



First Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

STANDING COMMITTEE

on

MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

39 Elizabeth II

*Chairman
Mrs. Louise Dacquay
Constituency of Seine River*



VOL. XXXIX No. 1 - 10 a.m., TUESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1990



**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature**

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ALCOCK, Reg	Osborne	Liberal
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	NDP
CARR, James	Crescentwood	Liberal
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	Liberal
CERILLI, Marianne	Racisson	NDP
CHEEMA, Gulzar	The Maples	Liberal
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	NDP
CONNERY, Edward, Hon.	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
MANNESSE, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	NDP
McALPINE, Gerry	Sturgeon Creek	PC
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	PC
McINTOSH, Linda	Assiniboia	PC
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
NEUFELD, Harold, Hon.	Rossmere	PC
ORCHARD, Donald, Hon.	Pembina	PC
PENNER, Jack, Hon.	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	Kirkfield Park	PC
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	NDP
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	PC
VODREY, Rosemary	Fort Garry	PC
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy	St. Johns	NDP
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

Tuesday, December 4, 1990

TIME — 10 a.m.

LOCATION — Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRMAN — Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Seine River)

ATTENDANCE - 10 — QUORUM - 6

Members of the Committee present:

Hon. Messrs. Ducharme, Penner

Mr. Carr, Mrs. Carstairs, Mrs. Dacquay, Mr. Dewar, Ms. Friesen, Messrs. Laurendeau, Stefanson, Mrs. Vodrey

APPEARING:

Steve Ashton, MLA for Thompson

Oscar Lathlin, MLA for The Pas

Daryl Reid, MLA for Transcona

Campbell MacLean, Chairperson, Board of Directors, The Forks Renewal Corporation

Nick Diakiw, Chief Executive Officer, The Forks Renewal Corporation

Sid Kroker, Site Archeologist, The Forks Renewal Corporation

MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION:

Matters relating to The Forks Renewal Corporation

* * *

Clerk of Committees (Ms. Bonnie Greschuk): Will the committee please come to order. We must proceed to elect a chairperson for the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs. Are there any nominations?

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (St. Norbert): I nominate Louise Dacquay (Seine River).

Madam Clerk: Mr. Laurendeau has nominated Mrs. Dacquay. Are there any further nominations?

An Honourable Member: None whatsoever.

Madam Clerk: Since there are no further nominations, will Mrs. Dacquay please take the chair?

Madam Chairman: Good morning. Will the

Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs please come to order, and before we proceed I have a statement to make relative to the proceedings this morning.

Today this committee will consider matters relating to The Forks Renewal Corporation, and this meeting is an evolutionary step insofar as the process is concerned. There is no report from the corporation before the committee. The committee has not been given an explicit mandate by the Legislative Assembly. In broad terms, the purpose of this meeting might best be described as an exercise in public accountability.

In the absence of a corporation report or a precise mandate, the following guidelines are suggested for the conduct of the committee's proceedings:

An opening statement will be made by the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) followed by responses from the critics of the official and Second Opposition parties.

The usual practices which apply to the consideration of Annual Reports of Crown corporations will apply at this meeting.

All questions will be directed to the Minister of Urban Affairs who may redirect them to officials of the corporation.

This will be the only meeting to consider matters relating to the corporation; and

This committee will not accept motions except by unanimous consent.

The principal objectives of this meeting are to:

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.

We will now proceed with an opening statement.

Point of Order

Madam Chairman: On a point of order, Mr. Ashton.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Just in terms of the general process, I would not want the statement that you have read to be seen as a precedent in this committee. I understand this is a different situation in that we do not have a mandated hearing in the sense there is no Annual Report nor requirement that we report to a committee.

* (1005)

I am concerned about some of the provisions in the statement, and I would not accept them as precedent. I do not believe, for example, we should be precluding motions other than by unanimous agreement. I agree with that, but it should not be a written statement from the Chair that leads us to do that. It should be by agreement of all Parties. I do not see that arising.

I am also concerned that this is a Standing Committee of the Legislature that we are dealing with, and we do have fairly well-established rules in terms of its functioning. It may be in the future we may change the Rules, we may look at alternative ways with dealing with situations, but I am a little bit concerned about some of the statements that were read into the record. I think there is a general consensus in terms of proceeding, in terms of information and in terms of accountability, but I would not want the statement that was read into the record to be in any way seen as a precedent or for that matter, binding on the committee.

With that in mind I would suggest we proceed, but not bind the hands of this committee either for this meeting or in the future by way of the statement read by the Chair. That is not to my mind appropriate.

Madam Chairman: Mr. Ashton, for clarification perhaps, it is not meant to be a precedent. It was meant explicitly to identify some guidelines within which the meeting could take place, because this particular meeting is unique and it, as I indicated in my opening remarks, has no report from the corporation so therefore cannot, although everybody is in agreement that it should probably follow the guidelines that we do follow when there is a Crown corporation report. I did, and perhaps the Honourable Member did not hear it, explicitly state that the committee would accept motions by unanimous consent.

Mr. Ashton: With all due respect, the Chair does

not have the ability to say that. We have rules set for standing committees. This has not been discussed between House Leaders. This statement, these so-called rules have not been raised with myself, so there has not been the normal process even followed in terms of dealing with matters outside of the normal rules, as we have done, for example, with additional hearings on Estimates.

I do not accept the statement that motions will be dealt with only by unanimous consent, as a statement by the Chair. The Chair does not have the authority to do that. I am willing to proceed with an understanding, but I would say quite clearly that from the position of our caucus, the statement read into the record has no force whatsoever. I do not know if it was the intent of the Chair or the Government, their view of what should proceed, but when we are dealing with a committee of the Legislature, if there are going to be any changes in terms of practices or procedures it has to be through agreement of all Parties, and we have not had any discussion, for example, of not having resolutions before this committee in the normal way, which is not by unanimous consent incidentally, it is by vote of the committee; that is the committee's right.

I am very concerned about this. Not only am I saying that we do not agree with this as a matter of precedent, I have real problems with the way this is being dealt with. I would suggest that we proceed without that statement in any way, shape or form having any impact in terms of this committee. I can give the assurance that we are not looking at resolutions, if that is the concern of the Government, but I am not prepared to, through this type of statement, see completely different functioning of this standing committee than has ever been functioned before previously. This is a total change in the way this committee operates, so I suggest we proceed without the statement.

* * *

Madam Chairman: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs will now make his opening remarks.

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs): My opening remarks will be very, very brief. I am more concerned about getting the information to the MLAs who normally do not receive that information. That is the whole process why we are here, as a result of the audit report, comments on the audit report that was done. We want to go

through the same information that goes to EPC at City Council, and I know there are Members here who want to use this time best to gather information.

* (1010)

I, as Minister, have to put on the record that it is unique, but remember that we are dealing with a tripart agreement where we have two other levels of Government involved, and there is no mandate for them to appear before committee. They are appearing on the willingness of The Forks to appear the same as the North Portage will appear a week from today, so I would suggest to the committee Members, let us get on with the meeting and gather as much information as you can in the time that is allotted for us today.

Madam Chairwoman: We will now have an introductory statement by the Member of the official Opposition, Ms. Friesen.

Ms. Friesen (Wolseley): I would like to welcome The Forks people here, and perhaps put on the record first of all that I was on The Forks Board for the early years of its presence in Manitoba, and also for the record I should say that I was part of a consulting team which until this spring was dealing with the historical and cultural elements of the site. I think that is important to state at the beginning.

I think from the perspective of our Party, we have obviously had an interest and an active interest in participation in the forming of the elements of The Forks site, and the kinds of things that interested us in the beginning was that this was, first of all, a wonderful opportunity for Manitoba and for Winnipeggers to develop a new community, to develop a new part of the city in a very ancient, historic site that we wanted people to know more about and to understand.

That sense, first of all, of the new community and the ancient meeting site was something which I would like to follow up on in these hearings and to see how those kinds of concerns have been met through the plans of The Forks Board. It was a site which was hidden for hundreds of years.

The second principle that we did try to enunciate was the idea of slow development. This is a site which most Winnipeggers, except those who perhaps were very keen fishermen, knew very little about, so that the idea of bringing people to The Forks in a slow and measured way, giving them access to the rivers and of enabling people to have a participation in setting the goals for The Forks, I

think, was something that was there at the beginning. Again, it is something I would like to pursue in questions.

The second principle, the first one being the discovery of the site, that we were interested in and still are interested in is the role of public participation, the idea of setting the goals for the site, of the hearings, the annual meetings. These are things we were involved in as members of The Forks Board. I think that is something which concerns everybody and something that we will all want to pursue, the expansion of the public role in the setting of Forks goals, in the evaluation of Forks policies, and in the development and participation in the activities at the site. Public participation I would outline as the second principle.

* (1015)

A third one, I think, was ensuring that the mandate of The Forks Board enabled The Forks to put as a priority the development of the historical and cultural framework of the site. That again is something I would like pursue in this discussion. First of all, the archeological investigations that are mandated by The Heritage Act, the way in which those have been explained to the public, the way in which the public has been enabled to participate in those historical and cultural discoveries, I think we would like to see that go a great deal further. I would be interested in discussing with the members of the board, the chairman and the chief executive officer the kinds of plans they have for the expansion of that kind of participation.

I think, finally, one of the other principles that we enunciated as members of the board and have continued to take an interest in is the idea that one of the priorities for this site is that it should be a Native site. It should reflect the Native participation in Manitoba and particularly in the increasing Native participation return to the Winnipeg sites.

A Native centre has been proposed. It is a centre which has to be developed, not just in conjunction with Native people, but by Native people. That idea of recognizing the principles of aboriginal self-government in the creation of the plans, of the location and of the function of the Native site I think is very important. It does not and should not preclude the interpretation of Native history or of Native activities anywhere else in the site. Again, I would be interested in exploring those elements with the board. Even though three and four years ago we

were talking about the importance of the Native presence at The Forks, of the Native history of The Forks, and of the creation of a Native centre at The Forks, I think the last three years have shown us how much more significant that is.

I am not just speaking of recent political events, of Meech Lake or of the peace camp of this summer, but speaking particularly of the expansion of the aboriginal population of Winnipeg and particularly of the expansion of aboriginal organizations and the growing focuses that there are for areas of self-government, for urban Native strategies and for urban Native centres for a variety of functions within the city of Winnipeg.

I would be interested in discussing with the board where the Native centre at The Forks now stands, how it is being governed, how you plan for it to be governed, and how it fits with the rapid expansion of aboriginal government within Winnipeg as well.

Those are the three areas I will be focusing on. I think we do have the opportunity also for a mid-term evaluation of the mandate, of the financing, of the evaluation of the programs which you think have been successful, and of the future lines that you would like to take. Housing, I think, is an area that is still hanging there as an element of The Forks plan, and we need to have some discussion on that. Particularly and finally, we do need to have some discussion of the way in which The Forks has communicated to the people of Winnipeg. I am sure that you have some plans for the future of that and would be interested in discussing those.

Madam Chairman: Thank you. We will now have the official statement from Mr. Carr, the Member for the Second Opposition Party.

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): Let me begin by thanking the Government for calling this meeting. The terms of reference aside, the very fact that we are here this morning debating The Forks Renewal Corporation is new and important, because it underlines the principle of public accountability at a time when the whole concept of tripartism is under scrutiny and indeed under discussion by the three partners in the Core Area Initiative, The Forks Renewal Corporation and North Portage. I think it is doubly important that Members of this Legislature have an opportunity to discuss past decision-making and future plans with the Minister and through the Minister with the chairperson of The Forks Corporation.

It was a long time in coming. We, as many people around the table know, have been pushing for this kind of meeting of accountability for a long time, but again we are glad that it is here. The Forks is a unique place and a very important place. I can recall in the days when I used to write columns from time to time that I took a walk down to The Forks site with an employee of the mayor's office. We were tripping and stumbling over gravel, tumbleweeds, old rail tracks, broken beer bottles. When you contrasted the physical reality of the site with its historic importance, it was really quite a contrast and quite startling, because we all know that The Forks really is the birthplace not only of Winnipeg but of western Canada.

* (1020)

It was symbolic of the way in which we had treated access to our riverbanks for over 150 years, that citizens of Winnipeg, indeed visitors to our city who had an interest in pursuing our historical roots, were unable even to get there physically because of the impediments that were in front of them. Developments have proceeded in such a way that now we have begun development of that site, in many ways appropriately, in other ways more controversially. We will look forward to the opportunity of debating some of the controversy this morning and hopefully in a continuing way with the president and the chief executive officer.

There are many, many issues. There are issues which are a bit dry—the relationship that the board has with all three levels of Government. The fear, of course, is that when you have too many people responsible, you have no one responsible, that the diffusion of authority through three Governments means that no one really speaks for The Forks. We have seen that over the years with not only this corporation but with North Portage. There are ways being sought now to make public accountability more focused and more acute.

Then there are the issues of development itself. What should we do with this unique historic place? Ought it to be an archeological site, an historic site, a place where people meet, expose and express their cultural differences? Should there be a commercial component? Ought The Forks to be self-sustaining and self-sufficient, or should it depend on public subsidy for its survival? These are major questions that we will have to consider carefully. I understand that the renewal corporation is now virtually out of money and will have to look at

ways of either sustaining itself through commercial operation or looking at Governments at all three levels to continue the operation.

My colleague from Wolseley (Mrs. Friesen) has talked about some of the issues that we also intend to pursue. I could make a long speech, but I will not, because I would like to leave as much time as possible for debate, dialogue, question and answer. With those very few opening remarks, Madam Chair, I am anxious to get into the debate.

Madam Chairman: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs will now introduce the staff present.

Mr. Ducharme: Maybe I will get the CEO, Mr. Nick Diakiw, to introduce the chairman with him and the staff.

Mr. Nick Diakiw (Chief Executive Officer, The Forks Renewal Corporation): I have back-up staff with me, behind me, but what I thought I might do, if it falls within the rules of this committee, is set a little background to this site in terms of the history and the importance of the site. I would not be anywhere near as articulate as the Members of the Opposition, because I think they have very clearly stated the importance of the site, and I concur with everything that has been said. I again welcome the opportunity of being here. We have been to committees of council with our mandate plan and have debated that issue with them in the past, and we welcome the opportunity to do the same today.

What I would like to do though is put to rest some of the questions and some of the controversy with respect to the site itself, to set the stage for those who may not be familiar with the site and the lands that are owned by The Forks. This is the Assiniboine and the Red, bounded on the west by the highline of the railway that runs through here, which has provided the barrier for people recognizing what actually existed to the east of this site.

If you look at the extension of York Avenue, this dotted line, our lands are the lands to the south. They include the south point, about seven acres here, and include this total area with the exception of The Forks National Historic Park, about 11 acres in this general area. We also have the lands along the river frontage to the north of the Provencher Bridge.

When the land exchange took place, of course, there was a split in responsibility. We retained the 56 acres that I have outlined. The CN retained the 16 acres to the north, the idea being that they were

going to be developing their site as a commercial development. We were going to be developing ours in quite a different way, and it is covered in the Concept Plan.

We look at it from the standpoint of being an historical, cultural area, a recreational area, supportive commercial area and a housing area. One of the first things we had to do, as has been indicated—95 percent of the people of Winnipeg would not even know this site existed, because you had the barrier on the west. Along Pioneer and Water you had the old warehouses that provided a barrier, so most people coming to the site for the first time are really amazed by the size of the site. It has been an industrial area for the last 70 or 80 years and, as Mr. Carr has indicated, just did not reflect the kind of history that this site demands be dictated for the site.

What we had to do is we had to come in and clear the site first, get rid of all the old warehouses that should be taken down, take up the track, and we did that. That was one of the first areas of concentration that we had to do. One of the other things that we were faced with was The Forks National Historic Park, which had been developed. It was land locked. There was no way to get to this very historic park. From the standpoint of people saying that we may have moved quickly, we moved quickly in that we provided the service. We cleared the lands; we provided the services. We made the site available to the public so they could come and rediscover The Forks. That was our first thrust, to do just that.

* (1025)

In the development of the site, our board took the position that we would retain the two old stable buildings that have been turned into the market. We would retain the Johnson Terminal building that had been designated of some historical significance, I think Class E by the City of Winnipeg, and the old B & B Building, which is over a hundred years old, that had been declared to have historical importance by the provincial Government. As well, we retained through the decision of our board, the old steam plant. It has no historical significance, but the location and the structure seemed to dictate that we should leave it and see what we might do with it. Those are the areas that we left.

Subsequent to that, we started the specialized food market. I will not go into that, because I am sure we will be getting into that. That was decided by the

board as being the kind of generator that would make people come to The Forks because, of course, we were trying to make this into the meeting place, a place where people from all over the province and the city would come and gather.

In the development, we called for proposals on three buildings, the B & B Building, the Johnson Terminal and the steam plant. What we received was a proposal from the Children's Museum on the B & B Building. We received a proposal from a hotel developer for the Johnson Terminal building. In the Concept Plan there has been some criticism of the fact that this might be a hotel.

In the Concept Plan, the structure itself had been looked at, and everybody that looked at it, including our site consultant, indicated that could be converted to a hotel. This particular building we received no proposals on at the time we went out to public tender, so we entered into letters of intent. I forgot one important community, the German Canadian Cultural group did put in a proposal, and we entered into a letter of intent for a joint development of the Johnson Terminal incorporating both the hotel and the cultural centre. Those letters of intent were entered into, a letter of intent being simply the first step in the negotiating process. They have gone back and developed their designs and done their feasibility studies, and that is the point that we are at.

As well, late last winter, this very historical area in front of the market in the Assiniboine key area, we started the construction of that area. I might mention that before we went into the construction we did carry out archeological digs and prepared an archeological assessment of that area. Historically what had happened at that site, the railway had dumped an awful lot of fill and garbage in that area to prevent flooding in that general area, so what we were faced with was trying to keep and recognize the history of the site. This is where boats used to come and dock.

Well, very generally that is what we have been up to. The thrust of our development has been the redevelopment of the riverbank frontage, and that is where we are at the present time.

Mr. Ducharme: Maybe we could now entertain questions.

Ms. Frlesen: Mr. Minister, we have agreed to take a half-hour each to begin with, and then just look at what the time is like after that. I will take the first

half-hour, and Mr. Carr (Crescentwood) will take the second.

Point of Order

Madam Chairman: Mr. Laurendeau, on a point of order.

Mr. Laurendeau: If I could just make one recommendation, Mrs. Chairman. If the questions could be directed directly to Mr. Diakiw—

Mr. Ducharme: No, they have to be directed directly to the Minister, but I will have Mr. Diakiw or Mr. MacLean—they will respond directly to you, but they have to be directed to the Minister.

Madam Chairman: It is not a point of order. We clarified that, or at least I attempted to clarify that in my opening remarks.

* * *

* (1030)

Ms. Frlesen: I wanted to take the first opportunity to ask the Minister and his officials to reflect upon the mandate that The Forks had at the beginning, the mandate for self-sufficiency, for mixed development, for its relationship to other developments within the City of Winnipeg, and then finally I would like to come back to some methods of reporting, but could we start with that, some reflections on the mandate?

Mr. Diakiw: In terms of mandate, our mandate was to develop this area as a meeting place with the primary thrust being the historical cultural aspect of this site; secondly, recreation. This area historically was a place where people came to, came from all over the continent to trade and to live and to recreate at the site.

As well, there was a residential component to the development. In order to be financially self-sufficient the plan required us to look at somewhere at between 500 and 511 residential units. As well, in the mandate there were specific references to specific projects that should be looked at, one being the Native cultural centre, the other being the multicultural centre, and the third being the leisure centre. If you want, I can elaborate on each of those. I am not familiar with your rules, but if you want to ask questions on each one of them I would be prepared to answer.

Ms. Frlesen: I wanted to come back to the original mandate, the idea of self-sufficiency or eventual self-sufficiency. You have now been managing the

project for three or four years, not you specifically, but the project has been there for three or four years. What reflections do you have upon that? Is self-sufficiency ever going to be possible? What kind of long-term deadline would you be looking at for that, and if not self-sufficiency, then what?

Mr. Diaklw: The projections we have prepared on the basis of the development to date are, given that all the commitments that have been made by the three levels of Governments are lived up to, and given that the progress will be slightly slower than we had anticipated, particularly in the residential area, because clearly we have looked at this component of the mandate, and because of the high vacancy rate downtown, that projection has been setback. To answer your question more directly, we are looking at self-sufficiency probably around the turn of the century, somewhere around 10-11 years, somewhere of that order.

Ms. Frlesen: Does that self-sufficiency include additional monies from the three levels of Government, or are we looking now at the end of the five years and then self-sufficiency from then?

Mr. Diaklw: In terms of direct funding, at the present time, no. We are not looking for any direct additional funds. The Concept Plan always contemplated that Government would be involved in terms of assisting in the development of some, particularly some of our non-profit public type of projects. I think that is where we would be looking for some direct involvement as far as the Governments are concerned.

The other thing I would bring to your attention and a problem as far as self-sufficiency is concerned, depending on the rate of development, what we are faced with is municipal taxes that run at \$600,000 a year. If there is any meaningful delay in terms of greater public consultation or the economy slows down dramatically, then I think it would fair of us to approach the Governments and say if we are not going to develop those lands, at least we should have some tax forgiveness on the non-developed lands. At the present time that is all we are looking for.

Mr. Ducharme: Just to add to that, to the Member, of course, no, in the mandate, in the original concept was that if York Street-St. Mary was to be completed, then the provincial and the city would have to kick in the equivalency of the money put up for the lands, and that is \$4 million each. However, if the York Street-St. Mary is not proceeded with or

if the lands are sold, CNR lands are sold or developed, that is still in process. The money from those lands will go into The Forks, plus the provincial and the civic will have to come up with their equivalency of monies.

Mr. Campbell MacLean (Chairperson, Board of Directors, The Forks Renewal Corporation): Yes, I would add besides that we have monies coming from the CNR, and they do not kick in until that York-St. Mary road is completed—that is another \$5.8 million. Unless something happens right now, we will be running out of money but I do not think that. Something will become about it I am sure, but we are waiting for everything to kick in when the York-St. Mary road is completed or the land is sold.

Ms. Frlesen: Have you had discussions with the City of Winnipeg on the opportunity for some relief in taxes?

Mr. Diaklw: We have had discussions as well. There have been discussions by the planning committee at City Hall with respect to that matter itself.

The one thing that I should mention to you in terms of the financial thrust of your questioning, we have a borrowing limitation of \$10 million we have not used. We have simply used \$2.5 million of that \$10 million. It was always contemplated in the Concept Plan that there would be borrowings during the early part of the years, when the revenues were not flowing from the Governments and from the leases, to carry us into the two or three years before we got into revenues flowing from that area. I would not want you to think we have exhausted that. We have just simply borrowed \$2.5 million, where we have a borrowing authority of \$10 million.

Ms. Frlesen: When you are talking about self-sufficiency at the turn of the century, does that include having borrowed up to the \$10 million?

Mr. Diaklw: That is right, yes. Having borrowed up—I am sorry, I come from a City Council background where the rules are not as stringent as they are here. Yes, it does include the full borrowing.

Ms. Frlesen: Yes, it is indirect attack here rather than direct. Do you get any sense in your communications with the public, in the annual meetings that you have had, the letters that you must receive, the deputations, of a public concern about the mandate and the self-sufficiency aspect of it?

Mr. Diaklw: What I get, and we do have our annual

meetings and I speak to any number of service groups, is the overwhelming support for what we have done to date. I do not think there is any question in terms of the public reaction to what has been accomplished to date. It has been very, very favourable. There have been a number of surveys carried out, one by The Sun that indicated about a 75 percent support. We have done some surveys, and the indication is they are very happy with what we have done to date.

The concern has been raised by people who seem to be indicating there are all kinds of mega developments, either happening or about to be happening, and that is raising concerns in the minds of the public. You will recall that at our annual meeting, because there was this kind of feeling, we felt that one additional step we could take in terms of the evolution of our letters of intent would be that before we entered into the final agreement with whatever proponent, whether it is non-profit or private, we would have a public information session, so there would not be any secret deals. We would not be springing a 14-storey administrative building on anybody, that we would be going that route.

That, at the point in time when we communicated with our public, seemed to be acceptable, but in a long sort of round about way, yes, strong public support for what we have done, some concern about what may be coming later.

Ms. Frlesen: I think that is what I wanted to address, the concerns about what is coming later. It seemed to me that the presentations that were made to the City Council on this indicated people were interested in public amenities at The Forks. In some cases that might mean in some people's minds simply a park atmosphere, in others I think it meant public non-profit activities, and that is not inconsistent with the kinds of things that you have planned and have done in the past, but it may well be inconsistent with a self-sufficient mandate. I wondered what your reaction to that was?

Mr. Diakiw: It all depends on the extent to which the restraint on development is placed. Obviously if our sources of revenue that would flow from the private sector are not available to us, then we cannot be self-sufficient.

Ms. Frlesen: I am still pursuing the self-sufficiency. In terms of the people whom you have already at The Forks, the participants in the market, the perspective letters of intent you have, do you get any

sense from those participants of what their reaction is to the goal of self-sufficiency?

Mr. Diakiw: No, I do not think that I get any kind of concern from them in terms of self-sufficiency. What I do get from them is a concern of what the Concept Plan really is. Is it this document that has been approved by the three levels of Government or is it something different?

* (1040)

I think when you ask the private sector to become involved in a development, they like some degree of certainty as to what form and shape that development is going to take. If you have a continuing debate after you have approved the plan, then that harms the private input. The private sector becomes a little nervous about what is actually going to go in. The people that are there now, the Children's Museum, the hotel might have some concerns with respect to what may be coming, but in terms of the market itself, no we do not get any.

Ms. Frlesen: Can I move on then to another element of the mandate at the beginning, and that was the need to avoid competition with other developments in Winnipeg, particularly the North Portage development, but also the Exchange district? I wonder what kind of response you have to that to people who perceive there are these pulls in the development of Winnipeg, and what kind of plans you have to meet those perceptions.

Mr. Ducharme: There is that perception there, I say to the Member, but Mr. Diakiw?

Mr. Diakiw: In terms of the facilities that we are contemplating—let us go one by one through them. We have the Children's Museum, I think one of the real success stories in the city of Winnipeg over the last four or five years, clearly have outgrown their location. They have no good transportation to the site; they have no parking; they have no food facilities; they have no room for interpretation, and The Forks is just a glorious opportunity for them to move onto a site that is very historical in nature and a site that can be interpreted to our young people, children between the ages of two and 12, the site would be interpreted to them. From that standpoint, whether that is a pull or whether it is a logical move, they feel, and we agree that is an ideal marriage of a site to a use.

In terms of the hotel itself, there may be people who would feel that is in competition, but hotels are going up, and they do compete with one another.

Our hotel developer feels that there is a unique niche in the marketplace for people from around the province to come to The Forks, to come to this activity centre, and that is viable. It is their money that they are putting up, and they feel that it would be viable. The steam plant itself is—I indicated earlier and did not get around to telling you a little about that. Although we did not get a proposal for that site, what we have since then entered into a letter of intent with the rail heritage people, who want to develop that into a rail heritage interpretive site where they rehabilitate old rail vehicles and then put them out on the site.

I missed the market, and I think some of the complaints that I have heard relate to the matter of what we may have drawn in the market itself. I would like to share with you that as of April '90, we had 36 enterprises at the market. We have more now, but these figures are as of April '90: 17 or 47 percent are new enterprises; 12 or 33 percent are existing enterprises or enterprise expansions, second stores or more; and seven enterprises are relocations. In short, 80 percent of our business enterprises represent new investment, which would not have existed if it was not for The Forks Market.

The Forks Market, as you well know, is our attempt to bring this specialized food market to Winnipeg and to encourage our entrepreneurs, our local moms and pops—and a lot of them are first-time investors in our market—to come and bring their wares and provide not only the specialized foods, but the service that goes with those foods. As I say, over 80 percent represent new investment.

Ms. Frlesen: There are perceptions, I think, that the food market elements have taken away from the old food market that was on Selkirk Avenue, that the restaurants perhaps have taken away from Osborne Village or from Corydon Avenue. Do you have any response to those concerns, and have you done any studies that might indicate how these kinds of areas are working in Winnipeg as a whole?

Mr. Diakiw: In terms of the markets that you are talking about, those markets normally have existed for a short time frame during the year because of the climatic conditions. What we have built here is an all-weather, all-season specialized food market, so it would be very difficult to determine how much—you would have to ask the people who are out there in those markets whether we have drawn away from them or not. I would doubt it, but I do not know.

In terms of restaurants, all of our restaurants are very, very successful. Whether they have drawn away from others, I could not tell you that. They are very different. Each restaurant caters to a different clientele in the Manitoba environment, and I could not tell you whether they have drawn individually from any restaurants.

Ms. Frlesen: Yes, my question, Mr. Minister, was not really to doubt the success of The Forks Market and restaurants, but to ask the Minister whether he has any indications that others have failed because The Forks have succeeded, particularly, for example, where you might be aware that core area money is going into The Forks and it might have been directed to other areas.

Mr. Ducharme: On the tripart agreements, the only restaurant that I know probably did not succeed was the one inside the North of Portage. There was one that did not last very long. Others, I am not aware, unless Mr. Diakiw has something to add to that. Myself, I am not aware of some not succeeding. Mr. Diakiw has expressed that the ones at The Forks have been very, very successful, but I think restaurants will pop up at different places throughout the city and take—that is the whole. If you talk to restaurants, there is not a phenomenal growth. However, people will move from one to another, depending on the environment, and I guess that is what has made these three very successful.

Mr. MacLean: I would say the Sandpiper, for example, had already closed before they moved over to The Forks, and that has been very successful—

Mr. Diakiw: I think the key to our success—oh, I am sorry, you will have to forgive me, it is just too many years at City Hall. I guess the key to the success of a market, whether it be restaurants or whether it be specialized food, is to get the proper mix in the blend. I think what we have done with the restaurants, we seem to have hit just the right niche for each one of those restaurants, and each one enjoys a very strong, strong support.

Ms. Frlesen: Since Mr. Diakiw has raised his many years at City Hall, could we draw on that experience and ask him if he would feel more comfortable operating as CEO of The Forks in the context of a downtown development plan for the city of Winnipeg?

Mr. Diakiw: I am not quite sure what you are driving at. In terms of a downtown plan, there is a downtown

plan. There is a Plan Winnipeg, and we are operating within the context of that plan. As a corporation, we are operating within the zoning and a concept plan that has been approved by three levels of Government.

Ms. Friesen: I am talking specifically about the absence of a business downtown development plan that would be responsive to citizen input, that looks at the development of North Portage, of the second tier of urban areas, of the so-called gray areas, that looks at the Exchange district, includes The Forks, instead of having different developments with a perception that they are competing against each other. Would it help the work of The Forks to have that kind of downtown development plan?

Mr. Diakiw: I think that we are entering into a policy area that I am not sure that I feel very comfortable in terms of the kind of policies that might be considered by the three levels of Government. In terms of management, in terms of the way I manage, and my success or lack of it in the city of Winnipeg, I have found that I can manage just about anything that I feel inclined to do.

In terms of reporting relationships—let me just say this so that it goes on the record—I think that what we have in Winnipeg is something very, very unique in the tri-level thrust of our redevelopment of the core. I have a very strong feeling for that; I was part of the initial determinations that went into that with all different parties; I was part of the evolution of Core I into Core II, and I think that those things that have happened are unique to Canada. They require some very special skills in dealing with three different levels of Government and in dealing with those issues. I feel comfortable in that environment. I do not have a problem in dealing with it, and I think we have been very successful in Winnipeg in that way.

Mr. MacLean: I think that is one of the reasons that the board chose Mr. Diakiw is because of his experience in the core and his ability to deal with three levels of Government, because it is very difficult as you can imagine. It is difficult for one Government to get agreement, and when you have to deal with three, it is very important that we chose the right one.

* (1050)

I still feel very strongly though that there may be amalgamation say with North Portage, but if you go any farther, The Forks is a real jewel, and you should

have somebody concentrating on that jewel to make sure it comes out right. We will never get another chance to develop something like this, and it is very important that we do it right. As we say, we should not go too quickly, but we want to make sure that it does not get mixed up with all the other problems of Winnipeg.

The Forks belongs to the whole province, not just to the city of Winnipeg, so that as far as I think our board—I am speaking for myself and not really speaking for the board, but I think it is very important that we do not make the job too large, and it should be concentrated on bringing out the best of The Forks.

Ms. Friesen: That obviously is where my questions are leading, is to the new kind of organization that is being discussed for the various corporations in downtown Winnipeg. I think from our side of the House the concern is for citizen input and citizen control. I am unclear as to how a megacorporation is going to achieve that. I am interested in your response to that specifically. One of the mandates for The Forks originally was that there be public consultation, there be public input, there be public hearings and annual meetings. How is the creation of a larger corporation—I should address this to the Minister—going to achieve those kinds of ends?

Mr. Ducharme: First of all, in responding to the fear, we are comparing the amalgamation of North of Portage with The Forks. The board itself does not have to be any great deal of size. It would not stop the process that is in place now dealing with the public. If you look at the mandate of The Forks, and the consultation they have had with the many, many groups, and you know you are a member of the board, you sat through a lot of these reviews with different publics, there are many advisory groups that have been established. I think the whole idea of the amalgamation is probably more in perception than it is anything else. In other words, there are people out there saying that the North of Portage is competing with The Forks and vice versa.

However, you have to remember though that when the intent was forming of The Forks, there was always that intent there that North of Portage and The Forks could utilize the resources from the commercial to help the resources of the park-like setting of The Forks in the mandate and the original discussions, it was there all of the time; so there is nothing unique about putting the two corporations and having them working together as a board and

having the same CEO and the same chairman dealing with those same public.

Mr. Diakiw: No, I was just going to—I think you touched on it, Mr. Minister. In the Concept Plan itself, it indicates that on page 37: "It is recommended that the development agency's situation", that is The Forks situation, "be reviewed after the initial five-year program, at which time a Phase II Financial Plan should be established for the next five-year period; at the end of Phase I it may be appropriate to integrate ongoing activities of the East Yard development agency with those of other development corporations owned by the three governments to achieve cost economies and utilization of lease incomes derived from other projects."

I think at the time that Concept Plan was under discussion, the view was that what we had in North Portage was purely a commercial type of development, whereas The Forks was something unique and different and that there would be financial support required on an ongoing basis and that that may come about as a result of the integration of those two corporations.

Mr. Ducharme: I did not clarify it as much as Mr. Diakiw, but you can understand why he was a survivor so long with the City of Winnipeg.

Ms. Friesen: I have one last question, and then I am going to turn it over for the last part of our section to my colleague Oscar Lathlin (The Pas). I wanted to ask about the other element of citizen input. That is really the political element. Could the Minister explain for the record how the boards report to each of their levels of Government and what kind of frequency? Are they formal written reports? Are they informal meetings? What is the relationship between each political level and the board?

Mr. Ducharme: First of all, we have our shareholders meeting. We usually meet—the Core, the North of Portage and The Forks—on the same day. We usually have an all-day seminar, probably five to six times a year. We do get written reports; we do get the statements. We do have one advantage, which is that all three levels of Government have their members sit on the board. I am fortunate that the people who have sat on as my reps have kept me pretty well in tune to what is going on at the board level. As far as political, I do receive a lot of information.

However, the information I probably do not

receive is probably the financial in regard to leases, day-to-day types of operations and this type of thing that I would not be aware of as a Minister. I am only talking from the provincial level.

Ms. Friesen: Could I pursue that with the other levels and perhaps ask the board through you to indicate? You say that you receive the written reports and that you have informal communication with your own board representatives. How does that work at the city level and how does it work at the federal level?

Mr. Diakiw: At the city level, our reporting relationship is through the Committee on Planning. We have had a number of meetings with the Committee on Planning. As well, we have reported to the Executive Policy Committee. We have been invited to report to EPC and we have done that. We have also extended to all three Parties in the provincial Legislature invitations to come to meetings at The Forks, because we feel it is very important that everybody understand exactly what we are up to. We have extended that, but we have not had any formal relationship other than through the Minister.

In terms of the federal Government, the communication other than that which takes place at the board itself, where we have two federal representatives and a board and a professional administrator representing the federal Government, we just deal through the shareholder, simply. That is the reporting end of it.

I am sorry, one other thing. The chairman just did correct me. The other decision our board has taken is to ensure that the Core Area Initiative—we are all under the umbrella of the Core—is represented on the board. Jim August sits as an ex-official member, the general manager of the Core.

Ms. Friesen: Just to complete that line of questioning, could the board through the Minister explain how the federal representatives report to their level of Government?

Mr. Diakiw: The only communication that we have is through the shareholders, between the board and the federal shareholder but, again, I reiterate that on the board are three federal appointees. I am sure that they communicate back to the shareholder on matters that are before the board, two being citizen appointees, one being a professional administrator.

Mr. Oscar Lathlin (The Pas): Madam Chair, first of all I would like to thank the Minister and the board

for sharing a lot of information with us this morning. I am not a former member of the board and I am not a former member of Winnipeg City Council, so my knowledge of The Forks development is, you might say, limited to what I have been following in the press and in the reports that have come out and so on. I had basically three questions that I wanted to ask if I could be allowed, and let me before I ask those questions also say that because of the historical significance of The Forks—

* (1100)

Madam Chairman: Excuse me, Mr. Lathlin. Order please. I would ask the Members at the back of the room if they might leave the meeting area so that the Members who wish to participate in the discussion and hear Mr. Lathlin would be able to concentrate. Thank you.

Mr. Lathlin: As I was saying, because The Forks has such a significant history and importance, and I am basing my historical interest in the area towards aboriginal people. From that point of view that was my main interest in following The Forks development, not because I was interested in commerce or anything like that, which is incidentally another question that I will be asking.

Let me ask maybe a dumb question. The burial grounds issue that was at the forefront during the last little while, was there ever any resolution to that issue? How was it settled? Are we looking in the future at any more conflicts coming up like that from the point of view of the aboriginal people in the area?

Mr. Diaklw: If I might, let me give you a little bit of the history of our negotiations with the aboriginal peoples, because I think it is important to understand that we have been meeting with the elders for about a year and a half now in terms of getting their input and a sense of ownership of the development.

I have taken them on tours of the site and indicated what areas might be available for their consideration so that we could get their involvement in the planning of the way the Native presence should be celebrated. In other words, the position we wanted to take was to be very careful that we did not drive the planning, that it be driven by the aboriginal peoples.

We have been meeting with the elders. The chairman and I met on at least three separate occasions, the last occasion dealing with the burial sites. In fact, I think Ms. Friesen was at that particular

meeting. That question was raised, and I think the position that I took seemed to satisfy the elders. That was that any construction that takes place on the site, we have an archeologist, it will be monitored, and we will approach any works on the site making the assumption that there are burial sites, not the assumption that there are not burial sites.

Given that kind of approach and the care that goes with that approach, we would make a commitment to the aboriginal community that through the advisory committee that we have now set up with the aboriginal peoples, if there were any burials discovered, the first contact we would make would be through our committee. Then we would be bound by the provincial legislation in this regard.

I think that having given that kind of corporate and almost personal commitment as well, they were looking to me for a personal commitment, and I gave them that commitment, that that is the approach we would take, that we would be very sensitive to any potential burial sites.

I think they have accepted that and recognize that with the fact that we have Mary Richard on our board, we now have a Native advisory committee that is dealing with the planning of the Native presence. There seemed to be an acceptance by the elders at that meeting.

Point of Order

Ms. Friesen: Just a point of order, Madam Chair, I just want to put on the record that I was there at that meeting at the invitation of the elders, not representing The Forks Board.

Madam Chairman: Ms. Friesen, that is not a point of order. It is a matter of clarification of facts.

* * *

Mr. Lathlin: Madam Chairperson, if I recall correctly there were court actions taken back and forth. I am just wondering if the Minister could tell us whether the conflict was resolved eventually by way of legal means or by way of consultation and mutual agreement as has been suggested?

Mr. Diaklw: The conflict was not between the Native community and The Forks. The conflict arose out of a challenge with respect to an environmental licence. What we have done by way of background, in the area that we are talking about is the boat basin area just in front of The Forks Market.

Mr. Lathlin: I know which area I am talking about.

Mr. Diakiw: Okay, what we had in that location, we had done our environmental impact assessment. We had prepared an environmental impact plan. We had gone to the three levels of Government, the provincial Government, the federal Government and the city Government, to all of the regulatory agencies to get the necessary licences. We got all of them. At the city, we went to two or three committees. We got all of those licences. Pardon me; we got an agreement from the provincial environment branch that we were not required to get a licence, that we could proceed without a licence. We started the construction; we were challenged in the courts.

The issue as I understand it legally was between whether this was a marina and a boat basin. The position we took was that we were not providing a marina, a marina being an area where you could provide permanent docking, sewage and water facilities, lighting, all of those things. What we were primarily providing was an area where people could come, dock for a short period of time and enjoy The Forks site. That issue then went back to the Department of Environment, and about a month ago we were issued an environmental licence that cleared us to go ahead. There was a 30-day appeal period. That has run out with no appeals, so that issue has been cleared up.

Mr. Lathlin: Madam Chairperson, I want to come back to the historical significance of The Forks. I think it has also been referred to as being a jewel. That would suggest to me that it is quite an important area not only in terms of what it is doing now, but the history is what I want to come back to.

When I go through material on The Forks Renewal Corporation and the work they are doing, including the Board of Directors, I have heard on numerous occasions how much of a role aboriginal people would play in The Forks development. Yet to me anyway, my immediate reaction when I started reading about The Forks, when I started hearing about The Forks, is that there is no immediate connection to the aboriginal people.

If The Forks represents such a significant part of Manitoba's history, not only the settlers who lived there earlier, but also Canada's first citizens who were there long before anybody showed up along the Red River, then it makes perfect historical, moral and logical sense to me that The Forks project include aboriginal people in a more substantial manner than it has been doing in the past, at least

to my way of thinking and more than in just a passing way.

I want to come back, and I want to lead into the Native centre here. Is that all that is going to be representing the aboriginal people's contribution to Manitoba—putting in a Native centre there? Has anybody ever thought of appointing an aboriginal person to the board?

As an aboriginal leader I have sat on many, many advisory committees. Madam Chairperson, I would like to advise the Minister that I have advised a lot of bureaucracies, senior officials and Ministers, except that nobody ever took my advice. If I am sitting on a board then at least I have a little bit of decision-making power. So if aboriginal people, as the Minister says, are a significant component of this Forks development, could we not include them in a more substantial way than rather in a centre.

Madam Chairman: Just in keeping in terms of the agreement prior to my letting the Minister respond to your question, Mr. Lathlin, may I ask for the co-operation of the critic of the official Opposition to, after this question let the official critic for the Second Opposition Party resume questioning for 30 minutes, and then it will be a free for all. You may move back and forth between—

Mr. Ducharme: I will get Mr. Diakiw to answer that one. Then, as said, we will have ample time to go back and review the questions for the Members of the—

* (1110)

Mr. Diakiw: I guess maybe I went over it too quickly. I should have taken a little more time because it is a very important issue. I recognize your sensitivity, and I share that sensitivity with you.

What the City of Winnipeg did do, they did appoint a Native person, Mary Richard, to the board. She is on the board of the corporation. As well, the aboriginal steering committee that we have appointed, that is working with us and with the elders, involves Mary Richard; Mr. Ed Wood, who is a businessman in the aboriginal community; Miss Claire Riddle, who represents the Manitoba Metis Federation; and a Miss Olson, who just recently passed away. We have not replaced her yet on the steering committee.

Now that steering committee is in the process of being enlarged, not by us, but by this particular steering committee. We have very much said to them that we are prepared to provide the resources

and the support, but the thrust of the planning has to come from that committee. In fact, we did get a status report from that committee on Friday last, that has not even been to our board yet, so the Native community is working on in terms of the kind of presence that they feel would be appropriate to the site.

Mr. Carr: Madam Chair, I was glad to hear Mr. Diaklw say, in the course of an answer to a previous question, that he did not want any part of secret deals, that the corporation was run in an open fashion. Could the Minister or through the Minister, the president, tell us how many Letters of Intent have been signed between The Forks Renewal Corporation and private developers or public sector corporations?

Mr. Diaklw: Four.

Mr. Carr: Could he please tell us which they are, or what they are?

Mr. Diaklw: One with the Children's Museum for the B & B Building; one with Penn-Co for the redevelopment of the Johnson Terminal as a hotel; one with the German Canadian Cultural Association for the joint redevelopment of that site; then the fourth being the steam plant and that is with the rail heritage people. So those are the four.

Mr. Carr: Madam Chairman, in the spirit of openness, could the Minister please share with Members of the committee those Letters of Intent?

Mr. Diaklw: The position that my board has adopted in this case is that those Letters of Intent are simply the first step in a process and that process may lead to a conclusion, it may not lead to a conclusion. There are certain business parts of that Letter of Intent, and my board has taken the position that the Letters of Intent should not be made public.

Mr. Carr: I am a little confused, Madam Chair. We are talking about a corporation that is funded entirely through the public sector, through three levels of Government. We, in this committee, are here to ensure that the tax dollars of the people of Manitoba are well spent. The president has said that he wants to avoid secret deals, yet he is not making public four Letters of Intent. Could he just elaborate on that, and may I ask him to justify to Members of the Legislature why it is we will not have access to this information?

Mr. Diaklw: I do not think I said that I was withholding them. I indicated to you that my board has taken the position—the chairman is not here. In

terms of the non-profit Letters of Intent, there is nothing there that I would be concerned about releasing. There really is not. It deals with design. It deals with space. It deals with leases. In terms of non-profit groups who do get some support from other levels of Government as well, I do not have a problem.

In terms of the hotel itself, I think you have to remember that the hotel developer is talking of investing up to \$10 million of his own funds into the particular redevelopments, so it is not as if he will get any support through that Letter of Intent. There is no involvement of public funds in that aspect of the redevelopment of the Johnson Terminal building.

Mr. Carr: We are looking for an explanation as to why the Letters of Intent will not be made public. I am glad to go onto another line of questioning until the chairperson returns. I will certainly want to ask him that question when he does.

Mr. Ducharme: The only comment I have to make to that is that under the Freedom of Information, if that is available then to the Member, they can be obtained under that. However, I think maybe Mr. MacLean can maybe further answer why those letters—he is here now, maybe he can instead of going onto the next question. Remember the Member has that right to inquire under the Freedom of Information. The Freedom of Information, there is that process set in place by our Government, and we proclaimed that information is coming to him, well, then he can gather it under that other information.

Mr. Carr: Madam Chair, just for the information of the chairman, I was asking if the corporation in the spirit of openness would make public its Letters of Intent with Penn-Co, the Children's Museum, the German-Canadian Congress, and whatever relationship with the steam plant has been entered into. The president answered that it was a decision of the board not to make those Letters of Intent public. My question is, what is the reason for that?

Mr. MacLean: I think at the time we were worried about information with the private enterprise. The public ones we were not worried about at all, but whether or not these people wanted that information available before they really did any further studies.

We are taking another look at that situation today because really there is nothing in those Letters of Intent that could not be made public, but we would

not want to do it without the consent of the people who we entered into a Letter of Intent for. We are going to approach those people now and see whether they would or not allow us to give them.

I think it is basically, we have a mandate. It is my responsibility to make sure everything that happens is within that mandate. If anything goes outside the mandate, I must report to the three levels of Government immediately. That is one of my roles. When you are dealing with some of the private people, they would like to have a good look at it, go through and do their own studies after a Letter of Intent. They do not want to do until at least they have had a chance to examine further.

Mr. Carr: Do I take it to mean then that the chairman will make public the three Letters of Intent with the public corporations immediately, and he will seek to enter into discussions with Penn-Co to make the fourth Letter of Intent public, if they agree?

Mr. MacLean: I cannot speak for my board, but that is the recommendation I will be making to my board.

Mr. Carr: Madam Chair, I would like to ask the Minister some questions about decision making and the nature of board appointments. I presume, from an earlier answer, that the Minister does not have any hands-on relationship with the operation of The Forks, that he leaves that to the members who are appointed by all three levels of Government.

I would just like to press the Minister a little further on that point and ask him how often he either corresponds or holds conversations with his representatives on the board, and whether he can say honestly, to the best of his knowledge, that the board runs the show at The Forks Renewal Corporation and the Minister is there for only broad policy questions, leaving the administration to those who he and other political people appoint?

Mr. Ducharme: First of all, to the Member, the structure of the operation was not set up by this particular Government. I am there to function under that structure. I am very, very fortunate. I have my representatives, one being very, very close to the Government, a Mr. Don Leitch, who is one of my members put on that board to give us that contact that is required.

My other appointments are probably in touch with me quite frequently during the year. They do give me the information. We are contacted quite often by the CEO, by the chairman, when we are addressing the main concerns of Letters of Intent. We are very,

very clarified on them. We have met quite thoroughly on those principles of it.

I note the Member wants to know whether I am contacted on a daily basis or a monthly basis or a weekly basis. I must say to the Member that I am given information quite frequently from my three appointments, and I felt that at the board level it is working well. I have the availability of getting my point across to my members or to my appointees or the Government appointees, and they are Government appointees, and they are appointed through the Minister. However, they have been very, very helpful in any decisions at The Forks level.

* (1120)

Mr. Carr: I just wanted to establish—and the Minister has established for us—that the board of The Forks Renewal Corporation runs the show, which means that the people appointed to that board ought to be of the highest quality and not to have the kind of background necessary to run what the chairman himself calls a jewel in the crown of Winnipeg places.

The logical next question to ask then is what is the criteria used by the Government when it searches out for appropriate appointees to this very important board? Does the Minister have a set of printed criteria that he could share with the committee? How does the process work? How does he ensure that the best possible people are appointed to a board, which he admits through the answers to these questions, has the responsibility of running the corporation?

Mr. Ducharme: First of all, to the Member, when you are appointing people to different boards, whether it be the North of Portage or whether they be The Forks Board, I do not know what information the Member would want other than one of my appointees happens to be the Clerk of Executive Council—I do not know how much more closer it can be to the Government that is there at the time—who carries a very, very expertise with him.

My other Members, when we are appointing, we do like to make sure that we have a good cross section of people to the board. When the Member, Jean Friesen, was on, I left Jean Friesen on the board. She was doing a very, very good job. However, Jean Friesen was going on an eight-month sabbatical. I reappointed another Member whom I felt was very, very qualified, who

had information that would be required and her expertise.

You usually appoint by no straight type of advertising, like the city is doing now with their particular boards. They are now asking all councillors to submit names. I feel I have been very, very well versed with the people that I have appointed. They are all of excellent calibre.

Mr. Carr: I was not trying to determine how close the appointed individuals were to the Government of the Day. I was trying to establish how the Government of the Day determines the best people to do the job. Could the Minister tell us who the provincial appointees sitting on The Forks Corporation Board are presently?

Mr. Ducharme: I right now have Charlette Duguay, and I have Don Leitch and Roy Parkhill as my appointees to the board. Those are my three.

Mr. Carr: Could the Minister outline their qualifications? He has already discussed Mr. Leitch, so let us leave him aside for a moment. Can the Minister outline their qualifications to sit as members of the board of The Forks Renewal Corporation?

Mr. Ducharme: I do not have their qualifications in front of me. All I can say is that they are people who have been involved quite extensively in the City of Winnipeg. Mr. Parkhill was a former city councillor who has been involved in the development process. He was a city councillor. He was on the Convention Centre Board. I believe he was on a planning committee of the City of Winnipeg.

Charlette Duguay is a business entrepreneur in the City of Winnipeg whose involvement is in consulting with architects. She is a design architect and has qualifications that would be very unique when you are dealing with a development and a corporation.

Most people who are involved in The Forks or any appointee boards are usually people who come forward. You generally look at the qualifications of people, their general qualifications. Some people have been involved. Most people you will find throughout the city if you look through, there is a very small sector of people who you run in to all over the city, whether they are on the Theatre Centre, or whether they are on The Forks Board or whether they are on many, many committees, you will find you will run into the same people.

A lot of people, when you are addressing the fact of what they have been on and what their

qualifications are, you take all of those things into consideration. You like to have a good cross section of people. You have a cross section of people because of maybe their historical background. You might have people because of their development background, or their background in dealing with the overall development of some type of project. So generally one person will have one qualification that another person does not have, and that is how you appoint all of your board members.

Mr. Carr: Madam Chair, there was some controversy over the last week or so arising from statements made by, I gather, a public servant for the federal Government that the province had not lived up to its commitments. I think the Minister had put that allegation to rest through the \$6.5 million of equivalent contributions that was the responsibility of the province to hand over to The Forks Corporation after the extension of the streets in 1992.

Could the Minister just bring us up to date on federal-provincial relations as they relate to The Forks Renewal Corporation? We know that there was a meeting on Friday of the three partners, Mr. Jake Epp, the Minister of Urban Affairs representing the province, and the mayor to discuss a host of issues including, I gather, the amalgamation of North Portage and The Forks. Could the Minister bring us up to date on the status of those discussions?

Mr. Ducharme: First of all, it was a very, very lengthy meeting. The status of it was to clarify, and it was not \$6.8 million. Where that figure came, it goes to show you what type of figures are thrown out in the air. We are living up to our commitment, that if the York Street-St. Mary extension is developed, and it has to be developed by 1992, that we will be committed to those dollars to go in the York Street-St. Mary extension.

Also, there is an equivalency payment required when that extension is done or the lands are sold or the lands developed—and I am talking about CNR lands—we must kick in \$4 million along with the city. This was addressed in the table, and we made it very clear that in The Forks, we would live up to all of our obligations.

About the amalgamation of The Forks and the North of Portage, all three parties were in general agreement and very, very optimistic that it could be done, especially the province and the federal

Government, that it would probably be very beneficial at this time for the amalgamation to take place. However, the mayor of the City of Winnipeg must go back to his people to ask them what they felt that their opinion was of the amalgamation.

The mayor has to deal through a different type of level of dealing with that. He has to go back, and if there is an amalgamation, there has to be a clarity that the shareholders' agreements would have to be changed, et cetera. So he wants to go back to his council to determine where they are at at this time. He is only the reporting body. The federal Government or the provincial body could make those decisions without going back to any legislative agreement or anything like that. I am very optimistic in regard to that, so those are the two comments dealing with The Forks and North of Portage at this time.

Mr. Carr: Madam Chair, from the Minister's point of view, are we on the fast track here? Does he expect a decision to be taken within weeks or several months? Is it a year or two away? Does the Minister expect that the board will be amalgamated and that some directors will be asked to leave? Does he expect that there will be advertisements placed for a chief executive officer of the amalgamated corporation? What impact will amalgamation have on staff, on the administrative costs of each organization and their infrastructures? Could the Minister give us some insight on his thinking and just how soon he expects this to be a reality?

* (1130)

Mr. Ducharme: The partners have agreed to meet before the end of the year to bring back the information that was required for the amalgamation. The province and the federal Government had considered that probably due to the factual information we have now dealing with the administration, that administration costs could be resolved. We did discuss that in the original intent of when The Forks was formed, and it was addressed earlier at this meeting, that it would probably be maybe that time to look at such information.

We have come out very strong. We made the commitment that would be one of my first requirements of priorities that the amalgamation take place. Unless someone shows me some misgivings of why it should not take place, I have

made it very public and very clear that I am in favour of that amalgamation.

Mr. Carr: I would like to ask a question to the chairman of the corporation through the Minister. He was quoted in the public press, I think a year or so ago, stating that The Forks was a private corporation. I am sure that the chairman would want an opportunity to explain in front of MLAs what he meant by that, whether it was a slip of the tongue or if he had wanted to expand on what he meant by terming a corporation that spends only public dollars to be a private corporation.

Mr. MacLean: I think it was probably a slip of the tongue, because basically we knew exactly what was going on. The question, I think, that was asked at that time was something about what rents all the tenants were paying and the corporation. We said that really was not public knowledge, that in order for them to survive they should not have to disclose exactly what they were paying and how much they were paying. It would all come out in the end when we reported on the market through our financial statements.

We certainly are a public corporation, but there is no shopping centre starts telling you much each tenant is paying you. They may be paying differently. It all depends on whether it is a meat concession and there are heavy expenditures required by them, or they are selling doughnuts and have very little expenditure to put in, so there were different rates being charged.

We went to Mr. Finnbogason who was looking after giving us advice, because there are not very many people on the board running a market. We hired a market manager and their advice to us was that we should not give that information out. No organization really does. So any shopping centre you send it around and they would start publishing exactly what everybody pays. We had to be—and we are dealing with mamas and papas and we were having a lot of difficulty.

I might say that I am not always sure that the newspapers quote right, but I guess I must have said it, because I guess maybe at that time I was worried about giving the information. We felt that what I was instructed—at least informed by our advisors—should not have gotten out to the general public.

Mr. Carr: Politicians do not lose any sleep over

being misquoted. They lose sleep over being quoted correctly. That is another matter.

Since we are on the subject of the market, could the Minister report to us how the market is doing? Is the market breaking even? What are the projections for the next year? Can we just be brought up to date on that?

Mr. Diakiw: Yes, we opened about a year ago. We opened with about 16 or 17 tenants. We are up to somewhere around 41 tenants. We had projected that we would be breaking even. When we appeared before city committees on this issue, we had indicated we would be breaking even somewhere between one and a half and two years after opening. That was our best advice from other markets where they had started. It is very difficult to compare to a market in Vancouver, other than the Granville Island Market, because after the Granville Island Market, the marketplace itself had been established and so the kinds of successes they have enjoyed have been pretty dramatic. So, we have always related ourselves to Granville, because they were the pioneers in that area.

In terms of the opening, and in terms of where we are at now in terms of tenants and the make-up, I think we have done at least equal to Granville Island. I think we have probably done a little better. We are not at the same level as Granville Island right now. I would be kidding you. They are 10 years or 11 years old. They have matured as a market.

The thing that we have to be careful about in a market is to make sure you get the right mix and the right blend of the kind of services and the kind of foods and what is being offered. So we had to pick and choose. There were some people who wanted to come in who we felt should not, for instance, the fast food market. We are not taking any more applications, because we have a nice mix of fast foods.

In general, over the last few months, we are running on a cash-flow basis about at the break-even point. We had projected for the year ending March 31, 1991, that we would be slightly under a break-even point. We are also projecting that within five years, we are anticipating being on the positive side to the extent of somewhere between \$600,000 and \$700,000 a year.

Mr. Carr: What is the figure for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1990? What was the shortfall on the market operations?

Mr. Diakiw: That is in your financial statements. I think you have copies of them. What you have to do is you look at the revenue sign and it shows the market at \$290,000—the revenue. You see the operating cost at \$510,000 which puts it at a deficit of about \$210,000.00.

Now having said that, let me caution you, because we opened the market in October going into the winter season. None of our restaurants were open. All of those came on stream. So what you have is a heavy loading of tax, utility, heating costs and minimal revenues until we got everybody going. The restaurants, which have been very good producers, did not come onto line until January 1, and then they came on in February and March. So that is the position at that point in time.

I might say that in terms of, and to support that so that in comparing the month of October last year, our total sales to our total sales of October of this year—which is the first time we have been able to compare month to month, because we have only been in operation a year—the total sales went up by about 88 percent, somewhere from \$300,000 to \$600,000 a month. That is not as a result of tremendous growth. It is a result in terms of additional merchants coming on, the restaurants coming on flow and the market maturing.

Mr. Carr: Madam Chair, we were looking at some old files the other day and saw a report of an ad hoc committee of the City of Winnipeg in 1979, 1978. The members of the committee included Mr. Diakiw, Councillor Filmon, Councillor Ernst, and Councillor Leitch. This ad hoc committee had reported that the best spot for a new arena would be the CN East Yards, and that the province ought to be approached for a grant of \$5 million.

We saw last week that a consultant had reported that the more appropriate site—for a whole host of reasons, and we need not debate that here—should be the provincially held land across from the Convention Centre. Does this put to rest, in the minds of Mr. Diakiw and the chairman of the corporation, any discussion of a new arena being built on the lands adjacent to The Forks?

Mr. Diakiw: I am trying to recollect the circumstances of the report. My recollection is that the members of the committee that you outlined looked into the question of whether there should be a new arena built or an expanded arena built. That committee, at that point in time, had recommended

a new facility. The issue of location came from the Board of Commissioners, of which I was a member. I was not the Chief Commissioner then. Don MacDonald was the Chief Commissioner.

* (1140)

The Board of Commissioners had looked at something like 19 different sites in Winnipeg, and they had come down with the recommendation that not The Forks lands but the lands adjacent to The Forks, that I have described to you to the north, would be an ideal location. The second location that was chosen at that time was the existing location.

The thrust then—and my personal opinion to this day is any facility that is built should be built downtown. I think it is very, very important we recognize that what the downtown needs is a nighttime population. The daytime population is there. There is just absolutely no doubt in my mind that the location should be downtown, whether it be north of The Forks or whether it be across from the Convention Centre. That is for people to decide who looked at the study.

I have not seen their study. I do not know the basis on which they made their recommendations. I am looking forward to seeing it. At the time the board looked at it then that land was available for a dollar, and the recommendation was that it go there.

Mr. Carr: I would like to just spend a minute or two if I could looking towards the future. We had some good debate this morning about the past mandate and decisions that were taken, but all of us are interested in what the future holds for The Forks site.

Our Party has been on record that the best development is slow development. We do not want to make mistakes because the mistakes will be very difficult to correct.

There is the issue of a leisure centre. There is the issue of a tourism centre, which I gather is under negotiation between the provincial Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst) and a federal Minister. Could the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme), or through him the chief executive officer bring us up to date on the status of the leisure centre and the tourism centre and just what it is The Forks executive are doing with their time now.

The money is spent. They are managing a facility. Are they preparing for a future which is ill-defined? Are they attempting to define that future? What do they expect it to be, and if they could just gaze a little bit ahead of where we are now to bring us along to

the latest thinking from the board and from the chief executive officer.

Mr. Ducharme: Before passing on to the administration in regard to the tourism centre, as the Member is aware the Minister, Mr. Ernst the Honourable Member, and also Mr. Epp are still negotiating the amount that is due to expire at the end of March of '91. I believe the latest information I have is that of those monies that are available to the Member there is approximately \$2 million that is still available. I know they are still negotiating. I am hoping they will resolve something, but I just wanted to add that, that maybe The Forks are not aware of.

Mr. Diaklw: In terms of the three major projects that we are exploring now I think I have covered the aboriginal, the Native centre, and its presence, and I do not think I have to repeat that.

In terms of the leisure centre, we did set up an advisory committee of some 17 to 20 people in the community who had an interest in recreation, had an interest in parks and who have been working for about a year now with respect to the development of some form of water-based indoor-outdoor park area that could be placed at this site.

The leisure centre is a component that was identified in the study as one that should be reviewed and that is being reviewed now.

Mr. MacLean: I would just like to speak on the leisure centre. I chair that committee. I think it is very important. We have a very large senior citizen group in the city of Winnipeg and a large number of handicapped people who cannot use the outdoors.

What we are looking for really in a leisure centre is another park, but it is a park that is available all year round. It would have a water base, but it would have lots of walkways. It certainly would not be for those people who wanted to really go swimming. They can go to the pools.

We are looking at some place where the kids can run in and out of the water there a lot. I might say that one of the handicapped people who was on our committee indicated to us that it would be so nice. She said, you have never been locked up for six to eight months with no place to go except a shopping centre.

We are looking for a park really. A leisure centre really is a misnomer. We are looking for a park that would be something along the theme of Grand Beach where people can go and sit and enjoy themselves. There are a lot of seniors—if you go to

some of the senior homes—who would just love to get out in the wintertime and be able to enjoy the outdoors.

It is certainly not like what we are talking about in the Edmonton Mall. Edmonton Mall has a large big pool. What we are looking at is smaller—very small areas. Maybe the total area would be the same, but it would be all broken up and used by everyone in the city.

What we are looking for is maybe an acre and a half to two acres out of the 56. It would be probably 84 degrees all year round and would be able to be used by everyone in the city. We have to look after all of those people who cannot get out in the wintertime.

One thing that I would like to bring to your attention, we will have all of the necessary winter sports there. Right now we had a very helpful group from the (inaudible) union that built the Wall of Time for us. At the present time the Carpenters Union have come forward and they are going to build us two toboggan slides for The Forks that will be used. They are going to supply all of the material and the labour for these two slides at The Forks. They assure me it will be the largest toboggan slide in Winnipeg if not in the province.

You get all of these people who really want to make sure that The Forks is successful and they want to contribute time and money to The Forks. I just thought I would throw that in at the same time. We need really something in the wintertimes so these people can get out and use it.

Mr. Diakiw: In terms of the tourist facility, it was identified in the plan as well. It makes a lot of sense that a place where all people visiting Manitoba could come to a central location, a meeting place where they could learn about the city and the province and then fan out from The Forks made all kinds of sense.

What the board did say to the province though was any kind of facility that would be put into The Forks they would support providing there was a very strong historical interpretive part of that project. That was the position our board had taken, and we have not heard the latest on where the matter stands. That was the logic. That was the position the board took in.

Mr. Carr: Madam Chair, I have one more question before I pass it on to the Member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen).

There seems to be some controversy surrounding

the tourism centre because it is seen by some to be competitive with the Museum of Man and Nature—do they still call it that? I am wondering if they changed the name yet.

What comment does the Minister have or the chief executive officer about those concerns, that there may be a competitive mandate and the Museum of Man and Nature, which is already in financial difficulty, may suffer as a result of this new initiative?

Mr. Ducharme: A comment I could make, and I guess when we were talking and the monies that were originally talked about—probably a year ago you were talking about \$7 million or \$8 million including some private funding.

However as I have indicated to the Member, now that you have \$2 million coming from the agreement maybe a combination of one of those other buildings to fit in with that—without putting something on the table with the Member right now there could be, just to throw it out, a combination with the hotel or there could be a combination with the Children's Museum.

There are other alternatives now that could probably take place, and because I am not the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Ernst) I think he and the Minister, the federal Member, will come to some conclusion so we do not lose that \$2 million that is available before the end of March.

Ms. Friesen: Madam Chair, I wanted to continue with the future as well. We are three-fifths of the way through this particular five-year plan. I wanted to ask you, through the Minister, what kind of plans you have for public participation into the next phase of the five-year plan? Are you planning for that now?

Mr. Ducharme: I think before the Member—we have the CEO to answer that. I guess as a Minister you probably want to know exactly what our concerns are also, as to make sure that—and it has been explained here quite openly today, there is a finance position that is going to have to be addressed.

I mentioned we did address that at our meeting on Friday, so I wanted to make the Member quite aware that we have to address that. That is foremost as a Minister and as this Government is concerned to make sure that is addressed and that position is solved. I am very optimistic that will be solved in the next short while. Maybe I can have Mr. Diakiw answer in regard to what public meetings will be held.

Mr. Diakiw: As far as public participation is

concerned, I am sure you are aware that under the Phase I plan we are required to report on a Phase II plan prior to the end, which would be the end of '92.

What we announced at our annual meeting of this year was that we would be starting that process some time around the third or fourth quarter of '91. We would be going through a public hearing process and going through what we have accomplished to date and what was ahead of us, what financial commitments were in place, and get the input just as we have gotten the input on this first document, with the hope—I think that in fairness to all of the people who appeared the initial time around, I think people were dealing with a site that very few people knew very little about.

* (1150)

What we have done now is we have accomplished what we set out to do, which is to get the people to rediscover The Forks. They have, and now they will be in a position to tell us, I think more clearly and more definitively exactly what their view and visions of The Forks are. That is the process we would be going through.

You will recall that there were I think five or six public meetings held in the evolution of the preparation of this report, and we would be doing the same starting in the latter part of next year.

Ms. Friesen: I wanted to pursue the issue of public meetings as a mechanism for public input into The Forks. I think in the beginning there was perhaps a rationale for that. As you say, people knew very little about the site, but now people do know more about the site. You have, as you say, a number of committees already advising you in particular areas, the leisure centre, an aboriginal centre which is working on the basis of its own government.

Are there other mechanisms you have considered? One of the difficulties with public presentations is that they become seen and in fact I think perhaps are in reality simply petitioning—please do this, please do not do that. Are there other mechanisms you have considered for citizen planning over the next five years?

Mr. Diaklw: No, our board has not yet addressed that issue. We have indicated that we will be carrying out the meetings. We have not addressed how that public participation would come forward. Obviously there would be different mechanisms. I just dealt with the most obvious one, which was

public presentations. As you well know there were private presentations as well that were made to the board in the evolution of this particular report.

Mr. MacLean: If you have any ideas we would like to hear them, because really this is a joint effort. If we have any other means of getting input—we would appreciate very much if you could let us know what you might suggest.

Ms. Friesen: One of the areas I was thinking of that you have developed are these longer range planning committees, I am thinking for example the Friends of The Forks and the archeological component. There you have the opportunity for particular professional interest groups and public interest groups to begin longer range planning that can then be built in, not in the absence of public meetings but in addition to.

I think one of the other things that concerns me perhaps is the public communications of The Forks, and I notice that your newsletter no longer exists. Could you perhaps expand a little on that, on your communication strategy, and why you dropped the newsletter and what kind of things you are thinking of in place of it?

Mr. Diaklw: No, I am sorry, we have not dropped the newsletter.

Ms. Friesen: Okay, then it has not been reaching me. Sorry.

Mr. Diaklw: No, we may have missed a quarter. We went from a quarterly basis to six times a year. We found that it was just a little too much for our staff to keep up to date. That communication vehicle is still there, we intend to utilize it. I spend an awful lot of time talking to service groups and having an interchange with people. We also have a tremendous interest in people coming to The Forks.

What we found is the amount of programming that we are doing is substantially more than we ever anticipated. I do not know why we did not anticipate it. I guess we felt it would take longer for the public to get a recognition, but I can give you sheets and sheets of groups and choirs and senior citizen groups that come and perform and participate and have really developed a sense of ownership to this site.

That area, we have to be very careful about because it can grow dramatically. In Toronto—I do not know if you have recently seen the documentation on the harbour front, the close down of the Harbour Front Corporation, and the concern

they had with respect to the cultural and programming element—they are talking of spending \$8.8 million a year on programming. Now that is staggering.

Ms. Frlesen: I think that is a cut from eleven point something.

Mr. Diaklw: Yes, that is right. They are worried now where the shortfall is going to come from, and you know we are spending a couple of hundred thousand dollars. I do not want to make it sound like \$200,000 is not a lot of money, but in terms of what other people are doing, we are really managing on a shoestring and it is because we are getting a knowledge of our own site.

Not only are people discovering our site, we are discovering what that site can do and what it cannot do. As a result of our experience this year, we have come forward with a policy for our board to consider on the use of this site and what limitations it has and what expansions of public involvement would be there. Our board has been very supportive of us in that area. They recognize, that as distinct from North Portage, we have a mandate to communicate and that program has to reach out to the people. We have an awful lot of good comments on our current magazine or newsletter.

Ms. Frlesen: I think some of the points I wanted to pick up on what you said is that I think there is a growing public ownership of The Forks. One of the indications of that was the support level you received in the Winnipeg Sun, that the poll did there, and the encouragement that you received from that.

I think what I am really saying is let us build on it and let us have much more extensive public involvement in the planning of specific areas of The Forks and of the overall area, more than simply public meetings, annual meetings and presentation of petitions. I think there is a real opportunity to develop a different kind of corporation there or a different kind of development model for parts of Winnipeg.

I want to move on to ask about the CN lands. Obviously your neighbours are important to you and you have, I think, always considered St. Boniface as part of your neighbourhood and there has been joint planning with the riverbank area of St. Boniface. What is happening with the CN lands? There was at some point a planning commission that the CN or at least the real estate section of CN had in place for

that. What has happened to that and what is the status of those lands?

Mr. Ducharme: Maybe I can answer it politically that there have been discussions with the CN, with different people, but right now I think the CN has no immediate plans for their particular area. The lands are there, and I guess it is because of what is happening in the economy and what is happening with—they even had office buildings. I think in the original concept that you are talking about, they had left the lands along from there to Juba Park. That has never been changed. They did have some residential in there. However, right now at this time the CN has no immediate plans.

Mr. Diaklw: Yes, we have not met with them for—I was going to say, close to a year. We did see some initial plans very confidentially, and we have not seen anything from them lately, so I cannot give you any more information than that.

Ms. Frlesen: Could I ask the Minister then, how is this affecting the planning process for The Forks?

Mr. Ducharme: It was always perceived that The Forks would develop in its own way, away from the City of Winnipeg or from the CNR lands dealing with that part of the city. There was the York Street-St. Mary extension that was also involved when they originally looked at the mandate.

I guess because of the slowdown of what CN is doing with their lands that it would only affect the CN, other than that York Street-St. Mary, whether that will have to be looked at again is another matter. Apparently it is having some problems convincing councillors that extension should now go through. This is all part and parcel of those discussions.

Mr. MacLean: I would just say that as far as The Forks is concerned we are proceeding with the program as outlined in our mandate. We certainly would like to see that Children's Museum established in the B & B Building. I think it is a tremendous idea. It is a hands-on deal where the children take part and participate. They can take the history of the site, dress them as Natives and canoes in front of them. There are all kinds of things that can be done with those projects we are doing and along with the leisure centre.

We are, at the present time, just developing the buildings that are at the one end of the site outside of the leisure centre and, of course, you know the Native centre has been—they have agreed that they think they would like the South Point. They are

building on that question, and I think that would be ideal for them. We are not really involved, and it is all up in the air what is happening with the CN lands.

Mr. Ducharme: Just to point out, and we seem to not come into discussion today, a very important part of the whole Forks site or leading up to The Forks site is the walkway. That is very, very successful. I think it just adds a complete new light if you go through and you walk down there Saturdays and Sundays and people are using it. I think it is a great concept that is coming and is also part of the planning I know the Member probably was aware of. It was coming through when she sat on The Forks. I think something should be mentioned of that because it has been very successful.

Ms. Frlesen: I think it is successful on both sides of the river too.

I did however want to pursue the absence of CN activity here. One of the elements of the CN lands was that it is, of course, the most commercially viable, being the closest to the centre of the city, and that the presence of that kind of commercial land, to be developed in a different way with a different mandate, was to take the commercial pressure off The Forks.

* (1200)

Obviously given the condition of the economy, we may be talking commercial pressure is not realistic at all. I would like to hear your comments on that. If the CN is not doing anything with that land, are you finding that there is more commercial pressure on you at The Forks?

Mr. Diaklw: No. We have steadfastly maintained that in terms of the kind of development the CN is contemplating, the kinds of office development, we would not be contemplating that kind of development on our lands. The only area we have from time to time considered for a possible office development would be in the area west of Pioneer, the area where the parking exists now. We see that site eventually becoming an underground parkade and possibly, maybe one office building there would be the maximum and then housing along that side, but that is in Phase II. We are not talking about that presently, the parking we have is reasonably adequate but that is the extent.

The other area that we have an interest, of course, is north of York Avenue and we do own lands. That is these lands along here, which are contiguous to

the 16 acres and, of course, this was always planned as a marina, as distinct from a boat basin. We had always talked about 150-200 units of residential in this area. Because of the state of the residential market right now, we are not pushing it, and they are not pushing it. When that development takes place there has to be a rationalization of their involvement with ours and ours with theirs.

Ms. Frlesen: Do you have any sense of CN plans for that land over the next five or seven years?

Mr. Diaklw: None other than what I saw about a year ago and that was shared with me on a confidential basis. I have not seen anything since then at all. No. I have seen recommendations from the planning committee though that suggest the land be acquired by the city for whatever civic purposes.

Ms. Frlesen: Do you have any sense of the price?

Mr. Diaklw: No, I would not have any sense of the price.

Mr. MacLean: I would just say that we really with the CNR the discussions have just fallen off. It looks like they have just let it go now, and we are not looking for any development there at the present time. It may be that the price will be right if somebody wants to purchase it.

Ms. Frlesen: It seems to me from the context of public access and also of the design context at The Forks, the presence of the CN blight is something that should be concerning us. What kind of response would you have to that?

I mean, you want to create a community or an area of downtown Winnipeg where people are able to go in the evening. I think the absence of any kind of activity on the CN lands makes that a little difficult. Also, one of the major entrances comes through that area and people are having to drive through rather endless parking lots in order to get to the focus of activity at The Forks. It seems to me that there should be an impetus for the development in some way of those CN lands, in conjunction with The Forks, and a generalized planning, I think, for that area. I wonder what plans you have for that?

Mr. Diaklw: Well, I think that shortly in the new year, we will be approaching them again and asking them what their plans are. In terms of dealing with the CNR blight, that is exactly what our project is all about. We have been dealing on The Forks redevelopment with a site that has been an industrial area for the last 70 or 80 years, so in a very

small way we are opening up the rivers and opening up the site to the public.

You asked another question that I unfortunately did not answer and that is the question about the other side of the river. What we have just entered into you might be interested in. We have invited the festival people across the river to become part of our site in terms of planning, in terms of the riverbank activities and in terms of bringing them right into the plaza where we have a skating rink.

They are now providing the voyageur food in the pavilion building, they are providing entertainment and some of the maintenance of the rink. We have invited them to become a part of our site, and we are going to be participating with them in their festival coming up. They are going to be up on the second floor with a lot of the French-Canadian crafts. We have extended that arm, they have come over and we have a very good working relationship with them. There may be some long-term commitments that come out of this, but we have to walk before we can run, so we have entered into some very short-term commitments.

Ms. Friesen: I want to pursue the York-St. Mary extension a little bit. Have you done the archeological assessments for that area yet?

Mr. Diaklw: No. We would not be doing those assessments. They would be done by the city, and they are under way. There were digs carried out in the fall of the year, and it happens that the archeologist we had employed is working for the city and providing that data to them. We have no knowledge of what has gone on, other than there have been archeological assessments being carried out.

Ms. Friesen: Are the archeological assessments complete and is there a published report available?

Mr. Diaklw: I know there is no published report, but I do not know whether they are complete yet. They are not. They are continuing and the second part of the program will be in the spring.

Ms. Friesen: So, if there are any discoveries in that area, it is the city's responsibility to deal with it, rather than The Forks development?

Mr. Diaklw: Yes, that is correct.

Ms. Friesen: I see. Okay, thanks.

Could I pursue the historical and cultural framework for The Forks? Could you tell me what

stage you are at with the planning for that, including the public archeology aspect?

Mr. Diaklw: Well, as you know, the public archeological program that we have carried over the last two years has been one of the real successes. Most of the artifacts that people talk about and discuss are artifacts that have come out of our site. They have come out of our site through the monitoring of all the construction that went in. Every bit of construction that was done, we had our archeologist on-site monitored. Some of the utilities that we put in, I can tell you, are the most expensive in Winnipeg, because the contractors were so supportive and co-operative with our archeologist. I do not think they missed a thing in going through that construction period.

We did start a public archeological program last summer and over the last two summers we have had close to over 80,000 visitors. It has been a very, very successful archeological program. I like to tell the story of some friends of mine, came from China, who I visited with, to Winnipeg, and they came in January. What they asked me to see surprisingly was they wanted to see our public archeological dig and I said, well, you know we only go back 6,000 years in our dig.

What really amazed them was the fact that the public was invited to participate in the program. We have established an association, as you had indicated earlier, of citizens to deal with that aspect of the program. In terms of our heritage planning, we have a Heritage Advisory Committee. If you wish I can give you the names of the people involved—a very strong committee.

They have been charged with the responsibility of developing a heritage plan. They have been monitoring that process. We did go to a public tender and had submissions by consultants and engaged a consultant that has been working on this for a good period of time now. The heritage plan is in. It came in, I think, last week. I have not read it yet. I have not had a chance, but that is the stage we are at, and then that plan will be shared with the public.

* (1210)

Mr. Carr: I would like to ask a question or two about archeology. There was some controversy when the excavation was underway for the building of the boat basin. Can the Minister assure us that there was no disturbance of important archeological territory there? I would be interested in knowing just what

was excavated during that process, if the Minister or through the Minister to the chairman or the president can give us an idea of just what was found and how significant the finds were.

Mr. Ducharme: Maybe at this time I could bring Mr. Sid Kroker, who was the archeologist for the site and it may be filled.

Mr. Sid Kroker (Site Archeologist, The Forks Renewal Corporation): With regard to the area that was under construction, the initial assessments in 1988 found there was a dividing line in the territory. One area had a 3,000-year-old campsite, which has now become an archeological preserve. It has been preserved for future public archeology in the distant future.

The other area was an area that had bank slump. The riverbank had collapsed several times, and we were locating railroad cinders and fills as much as two metres below current summer water levels. This is the area that was being excavated for the boat-docking facilities area.

During the monitoring, the material that was recovered, all diagnostic historic material was collected. That primarily was broken plates and broken cups from the CN, or Canadian National at that time, and Grand Trunk Railroads. At the time of amalgamation most of that material, because of the new corporation name and logo, was not usable and it was discarded.

The deposits of this material and railroad cinders were extensively thick. Every time the riverbank slumped, the railroads would add more gravel, more cinders to rebuild the bank. During that whole period, there was no material that predated the turn-of-the-century 1895 period in the area of excavations.

The area which was stable and had not slumped yet, which contained the pre-contact aboriginal occupation areas, is the area that is being now preserved behind the Wall in Time which was built as a structural facility to prevent slumpage. That is the area that is now the archeological preserve.

Mr. Carr: Just to be reassured then, there was nothing found in the professional opinion of Mr. Kroker during that excavation that was, in his view, historically archeologically significant?

Mr. Kroker: The material that was recovered was secondary deposition, primary railroad-period garbage. Winnipeg City Dump No. 1 from 1910-1915 was in that area. It was probably used

by the railroad as a mechanism of building up land surface. The material that was uncovered was from anywhere in Winnipeg and, unfortunately, this city has had a tendency to use the riverbanks as a disposal area.

We have been able to document that aspect of garbage utilization of our riverbanks from the turn of the century until the current, because we were uncovering green garbage bags as much as a metre under the surface.

Mr. Carr: It sounds like the history of garbage might be the subject of a Masters thesis or something. Did Mr. Diakiw want to add to that?

Mr. Diakiw: Could I elaborate because I think what we had here—you have had the indication of what the archeological -(interjection)- what we had here was the fact that we wanted to build a river walkway to connect the parks and we had a sliding bank, a dump site or a sliding bank; we had a structural problem. We initially designed it to be all the way around here, but what Sid Kroker had found was there was an archeologically fertile area right in here that, in fact, could have slipped into the river and disappeared. What we did is we redesigned that boat basin development to build into that a concrete retaining wall that would retain that archeologically fertile area, and that wall is referred to as a "Wall in Time," the ones that the masons have contributed their manpower and their materials to build, so that is the area.

We have had to spend a fair amount of money. The project cost close to \$3 million in terms of the development of this area and primarily because of the structural failures that were in that bank. There is no way you could have constructed those walkways without those kind of engineering structures, and that is an area that I am familiar with and comfortable in.

Mr. Carr: What was the cost to the corporation of the delays and court challenges over the excavation for the marine?

Mr. Diakiw: I would say, roughly \$300,000.00.

Mr. Carr: I would like to move on to housing. The concept of housing is included in the Phase I development financial plan. Can the Minister bring us up to date on whether or not any kind of housing development is being contemplated for the site? If so, what kind of housing, and when he expects decisions to be taken?

Mr. Diakiw: In looking at our site and in looking at

the economy at the present time, and the state of the vacancy rate, we are just in the process of starting to address that question ourselves. We have set that aside and not dealt with it. From a planning standpoint, we would be looking at that within the next year, depending on the state of the economy. If the economy continues to deteriorate, that may not be the prudent thing to do. In terms of our mandate, we do have a mandate to provide housing, and we will be looking at it, but our board has not dealt with that aspect yet.

Mr. Carr: Madam Chair, there are two issues here. One is whether or not housing is appropriate to the site; the other is, if so, what kind of housing? I would like to ask the Minister, is it the policy of his Government to promote the concept of housing for The Forks site or not?

Mr. Ducharme: At this time, no.

Mr. MacLean: I would say also the board has really set aside the question of housing. We think it will be dealt with when we go around and inquire what we should be doing in the next five years. There may be some planning, but we will not be proceeding with housing at the present time because of the state of the economy in downtown Winnipeg, because it is overworked right now.

As far as the board is concerned, we will be listening, and when our second concept plan comes up for the next five years, that matter will be discussed very thoroughly.

Mr. Ducharme: I would suggest that if we were looking at writing a mandate up now of The Forks, and we know what we are knowing today, you would not even be considering housing at this particular point.

Mr. Carr: There are two ideas floating around the table. One is that housing is inappropriate, and the other is that this is a bad time to develop housing. I gather from the chairman's remarks and Mr. Diakiw's remarks that this is not an appropriate time to develop housing because of the vacancy rates in downtown Winnipeg. We could have a long conversation about Place Promenade and Martin Bergen's buildings, but we will do that next week, next Tuesday morning.

There is the broader issue of the appropriateness of any housing at any time in that jewel. Now, I am interested in knowing the Minister's view and the view of the Government, not on the appropriateness today, but the appropriateness at any time to use

that land for a housing development. Could the Minister let us know?

Mr. Ducharme: What we are doing is we will live by the mandate that housing could be placed in that area. As you can probably appreciate, I think some type of housing is very important because you are bringing people down to the site. You do want a mixture of activity, and I am not saying an abundance, when you are talking about housing to take over a very large park-like setting that is very important to this city.

People are starting to tell us now that maybe their views on what The Forks was originally intended—they are starting to tell us that they would like to see The Forks remain a slow type of growth with park-like setting. I think that this is very important. The Forks has been very successful. It is a beautiful site. We are not going to have these type of acres available to the City of Winnipeg again.

* (1220)

I know when Mr. Diakiw, myself, and the mayor first went down to Ottawa in 1984 to try to get the transfer of the lands over, we saw the opportunity of a very large acreage.

To the Member himself, to ask whether there is a concept of whether any type of housing, I would say that I would not close the door on housing of some type, however someone is going to have to convince this Minister, if he is the shareholder at the time, that housing will benefit the site. I would not want to see a highrise North of Portage type of housing on this site. It would have to be a housing site that has been done throughout the world adjoining these type of acreages. There is a concept that you do need people to be on the site permanently, which we do lack at this time.

Mr. Carr: Well, the Minister has argued both points equally successfully so I am not just quite sure what side he is on. He is arguing that you need housing, because you have to bring people to the site, and at the same time he is arguing that the people of Winnipeg have expressed their view that they want The Forks to remain a park-like setting. Well, it is not a park-like setting if you develop housing. It will, therefore, require a decision of policy on behalf of all three shareholders whether or not there will be any housing development.

Let me just press the Minister a little further. Assuming his first argument and not his second, that housing may be appropriate given the settling of

vacancy rates, et cetera, what kind of housing does the Minister believe is appropriate? Is it subsidized housing? Is it condominiums for the rich? Just exactly what does he have in mind?

Mr. Ducharme: I say to the Member he is absolutely wrong when he says that housing cannot be part of a park-like setting. We have that situation through parts of the city of Winnipeg now. So for him to say that housing would absolutely ruin a park-like setting—

Mr. Carr: I did not say that, Gerry.

Mr. Ducharme: Well, you have just said it. However, I must say to the Member that the chairman has addressed that we would not be looking at housing at this particular time. When the board through its committees come forward with their ideas on what type of housing should be there, then we will look at what type of housing is for that site. I am saying to the Member right now, with the vacancy rates that we have in the city of Winnipeg, we cannot in this immediate future look at housing. The Forks itself is having a hard time carrying itself now, and you would not want to put some type of housing that is going to put another strain on The Forks.

Mr. Carr: Does that mean that any housing built would not be revenue generating? Does that mean that the kind of housing the Minister contemplates would be subsidized housing? I wish he would answer the question, just what kind of housing does he feel is appropriate? Not now, so that we do not get entangled into a discussion of current economic conditions, but conceptually for the site, what is the Minister's view? What kind of housing does he believe to be appropriate?

Mr. Ducharme: The Member has mentioned subsidized housing and regular housing. What is the difference in the structure? If a person is in subsidized housing or they are in private housing, that has no concept in regard to what should be on the site. I mean, are you starting to tell me there is a designation now between subsidized housing and regular housing?

Mr. Carr: I am not telling you anything. I am asking you a question.

Mr. Ducharme: I said to the Member that we will get to all aspects when they come forward with their recommendations.

Mr. Carr: I know the Member for Transcona (Mr. Reid) wants to ask several questions, so I will finish

off by asking some detailed questions on the financial statement, and then I will bow out.

It looks as if expenses between 1989 and 1990 on the salary and benefits side increased by some \$110,000 from \$447,610 in '89 to \$557,158 in 1990. Could we have an explanation for that rather dramatic increase?

Mr. Diakiw: Very briefly, the increase revolves around two things. My coming on for half a year, my salary for half a year, plus the fact that we started our communications in programming. We brought in a communications person and an assistant to deal with the programming that I talked about earlier. Those were two additions to the staff.

Mr. Carr: Mr. Diakiw says his salary for half a year. Surely his salary for half a year is not \$110,000.00. You are saying that in addition to your half time, there were others—

Mr. Diakiw: Yes, in addition to my coming on, there was my half year's salary plus the addition of two people accounts for the difference.

Mr. Carr: The general and office expenses also rose by quite a dramatic percentage. Can the president tell us why?

Mr. Diakiw: Some of the increase is attributed to insurance. As we develop our buildings, our insurance costs go up pretty dramatically, and some of it was just miscellaneous increases with a full year and some were related to travel increases. The chairman and I went to Rotterdam to look at a leisure centre. Mind you, I do not think your—no, I am sorry, my costs were included in that.

Mr. MacLean: I went, but I did not go at the cost of—

Mr. Carr: I would just like to close my own participation in this morning's meeting by thanking Mr. Diakiw and Mr. MacLean sincerely for making the trip. It was worth it. There must be a degree of comfort among Members of the Legislature that provincial tax monies are being well-spent, and we must have the opportunity to assure ourselves through sometimes close questioning. It is a good precedent. The Government has done the right thing.

I am particularly pleased that the chairman has pledged to make public the Letters of Intent with the three public corporations and to pursue the matter with the private corporation, because it is vital that taxpayers have the full light of day on the way their monies are being spent. I enjoyed this morning very

much. I think it added to the process of public accountability, and I look forward to the next time that the Members of The Forks Renewal Corporation come in front of the legislative committee. Thank you.

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): It has been very informative here this morning to hear some of the comments that have been made concerning The Forks development, and I look forward to the future of this when we move towards Phase II. This particular site has always been transportation orientated. If you look at the river system as highways of transportation, and of course for the last 70 or 80 years, as was indicated, rail lines have gone through this particular area.

My questions will deal with the transportation nature. The questions I have are specific in nature to deal with tourism into that area, and how we can attract people into that area to allow it to grow and expand. Of course, that is supposed to be the focal point of The Forks area. I am wondering what thoughts have been given to allowing, or to giving the Prairie Dog Central the opportunity to come into those areas to utilize that as a means to attract people to that area. I know also that the Prairie Dog Central is stored in the Transcona CN Yards area and must still go through the CN lines to get to its departure point in St. James. I am wondering if there has been any progress to try and utilize the Prairie Dog and its tourist attraction to bring people into The Forks area.

Mr. MacLean: Yes, of course, we felt the same. We can assure you we did everything possible to make sure that we could get the Prairie Dog Central through The Forks. It would be great. It would be ideal for us. We cannot. It is a steam engine they tell me, and there is no way the CN or the CP are going to allow us to cross the main line with any passengers on that train. It would be ideal if we could do it, but we were just told it was impossible, and we try to find other ways where maybe we could take the paddle boats somewhere else where they could meet it and join up so that we could use the Prairie Dog Central. It would be great, but we found it was impossible to do it. We would still liked to have been able to do it, we cannot.

Mr. Reid: It is interesting to note that one of the reasons given here was that the in-training of passengers was the problem. If you look at the particular station, the CN Union Station here in the city, passengers has been the focal point, and there

have been means to allow people access or egress to that particular area. We are also looking at that as a rapid transit proposal for the southwest corridor, and it is going to bring people into those areas. I do not think people is the problem here, and how they have access to The Forks. I think it may be another problem that we have not hit upon yet, and I would like to hear some more comments in that area from the people who are knowledgeable about this.

Mr. Diaklw: As the chairman had indicated, the Prairie Dog Central—this was before I came on board, but everything that I have seen indicates that the board and the administration tried to persuade the powers that be at the operating railways that we would like to see this happen, and it did not. One of the things as a result of that, the position we took was that you are right, the history of transportation is the history of the site. The paddlewheel boats—we have a provision for paddlewheel boats now. We have the riverboats at the site.

We decided that we would try and get elements of transportation onto the site, and if you have been at the market, you will see there are individual train cars. We got those from the City of Winnipeg. Those particular vehicles were on their way to Alberta to go into heritage villages where they were celebrating the history of transportation. We were not successful in approaching the railways to get those cars. We had to go to the City of Winnipeg, stop the process of the transfer of these vehicles, and we put them on the site.

One of the other things that we felt very strongly about was that we felt that the Countess of Dufferin should be brought to the site, because it is so much a part of the history of the site. It was unloaded when it came from the South, from St. Paul, it was unloaded at the site. We had actually designed rails in front of the market just on the North side of the market, we had designed a location to bring the Countess of Dufferin to put her at the site. We had actually talked about bringing it by barge and re-enacting the bringing of the Countess of Dufferin to the site. It would have been its 112th anniversary I believe last year, but we were not able to persuade the rail heritage people that was the right thing to do. They felt very strongly that they did not want to see the Countess exposed to the elements.

* (1230)

I grew up in the north end, and I crawled all over the Countess of Dufferin as a little kid, and it

survived me, and I was surprised that it could not survive the children now. -(interjection)- Well, it did not run then either. I think what you get in circumstances such as—I think it is important that you have a hands-on approach to these things. If you create static museums, I am not sure that is the right way to go. What I had envisioned was the Countess of Dufferin right adjacent to the market at that location with proper controls and safety, but I was not able to persuade the rail heritage people.

My very strong feeling is that they have through the years—when I was with the City of Winnipeg, they have talked of a rail museum for many years. In fact, in the city we had dedicated a piece of land to them across from the Wilkes reservoir, and they have not been able to develop the funding. My advice to them was that if we brought the Countess of Dufferin to the site, and if we allowed the people to see the Countess of Dufferin, that in the vehicles that are there, they could set up their offices, and they could develop a community support for what they are trying to accomplish, because that is what they lack. They lack the kind of community support that, let us say, the Children's Museum has. That was the approach I suggested, but their approach was that they did not want to subject it to the elements.

Subsequent to that, we have entered into a Letter of Intent on the steam plant building. Their indication is that if they can bring that project into place, the Countess of Dufferin will be brought in there, worked on and then put somewhere else on the site. They would recycle a number of the heritage locomotives through that building and have the public come and watch as they work on these vehicles, which I think would be a pretty exciting thing for people to see. It would be more of a hands-on kind of active celebration of that era.

Madam Chairman: I would like to draw the committee's attention to the time, but at the same time, I have had a request from the critic for the official Opposition to give a very brief summation, as well as the Honourable Minister. Is there leave to extend one minute, give each Member a 30 second summation? Agreed? So agreed.

Ms. Frlesen: Madam Chair, I just wanted, on behalf of the official Opposition, to thank Mr. MacLean, Mr. Diakiw, and the Minister for attending today, and

also to the staff for coming and sitting through a long presentation, to let you know that we appreciate it. I think the fact that we have run overtime—we still had material that we wanted to discuss on a number of issues—gives you an indication I think of how great the interest is in Forks matters.

I look forward to seeing you next year, and I think the things that we will be interested in looking at then are things that we have not discussed today. The multicultural centre, I think we are all interested in seeing some progress there. From our perspective particularly, we are looking for a very concrete and strong Native presence at The Forks, and we will be interested in discussing that with you. I think finally we are interested in much more extensive citizen participation and looking to long-term planning, which will eventually lead to citizen responsibility for The Forks.

Mr. Ducharme: I will just quickly thank the staff, and I guess we have seen today how successful The Forks has been. I thank the Board of Directors who have been serving and the many that have served in the first few years, along with the countless hours by the advisory groups that participate and make The Forks very successful.

The only thing I was surprised by today was that either Mr. Cam MacLean or Mr. Nick Diakiw did not take the opportunity to wish you all a good opportunity to visit The Forks on Christmas at The Forks, December 14. I thank you.

Mr. MacLean: I also want to suggest to each of the caucuses that our board is open at any time you would like to come and visit and ask questions. We are open to visit with you and keep you advised as to what is going on. There is no hidden agenda as far as we are concerned. We want to make sure that The Forks is successful.

I might say we have a real momentum going for us now. Although I realize we have to go slow, but let us not make it too slow, because we want to make sure that things get done and the momentum keeps up. We will advise you if anything is going to happen at The Forks. Thanks again for inviting us, and we appreciate it.

Madam Chairman: The time being past 12:30, committee rise.

COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 12:36 p.m.