



Third Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

---

**STANDING COMMITTEE**

on

**MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS**

---

39-40 Elizabeth II

---

*Chairperson  
Mrs. Louise Dacquay  
Constituency of Seine River*



**VOL. XLI No. 5 - 10 a.m., THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 1992**



**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Fifth Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

---

<b>NAME</b>	<b>CONSTITUENCY</b>	<b>PARTY</b>
ALCOCK, Reg	Osborne	Liberal
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	NDP
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	Liberal
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	NDP
CHEEMA, Gulzar	The Maples	Liberal
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	NDP
CONNERY, Edward	Portage la Prairie	PC
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose	PC
DACQUAY, Louise	Seine River	PC
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	PC
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	NDP
DOER, Gary	Concordia	NDP
DOWNEY, James, Hon.	Arthur-Virden	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.	Steinbach	PC
DUCHARME, Gerry, Hon.	Riel	PC
EDWARDS, Paul	St. James	Liberal
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	PC
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EVANS, Clif	Interlake	NDP
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
FINDLAY, Glen, Hon.	Springfield	PC
FRIESEN, Jean	Wolseley	NDP
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	Liberal
GILLESHAMMER, Harold, Hon.	Minnedosa	PC
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	NDP
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Liberal
LATHLIN, Oscar	The Pas	NDP
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	PC
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MANNES, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	NDP
McALPINE, Gerry	Sturgeon Creek	PC
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	PC
McINTOSH, Linda, Hon.	Assiniboia	PC
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
NEUFELD, Harold	Rossmere	PC
ORCHARD, Donald, Hon.	Pembina	PC
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	PC
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
PRAZNIK, Darren, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	PC
REID, Daryl	Transcona	NDP
REIMER, Jack	Niakwa	PC
RENDER, Shirley	St. Vital	PC
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Gladstone	PC
ROSE, Bob	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Broadway	NDP
STEFANSON, Eric, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	PC
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	NDP
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	PC
VODREY, Rosemary, Hon.	Fort Garry	PC
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy	St. Johns	NDP
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	NDP

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**  
**THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS**

**Thursday, April 16, 1992**

**TIME – 10 a.m.**

**LOCATION – Winnipeg, Manitoba**

**CHAIRPERSON – Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Seine River)**

**ATTENDANCE - 11 – QUORUM - 6**

*Members of the Committee present:*

Hon. Messrs. Ducharme, Ernst

Mrs. Dacquay, Messrs. Dewar, Edwards, Ms. Friesen, Messrs. Gaudry, Laurendeau, McAlpine, Neufeld, Sveinson

**APPEARING:**

G. Campbell MacLean, Chairperson of the Board, The Forks Renewal Corporation

Nick Diakiw, President, The Forks Renewal Corporation

Marilyn Edmunds, Communications Manager, The Forks Renewal Corporation

Sid Kroker, Site Archeologist, The Forks Renewal Corporation

**MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION:**

The 1991 Forks Renewal Corporation Annual Report

\* \* \*

**Madam Chairperson:** Order, please. Will the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs please come to order. This morning the committee will be considering the 1991 Annual Report of and business pertaining to The Forks Renewal Corporation. We apologize for the late start, but we had technical difficulties with our recording.

The treatment of this annual report and the subject matter of the corporation is somewhat different from the usual committee proceedings and consideration of annual reports, given that there is no legislative requirement for the report to be considered by the committee.

When the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs met on December 4, 1990, to consider The Forks Renewal Corporation, the committee agreed at that meeting to hear opening statements from the minister responsible and the critics from both

opposition parties. The committee also agreed the question should be directed to the minister responsible who may then redirect the questions to the officials from the corporation.

Finally, the committee agreed at that meeting to adopt the following guidelines: (a) discuss means for the corporation to become more accountable for its actions and decisions taken; (b) review the corporation's mandate; (c) review the corporation's decision-making processes; and (d) review the corporation's future plans.

\* (1015)

Is the committee agreeable to using these same guidelines and proceeding in the same manner for today's meeting as a year ago?

**Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley):** Madam Chairperson, I have no difficulty proceeding along the same lines as last time, but I do object and we did object last year to your reading into the record those guidelines. We did indicate that those were not necessarily the guidelines which have been agreed to. I think that is in the record, Mr. Ashton's comments, but I do not want to take up time with this. I am quite happy to proceed on the way we did last time.

**Madam Chairperson:** Agreed?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Madam Chairperson:** Agreed and so ordered.

I would also like to remind the committee that we are not here today to pass the report as is done with other committees considering annual reports. Members will have ample opportunity to address questions pertaining to the report and to the business of The Forks Renewal Corporation, and when the committee has exhausted its consideration of the matter, the committee rises without passing the report.

I also understand that the officials from The Forks Renewal Corporation would like to make a slide presentation to the committee this morning. This, once again, is different from usual practice of the standing committee to permit audio-visual presentations. However, if there is indeed

unanimous consent from the committee, the presentation can be given.

My suggestion to the committee is that the committee recess at the time of the slide presentation to consider the presentation, as the presentation cannot be recorded in Hansard. Once the presentation is concluded, the committee would then reconvene to consider its consideration of The Forks Renewal Corporation.

Is there unanimous consent to permit the slide presentation to be given?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Madam Chairperson:** Agreed and so ordered.

Is there agreement to recess the committee at the appropriate time to consider the presentation?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Madam Chairperson:** Agreed and so ordered.

**Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Urban Affairs):** Madam Chairperson, I do not have an opening statement. I simply want to introduce, for those who are not familiar, the members of The Forks Renewal Corporation who are here today.

Firstly, to my immediate front here is Mr. G. Campbell MacLean, who is the Chairman of the Board of The Forks Renewal Corporation. Seated next to Mr. MacLean is Mr. Nick Diakiw, the General Manager. Then sitting next to Mr. Diakiw is Mr. Del Crewson, who is the auditor for the corporation. I believe Mr. Roy Parkhill of the board is also here as an interested observer of today's meeting.

There are other staff from The Forks Renewal Corporation who may get called upon from time to time, and I will ask Mr. Diakiw to introduce those people if he will.

**Mr. G. Campbell MacLean (Chairperson of the Board, The Forks Renewal Corporation):** I will introduce the other members of the committee. I have with me, as well as those ones that have been introduced already, Mr. Al Baronas, Vice-President of Operations; Mr. Randy Cameron, General Manager of The Forks Market; Mrs. Anna Shymansky, Corporate Accountant; Mr. Sid Kroker, Site Archeologist.

\* (1020)

I would also like to recognize members of our board appointed by the province, Ms. Charlotte Duguay unfortunately could not come today, and Mr. Roy Parkhill and Mr. Don Leitch, secretary of the cabinet.

I just would like to say a few words before we get into our presentation, and that is I want to thank the committee for allowing us to come back a second time to make a presentation to you. As you know, we are funded by the three levels of government, and are fully accountable to you, the Government of Canada and the City of Winnipeg. We also are required to hold annual meetings, and we have done so each year with a report on our activities.

Secondly, I would like to acknowledge our entire board, which has worked so hard to date, and also acknowledge some of our past members. I note that Jean Friesen was one of our first directors and she now sits in the Legislature and is here this morning. I am sure she will be interested and keep us on our toes. Other members included Ms. Dorothy Dobbie, Mr. Peter Diamant and Mr. Alan Artibise, Mr. Tony Reynolds and Mr. Ted Murphy.

As you know, there is a great deal of interest in The Forks. We have recently undertaken a survey of visitors and have documentation which shows that The Forks site is extremely well used. For example, awareness of The Forks is extremely high in Winnipeg—97 percent of the residents are aware of The Forks. In 1991, 81 percent of all Winnipeggers over the age of 18 visited the site. We experienced an estimated 3 million visits in 1991. If we included the estimates of children and out-of-town guests, they tell us that we would have exceeded over 7 million visits at The Forks last year. This is an astonishing number of visits. This indicates to me that we have achieved two of our first initial objectives, namely, to discover The Forks and, secondly, to establish a meeting place.

Clearly The Forks has been discovered by the community beyond our wildest expectations, and as a meeting place it is almost beyond comprehension. This level of interest has reflected itself in our board's activities. The board is extremely active and meets monthly and sometimes more frequently.

Board members also serve on various committees as well as many advisory committees. For example, Ms. Charlette Duguay serves on our very active Heritage Advisory Committee and at the present time is chairperson. Mr. Parkhill serves on our Finance and Audit Committee which meets monthly. Mary Richard, appointed by the City of Winnipeg and a prominent member of the aboriginal and native community, serves on our Aboriginal Planning Committee.

In addition at our annual—at least at our monthly board meetings we receive delegations from the community which seek to make presentations and speak directly to us with respect to their interests and concerns. With the growth of interest and acceptance of The Forks, the work of the board has expanded tremendously to deal with the community's interest. We welcome this interest and have responded to the best of our ability to make ourselves accessible to the community.

In summary, we believe we have come a long way since 1987 when we began this voyage. Now we are looking to the future. As you know, we are at the end of our first five years. By the end of this year, we are required to submit to the three levels of government the Phase II concept and financial plan to govern activities at The Forks for the next five years.

As we did in 1987, we will involve the community in a public consultation process to assist the board to develop a new concept and financial plan with community involvement throughout the process.

Today's presentation will be structured as follows. Mr. Diakiw will present an overview of activities for 1990 and 1991 with slides to illustrate the highlights. These are also summarized in our annual report. Mr. Johnson will overview the financial highlights, as set out in our annual report and our audited financial statement. Mr. Diakiw will then wrap up the presentation and provide you with some details of the public consultation process. After the presentation we will be pleased to answer any questions the committee may have.

I would now like to ask Mr. Diakiw to begin the presentation.

**Mr. Ernst:** Perhaps I can seek some advice from Mr. MacLean or Mr. Diakiw. Because the audio-visual presentation cannot be obviously recorded in written form, is it our wish then to adjourn or recess to hear the audio-visual presentation and your comments, Mr. Diakiw, associated with it and then perhaps following that we can reconvene and you can do the presentation on the public consultation process and the financial aspects of it which can be recorded?

**Madam Chairperson:** I think just initially, committee, if I just might get clarification from Mr. Diakiw's presentation: Are there salient points in your slide presentation that you would want recorded in Hansard? We are not exactly sure, from a mechanical standpoint, how we might do

that, but I think we could probably work out some arrangement with committee members, and I think we should establish that first.

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** Madam Chairperson, I think Mr. Diakiw should make his presentation and we should recess for the slide presentation, following which members, of course, having listened to it, will be able to ask questions based on any points that committee members feel have come up in his presentation. I think that would be sufficient.

**Madam Chairperson:** Is that the will of the committee? Agreed?

**An Honourable Member:** Agreed.

**Madam Chairperson:** Agreed. Mr. Diakiw, you feel comfortable with that as well?

**Mr. Diakiw:** No problem at all.

**Madam Chairperson:** Okay. Then at this point the committee will recess to view the slide presentation. Agreed?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Madam Chairperson:** Agreed.

\* (1025)

\* \* \*

The committee took recess at 10:25 a.m.

#### After Recess

The committee resumed at 10:53 a.m.

**Madam Chairperson:** Order, please. This committee now will reconvene and this portion of the presentation will be recorded. Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

**Mr. Nick Diakiw (President, The Forks Renewal Corporation):** Madam Chairperson, five years ago when this process started, there were very few people in Winnipeg who even knew that The Forks lands existed. It was an old rail yard that was hidden by a very high main line on the west side, by warehouses along the Provencher Boulevard side, and very few people knew about The Forks. A lot of them had forgotten about the history of The Forks as well.

At that point in time the three levels of government and the board were faced with the real challenge of developing a financing concept plan in consultation with the public for this site. I think it is fair to say that probably 95 percent of the people did not know the site existed and did not know the significance of that site. In that context, the board went forward and had

a number of public meetings, had some 130 or 140 submissions and developed a concept plan. I think that concept plan has stood the test of time, but at the same time we must recognize that we are now beyond that stage.

One of the big challenges that the corporation had was to get people to discover the site. That was the theme and the drive of the board for the first five years. I think even our worst critics would admit that we have encouraged the people, and the people of Manitoba have discovered The Forks is a very, very special place.

As we come into the last year of our mandate, and recognizing that we are required to come forward with another financing concept plan for the three levels of government, the challenge is quite different, and our board recognized that about a year ago. At our annual meeting we indicated that we were going to be coming forward with a consultation program that would address the concerns that some of our critics had that the public did not have the opportunity to make the kind of input that it should have at that time.

Given that set of circumstances, we looked at this and we looked at the process that the City of Winnipeg was going through in their Plan Winnipeg review. We looked at the constitutional process. We met with people who have been in the business of facilitating interaction with the communities, and we came to the conclusion that the thrust for the second five-year phase should be one of community involvement. We have to get the people to develop. They have developed a sense of ownership of the site. Let them now develop a sense of ownership of the plans and then the thoughts that go into the second five-year phase.

With that in mind, we did announce—let me discuss the process very quickly with you—we have an overhead that will show you the kind of exhaustive process we propose to go through over the next seven months. Throughout May and June, information regarding the views, concerns and ideas of the public will be collected.

Several consultation methods will be used with a focus certainly on dialogue. Workshops will be held with representatives of community organizations. It is expected that more than 200 community groups may be represented in this part of the process. As well, workshops will be held with our four established community-based advisory groups, the ones that have been serving us so well over the last

four years. An independent random survey of public views and priorities will be undertaken. As well, people will be invited to share their thoughts and ideas through a tear-off panel on the informational brochure that we have passed out on the kit that we have given to you. In addition, we will be encouraging individuals and organizations to submit their comments in the form of a written brief.

However, the key component in the process will be the participation of a jury of citizens. In early January, The Forks did an independent random survey of the public to determine the visitations to the site, to determine the character of the people who visit our site. Throughout this study, in which over 1,100 residents were interviewed, they were asked to give their views on The Forks and their patterns of visitation. The visitors to the site in the past 12 months, that is the year 1991, were invited to participate in public consultation meetings and other forums of public input. They were asked to actually get involved in the process. Out of that group, 137 individuals indicated their interest in participating as community representatives in a consultation process. We have had initial meetings with members of this group and a core of volunteers is being established as a citizens advisory group.

This citizens group will participate in every step of the consultation and the planning process. It will review all the data and the information collected and once public priorities and issues have been examined, the citizens group will work together with The Forks to formulate options for review and discussion. It is expected that this work will take several months.

Throughout the process, the full 137 citizen members who indicated they wished to be informed on a continuing basis will be so informed. Then in early October, the citizens group, The Forks advisory committees and the board of the corporation will meet in a conference-like setting to examine the options that will have been developed over the summer months.

Consensus for a preferred course of action will be sought and will form the basis of the Phase II plan. In November, the draft Phase II plan will be brought forward at a public presentation and another opportunity for public response will follow. All information collected through this consultation process will be made public and all submissions received will become public documents.

\* (1100)

Finally, the plan along with all the briefs and information collected will be compiled for the presentation to the governments, the three levels of government, at the end of December.

I think in the past our board has been criticized from time to time for being unmindful and unresponsive to wishes of the public. I think in fact the board has always shown a tremendous commitment to broad public consultation. There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that what I have outlined to you here will be a fully public process, one to encourage the community to become involved in this process and to particularly encourage those people who have become regular visitors to the site to play a meaningful role in the planning process.

This renewal of ours has touched only a small part of The Forks and certainly many challenges lie ahead. Our board is convinced that through the direct involvement and support of the community, a positive direction for the next phase of this revitalization will be achieved.

As I said, Madam Chairperson, this was presented to the media yesterday morning, and we have already launched the process. That concludes our presentation, and we are certainly open to questioning.

**Madam Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Diakiw.

**Mr. Edwards:** Madam Chairperson, I want to start by thanking the representatives from the corporation who have come and the experts that they have brought with them. It has been a very informative and interesting presentation, and I for one certainly appreciate coming to this committee and giving members of all parties of the Legislature the opportunity to learn what has happened and to ask some questions.

Firstly, I note in the funding contributions portion, through you, Madam Chairperson, to perhaps the financial expert who is here or Mr. Diakiw, Winnipeg Core Area Initiative has been a significant funder. What happens now? Are there future needs for further capital investment now that the Core Area Initiative has essentially died an untimely death? We all hope for more monies being made available, but clearly the amount of funding that has been made available in the past cannot be relied upon for future years.

What are the needs going to be? What are the alternate revenue sources going to be, given that?

**Madam Chairperson:** Excuse me, please. I would just like to remind all committee members that the questions are to be directed through the minister and then he will defer to The Forks Renewal Corporation representatives.

**Mr. Diakiw:** In the matter of immediate financing, I think Mr. Crewson indicated that in the form of the equivalency payments that we have received those from the federal government. In the financing concept plan, it was always contemplated that the province and the city would use their best efforts to match those funds. That would require an additional \$8 million spread over a number years, so that may be some additional funding.

This question was asked yesterday, and I think it is probably premature. I know it is premature to give an answer at this point in time, because we are going into a public consultation process. In support of the kinds of ideas and concepts that will be flowing from that process, we will be developing plans that go along with that process, not only design plans but financial plans as well, so that the people involved in the process get an appreciation of what the costs will be of some of the concepts that are coming out. Depending on what comes out of that process, I think at the end of the year I would be better prepared to answer what, if any, further funds are required.

The demands from the city, of course, over the last few years have been that we do less and less commercial, that we get involved more in a public amenity sense, so we are torn from that side. At the same time, to the City of Winnipeg we are paying annual taxes of some \$700,000. On the one hand, you are saying do not develop, and on the other hand, you are saying you have to pay taxes. That places the board in a bit of a conundrum.

I think as we go through this public consultation process and as we see the vision evolve, the question we will be asking is, what is it that we want from The Forks? We have a mandate. That mandate is a good mandate, but it is one that should be reviewed by the community to see whether the community agrees with it.

The second question we will be asking, once we have the vision clarified as far as the mandate is concerned, what is it that we should be doing over the next five years? It follows that once you decide what it is you would like to do over the next five years, then you have to come up with what the costs of that will be.

**Mr. Edwards:** Madam Chairperson, does that mean that the present work that has been going on with respect to the Johnson Terminal and the B & B Building, I think it is, the plans for that—I believe Marwest has a Letter of Intent or has some interest in the Johnson Terminal. The B & B Building has been proposed as the site for the Children's Museum in your slide presentation. Are those part of the consultation plan over the next year, or are they in effect committed uses for those buildings?

**Mr. Diaklw:** We, as I have indicated earlier, have entered into Letters of Intent, and our board has been focusing on development of the existing buildings rather than going into new development on the site. Those commitments that have been made to the Children's Museum and to Marwest and to the rail heritage people, those will be pursued in parallel. We feel very strongly, the board does, that those developments will stand the test of any public consideration.

**Mr. Edwards:** Madam Chairperson, what is left for Phase II in the sense—I mean, what are you thinking? I have not looked forward to reviewing and monitoring the public consultation, but what are people going to be talking about in terms of use of land or sites that are left? What are the major issues that are coming through in the next year?

**Mr. Diaklw:** During this first phase, through our advisory committees, we have been addressing some of the major components of the first five-year plan. For instance, the leisure centre, our advisory committee of about 20 citizens have been working for two years on the development of that concept. That will be brought forward during the public process, so the public can view what this leisure facility might look like, what it may add to the site.

The aboriginal people, the advisory committee, have been working on a presence at the site. They are actively pursuing the South Point as the area where they would celebrate their presence at the site. They will be reporting to our board next Friday on some concepts they have developed, so the Aboriginal Centre will be a prime consideration.

A multicultural centre as well, a feasibility study is in the process of being done. The multicultural presence at the site will be addressed. Those are some of the major issues that will be addressed.

In terms of the original mandate, there was a residential component proposed, and we have not followed the plan because of the recession and because of concentrating our resources on getting

the public portions of it done. That will be addressed by the public in terms of whether a residential component should be part of the process. So I think those are some of the major things that will be looked at.

**Mr. Edwards:** Madam Chairperson, this question is for the minister. I note that the corporation had indicated it would be coming back to government at the end of this process. They have outlined in December, I believe it is anticipated, December of this year.

Will we have an opportunity to reconvene this committee at that time and review the results of that public process?

**Mr. Ernst:** I have not considered that suggestion, but that is something that I will certainly take under advisement.

**Mr. Edwards:** Let me just indicate for our part that I think we have embarked upon a process of awareness that is very useful for us as legislators and, given our role, one of the three levels of government involved, then I would certainly like an opportunity at the end of the process to hear from the representatives we have here today as to the results of the Phase II consultation process. I will leave my comments at that. I may have further questions after my friend, but I know she will want to ask some questions.

\* (1110)

**Ms. Friesen:** I wonder if perhaps we could have some guidelines on procedure here. I think it is normal to begin with opening statements, and I noticed the minister did. The member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) chose not to, and we went into a number of questions. So are we going by time or are we going by an organized program here? What do you suggest?

**Madam Chairperson:** I indicated in my preamble that that was at the prerogative of the committee and the honourable member indeed. The process generally is to recognize the individuals as I see them or as they indicate they wish to speak. You certainly have the prerogative of putting opening statements on the record at this point in time.

**Ms. Friesen:** Okay. Thank you. I do not want to make a long opening statement, but I do want to say that I think The Forks Corporation has been very successful in the last two years in enhancing public accessibility to the site. I think it has been

successful in printing The Forks and the rivers on the public mind of Winnipeggers.

I am interested in the reports and surveys that you have done. I know the one in the City of Winnipeg, which has looked at recreational opportunities and has given some very good statistics on the number of people who visited The Forks, the level of satisfaction. In the hierarchy of ranking of recreational opportunities in Winnipeg, I believe that The Forks comes at the top of that.

I think for a corporation which has only been in existence for five years that that is very substantial. I think we should also be aware that it is also a question of economic conditions as well, that The Forks along with the zoo is still one of the few free opportunities for Winnipeggers. So while I congratulate you, I do not think Manitobans should be too complacent about that. Initial developments always benefit by the shock of the new and in this case it is the economic conditions of the time I think which are important to remember. However, I do want to offer my congratulations on that.

The second thing I think that The Forks has been increasingly successful with is the use of volunteers. I recognize that in the use of volunteers at a variety of levels, not just the advisory committees, but the volunteer contributions that you have had from the carpenters' union, from the gas company, from the masons as well as the numbers of people who donated their time to put down the sod at the Western Canada Games. I think that is something that deserves congratulations and credit at a time when volunteers are being incredibly stretched. We all know that, all of us who work in any kind of community activity.

I think I have some credit for the corporation, under difficult development and mandate situations, in maintaining a considerable portion, perhaps not as much as I would like, but a considerable portion of respect for heritage. The delay of the steam plant, for example, I think deserves credit. The continuing preservation of the B & B Building, which I know is a cost factor and is also something which is not necessarily supported by all the community but is very strongly supported by the heritage community. So I think in heritage buildings and in heritage planning, there are certainly areas for credit and continued congratulations.

Those will be my opening statements. The areas that I do want to discuss fall under the headings of accountability, both financial and in terms of

reporting, and some of this you have addressed in the plan that you set out here.

I am concerned about the programs, the nature programs, that are continuing and your future plans for programming, continuing concerns about the mandate, both from the perspective of the corporation and the plans of the government for the creation of what appears to be a megacorporation downtown, and the relationship of this to the development of downtown Winnipeg.

I have some concerns about budget, but they are more questions than general concerns at this stage, and, of course, some concerns, as everybody has, about the future funding of The Forks and the way this is going to affect not only the future but also the very immediate planning constraints that you are under.

So, Madam Chairperson, is there agreement to continue under that kind of agenda? Okay.

The first area I wanted to touch on was accountability. The Forks has been in existence now for five years. Could you tell me about the public meetings—through you, Mr. Minister—how many annual public meetings there have been, and how you would summarize the strengths and weaknesses perhaps of those public meetings?

**Mr. Ernst:** I would defer to The Forks here.

**Mr. Diaklw:** Well, we do have, as you well know, an annual meeting in which we present our financial plans. We give a report on our activities for the year and what future activities we are forecasting. We have turnouts of about—it varies, depending on the controversy. If there is something controversial in the media then our turnouts are better, but I would say they average around 200 or 300 people.

I would characterize the questions that come back, not only for those annual meetings, but I spend an awful lot of time talking to service groups. The message that I get back from those service groups is that they are very positive about what we have done to date, no question at all about it. The project has captured the imagination of people in Manitoba, and everybody is caught up with it. They see it as a focal point, a meeting place, something that was lacking in Winnipeg. So they are positive from that standpoint.

The concerns that they have always had is what comes next, and that is as a result of these ideas that surface in the public that the board has no control over. Somebody will come up with the idea

of a megasporting facility right at the forks of the river, or some other thing. Of course the public reads about this and they become concerned about it. They are not sure that is not going to crop up the next day. So those are the kinds of concerns we have.

That is why, in setting up our consultation program, we wanted to get the public involved and a much better understanding of whatever mandate comes out of the process, so they will be reassured that, over the next five years, there will not be any of these imagined surprises coming up. I would think that, if I were going to synthesize the public reaction, it would be that, of acceptance and support for what we have done and just an unease about what may be coming next.

**Ms. Friesen:** There have been three annual meetings in five years?

**Mr. Diaklw:** Yes, I think there have been three. We would normally have had an annual meeting this spring, but at last year's meeting the criticism that we had was that our financial statements—our audited financial statements do not come out till the fall of the year, because our year-end is March 31. By the time all the accounting is done and the auditors go through it, we circulate the audited statements at the end of August or September. So, as a result of that criticism, we decided, the board decided, that rather than have our annual meetings in the spring, we would have them in the fall, so that the financial statements and our activities reports would coincide. That is the reason for us being out of step this spring.

**Ms. Friesen:** I think it is useful to have that on the record because I know there was some concern, people anticipating an annual public meeting this spring and it has not occurred. So you are expecting it to be in the—

**Mr. Diaklw:** —in the fall of the year. It will be in the fall of the year, yes.

**Ms. Friesen:** Have you considered any changes in the format of the annual public meeting? I know that there has been some public discontent with the format of the meeting, and I know annual meetings obviously are stymied in some ways in that they have a limited range of format, but using that opportunity for educating the public about the future of The Forks, providing perhaps for more informal participation rather than the set board of directors on the platform and the question and response,

which, I think, in some cases has perhaps unnecessarily set up a division.

\* (1120)

**Mr. Diaklw:** I would think that that would be something that we would look forward to, not in this fall's meeting, because I think the public consultation process in itself is going to be so all-encompassing that I think our annual meeting will probably fade in comparison to the things that will be going on around us. I think in the future that suggestion is a worthwhile one to look at.

**Ms. Friesen:** Thank you. I know that you have for a number of years now spoken, as you said, to service groups. What other kinds of community groups have you tried to meet with perhaps? Is there an area of the community that you feel you are not meeting?

**Mr. Diaklw:** There are only so many days in the week and so much time available. We do that. Through our programming at the site, there are all kinds of occasions for the board members and for the administration to interact with the public who come to the site, whether they are various ethnic groups, whether they are service groups. So there is a tremendous amount of interaction that goes on between the corporation and the public, sometimes in a structured sense, sometimes in a very social sense at The Forks itself. I do not know how much more we could actually do.

Then we expect the members of our advisory committees to carry the message as well. They are briefed on everything we are doing, all the plans, any letters of intent. Anything that we are carrying out, we communicate and pass by our advisory committees, and we expect that they then will fan out, in a sense, to the communities they represent, and carry the message of what The Forks is all about.

**Ms. Friesen:** One of my concerns in asking that question is, of course, the connection with the local community, that is, with the inner city community and particularly with more recently arrived immigrants and their group representatives. I think it is very clear that, if you go to The Forks, they are very frequent users of The Forks; and I wondered if you have been able to make direct connections with them rather than rely on the indirect connections, well-meaning as they might be, of the ethnic organizations.

**Mr. Diaklw:** The multicultural groups and the MMDI have annual conferences which I attend and

participate in. I do not think there is any question of the involvement with the multicultural groups in terms of the development of their facility. They have done surveys of their community and indicated what is coming.

We have interaction with ethnic groups. The Ukrainian Zababa 100, which is the largest social event which has ever come to the site, is coming to the site this year.

You are right. They have developed a very quick sense of ownership for the site, and I think it not only comes from the fact that it is free, but I think in the choice of the merchants we have in the market itself. It reflects the ethnic diversity of our community. We were very, very cautious in the choosing of those merchants, and I think most of the ethnic groups will find something in that market that reminds them of the country that they come from and the heritage that they have left.

**Ms. Frlesen:** My concern was particularly for those groups who live in the inner city. You reference particularly, or made a reference to, the Ukrainian groups, and obviously they are amongst the leaders of the multicultural society, but I think probably many Manitobans now regard Ukrainians as part of the established elite. What I am looking at is the—Mr. Diakiw—and I am concerned about the newly arrived people who have very limited recreational opportunities and who live closest to the site.

**Mr. Diakiw:** I guess I could answer it in this way. We have a Downtown BIZ that we interact with as well. I should have mentioned that what we have tried to do is to establish linkages with our neighbours in St. Boniface and in the downtown community. We have regular meetings with the BIZ as an introducing program, so that everybody is aware of what we are doing, and get a sense of co-operation in that regard.

One of the things that I think would be a tremendous opportunity—and from time to time in the development of the site we have to influence some direction. There is an opportunity that is developing a possibility of the immigration department coming to the site of The Forks. I was asked, you know, whether the board and the corporation would be agreeable to that kind of presence, and of course I jumped at it and indicated not only would we be agreeable, we would welcome that kind of presence because it would introduce The Forks to people in the very, very early days in our community and in our province and hopefully give a very positive

image. So we are pursuing that opportunity with one of the levels of government.

In our programming itself, our programming people work with people in the inner city. Again, and I will repeat what we did, and I am very proud of the fact that in our water-based programs we consciously took a decision that there might be an image that people living in the core of the city would not have an opportunity to be versed in water activities, water safety, canoeing, sailing and we consciously, not imposed, but persuaded our operators that one day a week would be set aside for the young children of that community to come to The Forks and participate in those activities.

So, through a combination and an integration of all these activities, I think we have succeeded to the extent that that group has the newcomers who would parallel my parents, who immigrated to this country in the latter '20s, probably develop a quicker sense of ownership than the so-called elite may have developed. We may have come along a little later.

I do think there is more we can do. I would not want you to think that I think we are doing everything we can, but I can tell you that the board and the administration is dedicated to that kind of communication and that kind of participation. It is vital to our site if we are truly going to be considered a meeting place.

**Ms. Frlesen:** I am continuing along the lines of accountability. In the beginning there were many discussions about whether this was a Manitoba place or a Winnipeg place, and I wondered if those kinds of discussions have continued and whether your contacts are with Manitobans generally or whether it would become much more specifically a Winnipeg location—Winnipeg tourism, a Winnipeg meeting place?

**Mr. Diakiw:** Well, I do not think so. I think that we have had meetings with people from Selkirk. Our market manager is constantly in contact with people who might come to the marketplace from various areas of Manitoba. I think we have tried to accomplish that. How successfully we have been I think is too early to say, but we certainly address that issue.

One of the other things that I neglected to mention in answer to your last question is that in terms of new immigrants coming to The Forks, we do have swearing-in ceremonies for the immigrants at The

Forks. We had one last year. Canada Day this year will be at The Forks.

In terms of our interaction with the rest of the province, I think the opportunity is there in a big way in the tourist facility that will be coming to The Forks. I think that tourist facility, properly developed, and recognizing that The Forks can be a kickoff for an experience in the rest of the province, I think will draw the province more to The Forks. I think that will be our major challenge over the next year, to make sure that the tourist facility reflects not only The Forks but the rest of the province.

**Ms. Friesen:** It was under some of the programs that we want to discuss. Just to continue on accountability and to comment on your proposals here for surveys and for your next phase of planning, I like many aspects of that. I wondered, first of all, how many people you surveyed. You did an initial survey?

**Mr. Diakiw:** About 1,100.

**Ms. Barrett:** 1,100, and how was that done?

**Mr. Diakiw:** It was done by a—

**Madam Chairperson:** Mr. Diakiw.

**Mr. Diakiw:** I am sorry, my City of Winnipeg experience does not hold me in good stead here I am afraid. We had a—

**Floor Comment:** That is for sure.

**Mr. Diakiw:** I left myself open.

We called for proposals in the local community to get a survey done that would give us an idea of the use of the site, and the survey was carried out by a local company.

**Ms. Friesen:** What I was looking for, was it a survey of people who were at The Forks or was it a broad-based survey of Winnipeggers or Manitobans or—

**Mr. Diakiw:** Maybe I can ask Marilyn Edmunds, who is our communications officer who worked with the consultants, to give you that kind of detail.

**Ms. Marilyn Edmunds (Communications Manager, The Forks Renewal Corporation):** Yes, the survey was done randomly by telephone. It included some areas outside the actual perimeter of the city. It was not restricted to site users but site users were canvassed for participation with the citizens' committee for the development of Phase II.

\* (1130)

**Ms. Friesen:** So there were 1,100 people in the random telephone survey then?

**Ms. Edmunds:** 1,125.

**Ms. Friesen:** The other thing, the comment I had was in the stages that you had for your draft plan. It seemed to me that there might be some use in a stage that Parks Canada has in many of its planning options. I noticed you go to planning option and then to draft option without a public space in there.

One of the things I think that Parks Canada has found very useful is when they get to the options stage, that there is a public meeting, and that there is some public comment on the options by people who have not drafted the plan, user groups and that kind of thing, whereas you are going straight through up to a draft option to the minister.

**Mr. Diakiw:** I think that is a useful proposal. What I do not want to leave with you is the impression that what we presented is very structured. I think a public consultation process can get very unstructured, and I think that we will have to ebb and flow with the kind of input that we have during that process.

I would not want you feel that we feel that we will not introduce any steps if the board thinks that they are appropriate. This is the best process that we could come up with, input on any number of people who have been involved in these kinds of processes. If during the process it shows that there is a step we have missed or something, that we may do better in a different way, I can assure you we will adjust the process to suit our experience.

**Ms. Friesen:** I think the principles of the process are very good, and I look forward to it. Of course, the kind of results you get out of it are going to be based upon the level of knowledge and understanding of the project that the participants will have. I wondered what kind of ideas and steps you had in mind to address that issue, because as you have said yourself there are many opportunities for misunderstandings and arenas that fly out of midfield and whatever.

**Mr. Diakiw:** And we will continue to have that. I think that is a fact of life that we certainly live with. I think the important part of the process will be in the communication with a public who is not involved in the process. I do not think there is any question that during that process we will have to in some fashion be sure that it is not seen as a closed process, that it is not seen as something that just the elite are involved in.

I think that is a challenge we will have to face. If we do not face up to it, then we will be criticized for

it. I think during the process—like, I have just outlined the principles, along with the principles go the fact that communication throughout that process with the media and with the public will be very important.

You cannot force the media. We, unfortunately, for instance, yesterday, had a media conference in which we presented our public consultation process, and one of the major newspapers in Winnipeg never even showed up. At the same time, a week from now they will probably be criticizing the process.

So you can lead the horse to water, but—

**Floor Comment:** It happens to us all the time.

**Mr. Diaklw:** Yes, that is right, and I do not say out of—I say that accepting the fact that that is the way the world turns.

**Ms. Friesen:** Yes, I had noticed the lack of reporting this morning, and I did catch something on the television news last night.

**Mr. Diaklw:** We had very good television.

**Ms. Friesen:** I think I would like to move on to talk about programming. Programming is a huge area, and I wanted to pick up perhaps where you left off. You were talking about the development of an immigration theme, and I wondered, in general, what your relations are with the CN, with the VIA Rail station, with the kind of gateway opportunity that seemed to be there last year, and also what is the state of the—are there any holdovers from the CN land issue that we should be aware of?

**Mr. Diaklw:** No, there are not any holdovers from the CN land issue. The chairman and I have had a couple of exploratory meetings with VIA people and a member of the board of VIA to see whether there was not a real opportunity here for the integration of what we were doing and what they were doing. Subsequent to that meeting, I have had a couple of meetings with their administration to see where they are coming from, so that is under consideration but in the very early formative stages.

**Ms. Friesen:** I do not know if it is fair to ask you, but I am still interested in the gateway possibilities that were there. Is there interest still from the CN side on developing that?

**Mr. Diaklw:** I think it would be fair to say that because of the massive changes occurring with CN and VIA at the present time that that is kind of on the back burner. They have major, major downsizing that is happening and restructuring that is occurring.

I would think it would be fair to say that the discussions are very, very preliminary and on the backburner at the present time.

**Ms. Friesen:** The second area of federal involvement in this site has always been Parks Canada. We are aware that there is certainly downsizing in Parks Canada, too. Could you give us an indication of how that federal downsizing has affected The Forks operations?

**Mr. Diaklw:** It has not affected The Forks operations to the present moment. We do meet on a regular basis with their staff so that our programming is integrated with theirs and theirs integrated with ours. I am not up to date on what the latest downsizing that may have occurred, but we do work with them on a continual basis, because the people who come to the site do not view this as a site that is fragmented, that involves the railway, that involves The Forks; they view it as one site.

We want to be sure that they continue to view that as one site. Any number of events that are carried out, particularly the Children's Festival, part of it is on their site, part is on ours. They had some pretty severe restrictions on the kinds of events they can allow on their site, so things that they cannot allow on their site may be suitable for our site. So we work together with them on that.

We co-operate in security as well. We ensure that the security of both sites is handled in a proper fashion. We have got recognition for that. I think there was a group that surveyed the safety of all public spaces last year and found that The Forks in general was viewed as the safest site in Winnipeg.

There is interaction of that order. They do assist us in terms of the tourists that they bring to the site. If there is a downsizing in that area, we may have to establish some of our own in order to be sure that, particularly, people who are not from this city and people who may be from outside the country brought to the site get a proper tour and understanding of what this special place is all about.

**Ms. Friesen:** As I understand it, their downsizing has been in archeological programs across the country and also in personnel, particularly research and interpretation personnel. So I believe that certainly some of the larger plans for interpretation and re-enactment that are necessary in a site which has very few historical buildings, constructions that are actually quite necessary. I wondered how that had affected your heritage planning and the kind of visitors that you can anticipate at the site.

**Mr. Diaklw:** Because I am not familiar with the downsizing, I would ask maybe Sid Kroker, who is our archeologist who is working on the site itself. I can tell you that The Forks Renewal Corporation maintains its very strong commitment to archeology at the site. It has been one, as I said, of the jewels of the site and the attraction to the site.

Sid, maybe you can help me in dealing with the issue.

**Mr. Sid Kroker (Site Archeologist, The Forks Renewal Corporation):** With regard to parks' downsizing, so far it has not impinged upon any of the interrelated activities which co-operate with The Forks Renewal Corporation. Their funding level toward the public archeology program is the same as it has been for the last three years.

Their possible downsizing, and it has not been confirmed yet, because they are still running through estimates and working it down through the filter, there may be a lack of interpreter time at the site, which may mean that our site interpreters at the public archeology program may have to take on more of a role in interpreting the past, because they will not have the staff on their side to be able to handle that.

\* (1140)

**Ms. Friesen:** Do you have any sense of the scale of it? Is it, the possible downsizing or cuts, 50 percent or 20 percent?

**Mr. Kroker:** I really have no idea. Last fall they lost two weeks of staff time for all of the interpreters on site. This year, the talks I have had with Parks personnel, they have not been putting numbers on it as to either individuals, person years, person weeks or programs.

**Ms. Friesen:** When you say two weeks, it is two weeks then out of a 12-week season?

**Mr. Kroker:** I am not sure exactly how long. Their season usually runs from Victoria Day through till Labour Day, so it would be about 12 weeks.

**Ms. Friesen:** Maybe while Mr. Kroker is at the table, we could talk about the public archeology program and other archeological issues. The public archeology program has been very successful, as I think everybody knows. I do not know what your waiting lists are already, but I am sure they are there. What do you think are the prospects for expanding it?

Would you recommend expansions or do you think there are, by the very nature of the program, limits that have to be there.

**Mr. Kroker:** I think the program has to have some limits. If it ran year-round for the next decade the flavour may be lost. This is something people wait for, they look forward to. If it was a drop-in, like going to any movie theatre, all of a sudden the thrill would sort of be diluted, so I think it has to be constrained in temporal aspect, also climate managed to do that quite effectively for us.

The place where it could be expanded, and this is funding contingent, would be in the educational component. Right now we are able to offer approximately three weeks on each of our years depending on funding for hands-on education for Grade 5 and Grade 8 students, including rural schools as well as Winnipeg schools.

Last year we had five rural schools that participated in the hands-on learning about archeology. Our waiting lists on schools numbers over 100. This component would be the one that would be the easiest to expand, the market is there, the resources would have to be in such a way that a facility would be needed for the students to be able to come to or the staff would be needed to be able to go out to the schools. That is the first expansion aspect that could be done.

In terms of the hands-on general public, I think it should be temporally constrained to an annual summer event rather than run it through.

**Ms. Friesen:** I accept your climatic limitations. I am not sure I would accept the argument of market economics on an educational activity. The second part, I think about the expansion of year-round educational activities, is an important one. I have certainly heard teachers speak about that and would like to have the facilities in terms of meeting rooms, classrooms, facilities for young students particularly, to enable them to take advantage of that.

In terms of archeology generally, what do you see are the requirements for the future?

**Mr. Kroker:** Future orientations towards archeology are spelled out in the archeological management plan. Any type of subsurface development, if it is putting in a new fire hydrant, it is monitored. If there is any new subsurface services going in, extending water to a new facility, that would be first assessed under impact

assessments and then monitored on a continual basis.

The opportunity is still there for academic research oriented archeology. We have had two university archeology field schools over the last three years. The opportunity for individual researchers from the Manitoba universities or other universities to be able to access, under the set of standards that have already been published, is available.

The in-house-derived archeology from The Forks Renewal Corporation would be as a result of projected developments, and this would be coming out of phase two.

Things like the B & B refurbishment or Johnson terminal refurbishment do not impact on the archeology inasmuch as they are working on built structure.

**Ms. Friesen:** That was the area that concerned me, in fact—the limitations that might be being placed on future archeology as a result of the B & B development. Obviously there is going to be landscaping, there is going to be external work. Are we in fact limiting possible research investigation in that area?

**Mr. Kroker:** I do not believe so. Part of it goes back to about 1888 when Bridges bought the land for the railroad. It flooded, so one of the first things they did was put down in some areas as much as two and a half metres of fill.

The early heritage, the fur trade and the prior aboriginal utilization of the area is buried under this fill, and the railroad activities were above grade, so any landscaping that would occur there would again be sitting on up to two metres of railroad-derived cinders and gravel.

**Ms. Friesen:** One final archeological question then. The provincial government is responsible for the development of a burials policy. Have you seen that burial policy?

**Mr. Kroker:** I have seen a published version, as far as the burials policy would apply to the area of The Forks, but I should point out that prior to this, The Forks Renewal Corporation, in consultation with the Native elders, Treaty of Aboriginal Rights and Research working group as well as the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs sat down and developed, based partly on the Navaho law aspect, a burials policy that was long in advance of the provinces.

**Ms. Friesen:** Has this been drawn to the attention of the province, and has the province made any attempt to modify its own policy?

**Mr. Kroker:** I cannot speak for the province and ours was published as a public document. In many instances, and in fact most instances, I think both agencies drew on the same sources. There is a great deal of compatibility between the way it is examined.

The province approached it on the aspect of a regulatory body, FRC approached it on the aspect of good neighbour, but the end result is a consultative aspect involving all agencies that have a part to play: the regulatory, the people with the heritage ownership of it, as well as those who have jurisdiction over the territory on which it occurred.

**Ms. Friesen:** I am familiar with the Navaho policy. I wondered if the policy which The Forks has developed has been confirmed, should we say, by other aboriginal organizations. Has it been to the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs for example, or is it just your own advisory committee?

**Mr. Kroker:** Perhaps I should pass this on to Mr. Diakiw, because he was at the meeting at which it was discussed with the elders.

**Mr. Diakiw:** When you asked the question earlier about dealing with the various ethnic groups and with the various groups in the inner city, I should have mentioned, of course, the number of meetings that we have had with the elders and the native community in trying to get them to understand what we were doing at The Forks.

The major stumbling block in all of our discussions was this concern about burial sites, and through a series of meetings and through the good support of Mary Richard we were able to get a policy in place that both sides feel comfortable with. Now how it may or may not have been formally approved by the aboriginal community I could not tell you, but I do know that there is an understanding on both sides in how we will operate and how we will contact each other in that regard. Both sides are satisfied that it is adequate for the purposes of both groups. Other than that, I am sorry, I cannot tell you anything more as to how they formalized that.

**Ms. Friesen:** Could I ask the minister then if it is possible to see that document and to see the provincial burials policy?

**Mr. Ernst:** I do not see why not, but I will inquire from my colleague the Minister of Culture (Mrs. Mitchelson).

\* (1150)

**Ms. Friesen:** Okay, thank you very much. Could I move on then to the Heritage Plan, which I know has been in process for a couple of years and which, I should state for the record, I had some part in. So, I wondered if you could give me an update on where the plan is and when you anticipate making the document broadly public.

**Mr. Diaklw:** The answer to the last part of your question, as to when we are going to make it public, I think I would defer to Al Baronas because I have been away for a few weeks, and I know that there have been some meetings in this regard. So he will give you more of an up-to-date answer, but I think what I want to emphasize, in the heritage concerns we have had a very, very active heritage advisory group that have played a very, very strong role, dedicated people who have given up their personal time working in the development of a Heritage Interpretive Plan.

They went to the public, I believe it was in June of last year, after having developed a framework plan with the aid of consultants and had input from all the various areas that were interested in heritage. They then went back and have been working very, very diligently in a hands-on way in redoing that plan to reflect the kind of input that they have got. We intend that that will be part of our public consultation process, but in terms of dates and when it will be coming forward, Al, could you help me in that?

**Floor Answer:** He has left.

**Mr. Diaklw:** I see. I am sorry, he is not here. They had a meeting, I believe it was yesterday or the day before, on this very issue. Sid, were you at that meeting? Were there any details as to when the plan would be coming forward again?

**Ms. Friesen:** That is all right. I am happy just to talk to him informally at the end, if that is okay.

Future programming then, I want to talk about the Children's Museum and to ask you what the discussions are there and what kind of planning process is in place?

**Mr. Diaklw:** Well, what we are finding with the nonprofit groups who come to The Forks, we are finding that the Board of Directors of those groups are citizens who give their time, very valuable time, to these particular areas. When it comes into a

development phase, what we are finding is that more and more as a corporation and as an administration we are having to become involved in assisting them in that phase. Although we did not contemplate that as part of our role, it is becoming more and more evident that we must get involved.

With the Children's Museum, they had developed a plan that had been approved by both their board and our board, a plan that required public financing as well as private financing. We found during that process that there was a shortfall between what they could raise through governments and what they could raise through private sources of around \$800,000.

The provincial government and the tourism staff particularly worked very hard with us and the Children's Museum people in seeing whether in fact there was a possibility of integrating the two, the tourism facility and the Children's Museum facility, into one and providing that extra money that would be required for them to go ahead with their facility. At the end of that about six months of negotiation and consideration, the city came forward and suggested that they would be prepared to support the shortfall in order to have the Children's Museum go as a stand-alone facility.

So, since that time, all the planning and the considerations have been in terms of a stand-alone facility at the B & B Building. They have started their fundraising drive. The province, as I understand it, has made a commitment as well to the project of, I believe it is, \$1 million. The federal government is being petitioned now in that process. The Children's Museum is looking to raising close to \$800,000 through the private sector.

For your interest, this summer they are bringing something to The Forks that they hope will help them in that fundraising. It is called a sonic playground, which will be located adjacent to the B & B Building, where children can come and play at these massive instruments. I have never seen it, but I am very taken by the concept. It has been very successful in London.

So that is where they are at. We will be working with them very closely. They are thinking in terms of the earliest start being next year, because they feel it will take close to a year to get the private financing in place. I think that is about all I can say in that regard.

**Ms. Friesen:** Could the minister confirm that that million dollars is in place?

**Mr. Ernst:** No.

**Ms. Friesen:** Could the minister explain the "No"?

**Mr. Ernst:** I am aware there have been discussions ongoing. I am not sure exactly what they are or what stage it is at at the moment, but I believe there has been a commitment, in principle, subject to certain things happening, and so on. I could check into that.

**Ms. Friesen:** I would appreciate if the minister would check into it. I know there have been proposals that have gone back and forth from the department to the museum and back again, and I was surprised to hear that the commitment had been made. So that would be useful to know.

I have two questions relating to site. One is the York-St. Mary issue. I wondered if you could give us some update on where that York-St. Mary issue is. It is part of the equivalency agreement which you mention the federal government has finally come through on, although I note that that cost Manitoba, what was it, \$265,000 in interest, the slowness of the payment of that equivalency.

**Mr. Diaklw:** No, the \$265,000 in interest would relate to the money we borrowed towards the market that we paid off at the end of the year.

**Ms. Friesen:** But had you had the equivalency in place, you would not have had to have a loan and Manitobans would not have had to have paid that \$265,000.

**Mr. Diaklw:** Having said that, the York-St. Mary—[interjection]

**Madam Chairperson:** Order, please.

**Mr. Diaklw:** York-St. Mary is with the City of Winnipeg. They are reviewing the issue of York-St. Mary. We have indicated to them—they did come forward with plans for the Provencher Bridge. I made representations at a public meeting in regard to the bridge, and what we expected of that bridge, that we felt that it should not be simply a bridge, it should be seen as a linkage between St. Boniface and the rest of the community, and the fact that it should not be designed only to deal with vehicular traffic but to recognize that there will be a very, very strong pedestrian linkage that should be established.

Other than that, the issue of York-St. Mary is in their ballpark, and they are considering it. I do not know where it is at. I do not imagine it will be resolved before the election in the fall.

**Ms. Friesen:** I think I agree with you on the resolution. It is going to be a while in coming.

But I wonder if we could just explore that a little bit. There is a city position, that is, a city administration position, there is a Forks position, and there is also a growing community concern, I think, about any changes. I wondered what kind of reaction there is from The Forks, for example, to the citizens' opposition. Do you feel that you are on the same wavelength or addressing the same concerns?

**Mr. Diaklw:** I am not that familiar with the citizens' view, but our concern is that in the plan there was a linkage provided, York-St. Mary. If the community decides that the linkage should take a different form, there has to be a recognition that access to The Forks is not what it should be so that something will have to be in place that is at least equal to the York-St. Mary, if, in fact, they do not build it.

**Ms. Friesen:** And the timing on that, because that is part of the five-year agreement, so when would you require a decision from the city on how they are going to deal with this equivalency issue?

**Mr. Diaklw:** In terms of the equivalency issue, I understand that is being discussed by the shareholders. I do not know where that issue is as far as the city and the province are concerned, other than the city, in dealing with the matter of the Children's Museum when they made a commitment to match the private funding on the Children's Museum dollar for dollar with the private sector up to \$800,000, they then developed a pay-back formula to the corporation over 10 years that indicated the \$4 million plus their commitment to the Children's Museum would be paid to The Forks over that period.

\* (1200)

My understanding is, although that has council resolution, the indication I get administratively, when I ask for the cheque, is that until the province makes a commitment on the issue of equivalency, we will not be seeing anything in the short term.

At the same time they indicate that the matter is under serious consideration by the shareholders, and I cannot comment more than that.

**Ms. Friesen:** I would then ask the minister. We were discussing the issue of the province, the city, the York-St. Mary issue. Is there a provincial commitment that Mr. Diaklw is talking about? When

will that come, and how does it affect the five-year plan?

**Mr. Ernst:** I believe the agreement says that within 12 months of the opening of the York-St. Mary Avenues there is to be a resolution of the question of equivalency, which could be a long way off.

The question of York-St. Mary is presently in the hands of the City of Winnipeg. There is an allocation under the cost-shared capital program between the province and the city for York-St. Mary that is still outstanding.

The acquisition of the CN property by the City of Winnipeg, the potential, I suppose, for an arena at some point on those lands—until some of those issues are decided, I think the city has said let us not jump whole-hog into a transportation plan for that area until we see what happens.

It may not make sense ultimately until they determine the disposition of the lands they acquired from the CN. It may not make sense, I think, in their view to commit to a specific transportation plan until it is decided. Quite frankly, as long as it does not take forever, it is probably a reasonable position. As far as that is concerned, it may take a while yet to resolve that.

The question of access to The Forks, I do not think, is linked necessarily exactly to York-St. Mary, but I think speaks in terms of reasonable visibility and access and things of that nature. That is basically where it is at the moment.

**Ms. Friesen:** I have the agreement here, and I wondered if the minister's staff could point out to me perhaps the particular clause that they are talking about where it does talk about the one year. I will not wait for that, but I would like to see it.

Second of all, I wanted to return and ask Mr. Diakiw if he could indicate what difficulties there are in—

**Madam Chairperson:** Order, please. I believe Mr. Minister wanted to respond to your first question.

**Mr. Ernst:** I am advised, there was, is a letter of comfort with respect to equivalency. It is not in the agreement; it is in the letter of comfort that was signed by the then Minister of Urban Affairs, Mr. Doer.

**Ms. Friesen:** Thank you. I am glad to have that clarified. Could I then turn to Mr. Diakiw and ask about the effect that this has on the landscape planning, program planning, and general financial planning for The Forks?

**Mr. Diakiw:** The question then relates to the construction of York-St. Mary or to the question of equivalency?

**Ms. Friesen:** The question is really the absence of a decision, and how this vacuum essentially affects your planning.

**Mr. Diakiw:** Let me deal with York-St. Mary initially. It was always contemplated that improved access would be provided to the site by the construction of York-St. Mary. York-St. Mary would do a number of things: it would provide a connection between the downtown part of Winnipeg and St. Boniface; but, as well, as far The Forks was concerned, it would improve dramatically one of the rail underpass accesses, which is in a very deteriorating state and create another one at St. Mary Avenue. So those two access points would have been very important to The Forks. I think that, if York-St. Mary, for whatever reason, is not going to be constructed, then we would be asking this city to improve the access points to The Forks now, in terms of the underpasses, if nothing else.

In terms of the equivalency payment, there is no question at all that, although the letters of comfort talked about using their best efforts, the two levels of government to match the federal grants, then in terms of the financial planning that was done and the scenarios that were prepared, that equivalency was built into those financial plans. So I think it would be fair to say that the board and the administration and the people who went into this always saw, at some point in time, the equivalency funds flowing from the two levels of government.

**Ms. Friesen:** So the difficulty then is now that we do not have the equivalency flowing from the province?

**Mr. Diakiw:** I am not sure it is a difficulty at this point in time. We have from the city an indication of how they will flow these funds. I think we will be looking to the province for some indication on whether they will be coming and how they will be coming. Certainly, that will have to be resolved before we get into Phase II.

**Mr. MacLean:** I would just like to add to that. We understand and we are hoping that the day the matter was triggered, that we would be getting interest if the payments are not made, because we are depending on that and that is built into our financial plan.

**Ms. Friesen:** Given that the interest clock might be ticking, perhaps I could ask the minister what his

plans are in this area, what timing particularly that he is looking at.

**Mr. Ernst:** We are using our best efforts, and beyond that I cannot really comment at the present time.

**Ms. Friesen:** Could I then return to the issue of landscape planning: the absence of a decision either from the city or the province, how does this affect, for example, your planning for long-term planning in terms of parking and green space? Do you have in particular a plan for the percentage of green space that should be maintained at The Forks?

**Mr. Diakiw:** No, I do not think that the York-St. Mary, the delay has affected us, because the thrust of all of our development has been along the rivers themselves. So all of our landscape design and construction has occurred along the riverbanks. In terms of our priorities, that is where our priorities were. What we were looking for was the completion of York-St. Mary. I believe it was in November of this year, and with that would come their landscaping associated with bridges and with the roadways and with the riverbank properties, and then we could build on that.

In terms of additional landscaping, no, we have not done any internal designs. We are continuing the design of the nodes along the riverbanks, that landscaping.

Depending on what comes out of the public consultation process, we will decide how much more we need. In terms of our present plan, my recollection is not that good at the present time, but in any of the designs that we prepared, it seemed to me that better than half the site would be devoted to public areas, but that could change with the public consultation process. It may change dramatically one way or the other.

**Ms. Friesen:** I am sorry, I missed quite exactly what you said. Did you say 50 percent retained as public space or green space?

**Mr. Diakiw:** As public space. I do not know—and Al may help me—whether we ever had a number on specifically green space. I could certainly review that just to see what we had, but I do not think we had a number on green space, we had a number on public space.

**Ms. Friesen:** I think we would be interested in that, in what exists at the moment, and I think we would also be interested in seeing it in the options for

planning as well. I think incorporating the Parks Canada as well, so that we know what portion of that green space is Parks Canada because at the moment, what is it, nine acres, essentially, of open space and 58 acres of mixed development at The Forks? I think we need to look at the unit as a whole.

**Mr. Diakiw:** As I said, we do have numbers. I just do not have them at my fingertips. I can personally make those available to you once I have had a chance to review them.

\* (1210)

**Ms. Friesen:** I would like to look at the market now. If you could give me—well, perhaps I should start from my immediate concerns that I have had and I know that other MLAs have had over the years, not necessarily this year, although I believe I have had one call this year, people who are concerned about the contracts at The Forks, the contracts for vendors.

I wondered if you could give as a general presentation on the nature of short-term and long-term contracts and whether there are differentials for different kinds of vendors and if this has changed. Does it depend upon the season? Does it depend upon the scale of the vendor, et cetera?

**Mr. Diakiw:** Let me just give you an overview on the tenancy that we have at the market and then deal with some of those questions. By tenancy, the number of stalls that were available to permanent tenants are 57. We have 48 of them leased with permanent tenants, which is about an 84 percent tenancy.

Those spaces that are not leased are used full time. They are used by temporaries. So we have 48, of which 84 percent are leased. By tenancy, that is about an 84 percent tenancy. By the area they occupy, that is about 92 percent that are actually leased permanently.

In terms of the temporary leasing, on the average, we have about 35 leases per week, and they are changing continually. In terms of the leases that we have entered into with the tenancies, they vary by use. The restaurant tenancies have a different kind of lease from the fresh food tenancies, from the fast-food tenancies.

Basically, they are structured in a way that we first of all recover our CAM, then we get a percentage of the profits. Clearly, we want to be sure that we

recover our maintenance costs up front and then we recover a percentage of the profits.

Particularly when it comes to the fast food in the restaurants, a percentage of the profits is very important, because if you have a percentage rather than a set fee if the restaurant does well then you do well and conversely, if it does not do well, you do not do as well.

The percentages themselves between the different usages, whether they be fresh food or whether it be the butcher's, they are different, but there are industry percentages that are applied to those areas based on industry averages. So we enter into these leases. Quite often two uses may be different in terms of the lease that we enter into, depending on the circumstances of that particular operation, how we view it, how successful it may be, how successful it may not be, what the risks are. We are dealing with, as I indicated to you, at any time with close to 100 mom-and-pop-type operations. We are not dealing with the Reichmanns. We are not dealing with chain tenancies. As you know, originally when the market was set up it was set up to encourage mom-and-pop-type enterprises to reflect the diversity of the community. So clearly we have to be very flexible in our approach.

In terms of the market itself, just to give you an overview, we had forecast that we hoped to make a profit before amortization some time at the end of the second year, and we are forecasting a profit at the end of this year. In terms of our last year, just to give you an overview, I have figures for the end of February that show that our total sales in the total market are up somewhere around 25 percent over last year. Now, that does not mean everybody is doing better. There are some that are doing much better; there are some that are having difficulties. Where the banks have to restructure with the Reichmanns, we have to sometimes restructure with the mom-and-pop-type operation, given that our business is very cyclical. The market in total does probably three times the sales during the summer months as compared to the winter months. It is a very, very interesting and different kind of operation to manage.

I think in terms of before the recession hit us, which was probably the end of the year—I do not know how Granville Island is doing now, but in the early formative stages we were doing as well as they had done in their early years, and that is what we

had modeled it after. So we have not had that many changes in the market. We have had a few people, permanent people, that have left, but the turnover has not been great. There has been a tremendous demand for temporary stalls. We are constantly being criticized that some people are not getting the kind of consideration that others are. That is good because it indicates there is a demand, and that is a very important source of our revenue too.

We have had some criticism on the second floor with the kinds of crafts that are being sold, and we reviewed that situation and we found that in order to encourage local crafts people, Manitoba crafts people, we found that their difficulty was in not being able to be at the market for seven days a week. They just could not afford the time. So we went to a public tender and we are opening a consignment shop on the second floor. It will be taking up a good portion of the second floor in which local crafts people, Manitoba crafts people, will be able to go to this particular shop and leave their wares to be merchandised on a seven-day-a-week basis. We anticipate that will really improve the quality of the craft on the second floor.

I am sorry, I have rambled a bit, but I just thought I would give you a little of the flavour of the market.

**Ms. Friesen:** I think the consignment shop might in fact solve some of the problems that have been brought to our attention. One of the issues though, of course, is equity of treatment, and essentially what you are saying is that you deal individually, individual contracts, and perhaps that the perception of equity is not there. Could you explain to me from your perspective how your decisions are equitably made? You say, for example, that you deal with one industry. You know, if they are all meat shops, for example, you would deal with them the same. What about location, does that enter into it within the market?

**Mr. Diaklw:** Yes, it did initially. We had the gentleman who designed the Granville Market actually allocate the stalls on a used basis based on their experience and their success. So we allocated the spaces along that line. The equity would come. If we had two butchers we would be treating them equitably. If we have two bakers we will be treating them equitably. But if you looked at the agreements between the ones we have with the butchers and the bakers, they will be totally different because the market and the produce that they produce is quite different, but they would be generally keeping with

the community approach, the industry approach to those kinds of shops.

**Mr. Ernst:** Madam Chairperson, I am advised that both the chairman of The Forks Renewal Corporation and the auditor have other engagements. Can they be excused?

**Madam Chairperson:** What is the will of the committee? Agreed? Agreed.

At this conjecture I would just like to thank you for your presentation, your participation this morning in the proceedings.

**Ms. Friesen:** Also, I add my thanks, and to the rest of the staff as well, for coming. I do realize the time is getting on. I have a couple of other quick questions, but—

**Floor Comment:** I can wait for a couple of minutes if you have more. I have to be in court at one o'clock, but it is not very far from here.

\*(1220)

**Ms. Friesen:** I assumed that the committee was finishing at 12:30. Is that our general agreement?

**Madam Chairperson:** There is nothing scribed in stone. It is the will of the committee, but traditionally we do not sit, I am told by the Clerk, beyond 12:30 to afford people to prepare themselves for the Legislative Assembly.

**Ms. Friesen:** Fine, thank you. The other questions I have deal with the tourist centre and with the mandate, and then perhaps a couple of questions on the budget at the end.

So the tourist centre, can you give us an update on where that is?

**Mr. Diaklw:** Yes, a development agreement is being put together at the present time. I believe it has been consummated. We are also working on a lease agreement with the province in terms of The Forks being the project co-ordinator on a tourist facility at The Forks—one that will be overseen very closely by the province, the tourism people. That, at the present time, is waiting on the decision that will flow as far as the Johnson Terminal Building is concerned. We have a letter of agreement, of intent on that, and they are out leasing.

So within two or three months, decisions will have to be made as to the location and when it will be built. But my understanding is that the tourism facility is certainly coming to The Forks, which, I indicated earlier, will give us a real opportunity to communicate with the rest of the province.

**Ms. Friesen:** Is there anything available on the particular plans for the tourist centre? It has been through a number of phases. I assume now you are talking about a freestanding building, one which does not use the heritage facilities of The Forks.

**Mr. Diaklw:** That is correct. The site that is presently the one that we are looking at very closely is immediately adjacent to the Johnson Terminal Building, that piece of land that I am sure you are familiar with that is very ideally located for that kind of facility. We will be engaging consultants on behalf of the province to develop the concepts and to do the architectural drawings, and we will be putting the work out to public tender as I said earlier.

The province, I am sure, will keep us on a tight leash in terms of what is happening. Their approvals will be necessary from the concept right through to the conclusion of the construction. Hopefully we will be able to get a construction start some time later this summer.

**Ms. Friesen:** Could I ask the minister then what level of funding he is considering for construction, content and operation?

**Mr. Ernst:** I am not considering any, but the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Stefanson), I believe, is considering—it was to be funded out of the Canada-Manitoba Tourism Agreement—\$3 million is it, or is it \$2 million?

**Mr. Diaklw:** My understanding, the last understanding I had was that it was going to be in the vicinity of \$2 million of which about \$1.2 million would go to the structure itself, and the remainder would be for the furnishings and all the things that are required inside the tourist facility. So it is that kind of a general split.

**Ms. Friesen:** And the operating costs?

**Mr. Diaklw:** Those were not to be borne by The Forks. They were to be borne by either the other two levels of government or the province, I am not sure which.

**Mr. Ernst:** The Department of Tourism will operate their facility under its budget, so in terms of operating costs, I do not know that they have even been identified at this point. They would not be incurred in any event in 1992. So, you know, once the construction is completed and staffing arrangements and things of that nature are made, then operating costs will have to be budgeted for.

**Ms. Friesen:** I am interested in the general scale of it, not so much the details at this point, though I

think the thematic content of it is very important. I think the one that they have at Granville Island, for example, is very useful for interpretation of the site itself.

That gets back to one of the earlier points I made about your public planning process. The kind of plan you get out of that will be very much based on the level of understanding of the purpose, history, and, I mean, administrative history and function of The Forks concept.

It seems to me that that tourist side or somewhere at The Forks Market there should be something which enables people who visit, the millions of opportunities you have there to give people the sense of the function of The Forks that we should take advantage of.

But I also recognize the wider Manitoba prospects for the tourism side.

**Mr. Ernst:** Yes, I think you should be aware, if you are not, that the main principle function of the tourism centre there is to showcase Manitoba, not The Forks. It is located at The Forks. The Forks Corporation or Travel Manitoba may wish to include some of the things you mentioned, but the primary function will be to showcase Manitoba.

**Ms. Friesen:** Yes, I understand that but I do not want to see the other opportunity lost. Maybe that is not the place for it, that is quite possible. Maybe there is another location at The Forks, but it is something that is missing it seems to me now. It is a stage where we need that.

**Mr. MacLean:** I understand the problems and am also looking at your perspective of a showcase also. Because there will be lots of room within the space and there will be slides and there will be movies, and they can be used at different times for different show businesses.

If it is to show off the province, they will have those exhibits, but they will also have, I understand, information about The Forks and background if that is what is to be shown.

**Ms. Friesen:** Can we then just turn briefly to the mandate of The Forks? It has been a continuing concern, I think, of everybody who has been connected with The Forks. I wondered, from the perspective of the board and the minister, what their current thinking is on that and have any discussions been followed?

I notice in the last time that you were here, we did discuss the creation of a megacorporation. I think it

was the previous minister who talked about there being a decision on that sometime in the last year. So I am interested in a number of elements of the mandate.

Obviously, first of all, the intent to make The Forks self-sufficient which, of course, limits the nature of public activities that can be noncommercial activities that can be continued.

The second is the future mandate of The Forks and the indications from this government—both in the last time that The Forks came and more recently, a couple of weeks ago when North Portage Corporation was here—that there are considerations underway, perhaps a little delayed at this stage, for a change in the organization of The Forks.

**Mr. Ernst:** Well, in terms of the mandate, it has not changed. Their obligation is to become self-sufficient. You look at the demands upon taxpayers' money and the need for—you know, we see it everyday, your requests for more and more spending on a variety of issues that are perhaps of a greater impact on people than The Forks.

Then those kinds of funds are limited so that the necessity of The Forks to become self-sufficient— notwithstanding we might under an ideal circumstance like to have something else—the need for it to become self-sufficient is more and more important, I think, given today's economy and, quite frankly, what we might look forward to for the next, at least, short period of time.

In terms of a merger between North Portage and The Forks Development Corporation, those discussions between the shareholders are ongoing at the present time. We may or may not reach a conclusion. Whatever conclusion is reached it will be unanimous, it has to be unanimous. Put three politicians in a room and it is made very difficult to come up with unanimous agreements.

Nonetheless that is the process, and we are going down that road at the moment, still going down that road at the moment.

**Ms. Friesen:** To start with the first element then, I think the minister is giving a clear indication of policy that The Forks should continue to aim for self-sufficiency.

Could I then ask the minister if this is part of the framework for the public discussions? Is that, then, a given?

**Mr. Ernst:** Unless the mandate is changed, of course. The Forks Corporation mandate embodies

that principle. They would be foolhardy in my view to pursue anything other than that in a public consultation process. That has to be one of the constraints. There are constraints as to site, constraints as to finances, and a number of other things, but as part of their mandate, they have no choice in the matter, they have to incorporate that.

**Ms. Friesen:** I think the minister is aware that there have been certainly public concerns about that at the level of the City of Winnipeg, some city councillors, and also in public meetings. So I want to be very clear that he is indicating to The Forks Corporation now that is not under discussion in the next round of public planning.

\* (1230)

**Mr. Ernst:** I have no communication from either of our two partners that the mandate should be changed. I have no indication from either of the two partners that we should even talk about it.

**Ms. Friesen:** The secondary, then, that you indicated was the movement towards amalgamation. The minister indicated that this is to be a three-party decision. I wonder if he could tell us which party he is having difficulty with? I assume that the push is coming from the province on this. Is that a correct assumption?

**Mr. Ernst:** Discussions amongst the three partners, as I say, have been going on for some period of time. There is no secret that we, as a political party, the Progressive Conservative Party, during the 1990 election, proposed that the two corporations be merged. There are a number of issues and a number of implications or impacts coming from any merger that need to be discussed and need to be addressed and we are in the process of doing that.

**Ms. Friesen:** I had one last question, perhaps for Mr. Diakiw on the budget. I notice that there has been an increase in directors' fees. I wonder if Mr. Diakiw could indicate the reasons?

**Mr. Diakiw:** Our board operates maybe a little differently than other boards in that it is a very hands-on board. Members of the board serve on various advisory committees, the heritage planning committee is chaired by one of the members of the

board. So the time they put in is fairly substantial. As well, the time that we have covered in this report, you have to recognize that at that point in time, we were faced with a number of things.

We were faced with an issue dealing with the development of the boat basin, which ended up in the courts. There was an awful lot of time required of the board members at that point in time, to make policy decisions with respect to the course we were going to follow. At the same time the City of Winnipeg and their planning committee were holding so-called public meetings on the mandate of The Forks; there was a fair amount of criticism of the mandate, questioning of the self-sufficiency clause. So there was a fair amount of time that our board had to put in, in terms of bringing those projects to fruition, in terms of dealing with the legal issues, so I think in that sense we had a situation where the board was being called on more regularly than in the past.

**Madam Chairperson:** Is it the will of the committee to rise? No? Is the committee willing to hear one more quick question? Agreed.

**Ms. Friesen:** It was to clarify the last answer which then is that it indicates a greater frequency of meetings rather than a change in rate?

**Mr. Diakiw:** Oh, yes, absolutely. I am sorry, I misunderstood your question. There has been no difference in the rate at all. It has to do with the frequency of the meetings.

**Mr. Ernst:** I just simply wanted to thank Mr. MacLean and Mr. Diakiw and the people from The Forks Renewal Corporation for being here this morning, for providing us with this information and for being very frank about their operations. I appreciate it.

**Madam Chairperson:** Hearing no further questions, the committee has thereby concluded its examination today of The Forks Renewal Corporation of its 1991 Annual Report.

The time is now 12:33. What is the will of the committee?

**Some Honourable Members:** Committee rise.

**Madam Chairperson:** Committee rise.

**COMMITTEE ROSE AT:** 12:33 p.m.