND WHEREAS it is proposed that the Federal Minister and the Provincial Corporation, pursuant to the said legislation, shall designate specific projects in the Province of Manitoba in the area outlined in red on the plan hereto annexed, for the construction of houses for sale to such persons, local housing authorities or co-operative associations as may apply for assistance and as are agreed upon by the parties hereto, (hereinafter called "the applicant");

NOW THEREFORE THIS AGREEMENT WITNESSETH that the parties in consideration of the premises and the mutual covenants hereinafter contained, do covenant each with the other as follows;

1. This agreement shall apply to housing projects designated within a period of two (2) years from the date hereof, pursuant to specific agreements between the Federal Minister, and the Provincial Corporation, undertaken for the construction of houses for sale to an applicant, the number of houses not to exceed one hundred (100), a copy of such agreement being attached hereto as Appendix "a";
 - (c) municipal taxes paid;
 - (d) insurance premiums paid;
 - (e) such other items as may be approved by the Provincial Corporation and the Federal Minister.
5. Any agreement for sale or mortgage given as a result of the sale of the lands and buildings to the applicant shall provide that any subsequent sale or disposal of the project or any part thereof and the terms and conditions of such sale or disposal shall not be valid unless first approved by the Provincial Corporation and the Federal Minister and that upon breach of said provision the whole of the moneys remaining unpaid under such agreement for sale or mortgage shall, at the option of the Provincial Corporation, forthwith become due and payable.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties hereto have hereunto affixed their corporate seals as witness the hands of their proper officers in that behalf.

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF CANADA,
represented by the Honourable Paul T. Hellyer,
Minister responsible under the National Housing
Act, 1954

THE MANITOBA HOUSING AND RENEWAL CORPORATION

THIS IS SCHEDULE "A" REFERRED TO IN THE AGREEMENT DATED
BETWEEN CANADA AND THE PROVINCE RESPECTING HOUSING PROJECT IN REMOTE AREAS
OF MANITOBA

1. In this Schedule:

- (a) "Family income" means the aggregate gross income in whatever form received of all members of a family, whether earned income or transfer payments, except family allowance.
- (b) "Family" means a natural family consisting of a family head and one or more persons related by blood, marriage or adoption and in addition to a natural family may include other persons known to have lived regularly as an inherent part of the family group and whose earnings and resources are available for use in meeting the living expenses of the group, but shall not include a group of unrelated persons living together, lodgers or persons living alone.

2. Each "Family" occupying each of the houses will be charged in accordance with their "family income" as listed below:

<u>MONTHLY</u> <u>FAMILY INCOME</u>	<u>MONTHLY</u> <u>PAYMENT</u>	<u>MONTHLY</u> <u>FAMILY INCOME</u>	<u>MONTHLY</u> <u>PAYMENT</u>	<u>MONTHLY</u> <u>FAMILY INCOME</u>	<u>MONTHLY</u> <u>PAYMENT</u>
\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
325	72	230	49	135	26
320	70	225	48	130	25
315	69	220	46	125	24
310	68	215	45	120	23
305	67	210	44	115	21
300	66	205	43	110	19
295	64	200	42	105	18
290	63	195	40	100	17
285	62	190	39	95	15
280	61	185	38	90	14
275	60	180	37	85	13
270	58	175	36	80	12
265	57	170	34	75	11
260	56	165	33	70	9
255	55	160	32	65	8
250	54	155	31	60	7
245	52	150	30	55	6
240	51	145	28	50	5
235	50	140	27		

3. In no case will a "family" be required to pay more than that required to meet the full operating cost of the house occupied by it.

4. In order to provide for families receiving income at irregular intervals, adjustment will be made annually at December 31st to ensure payments are related to total annual income.