

wrong and something has to be done about it. If it is a strictly local problem, they will get their neighbors together to see what can be done about it. If they see it as something they feel is beyond their control, they will bring it to the attention of someone they think can correct it. This is often their elected representative, i.e. they start using what is commonly called "political persuasion". This leads to the second stage.

2. At this time, people with special training or knowledge related to the problem are asked their opinions and advice on what can be done. This usually means a clarification and delineation of the problem which is by no means an easy task. However, with the aid of the local people with their knowledge of local conditions, the professional people with access to information on the broader aspects of the situation are better able to delineate the problem.
3. Having done this leads them to the third stage—suggesting solutions to the problem. Here again, these trained people have an advantage because of their access to information—*similar* problems may have existed before, and a solution found, and they know about it. So they have a ready-made policy to alleviate the problem. But do they? No, they don't. I emphasized earlier that similar problems may have existed, but seldom do the same social problems in the same form exist in different areas. We often fail to recognize the differences, and are therefore surprised when a policy that worked in one area does not work in another.
4. This leads us to the fourth stage in the formulation of development policies. It is the testing stage for solutions. Before a development policy, drafted by the so-called experts for any area, is implemented, it is imperative that it be "evaluated" or tested by at least key individuals in the area. They are the real experts on the local conditions.

These four stages that I have outlined are not in practice as clear-cut as my analysis would indicate. Nor are they carried out one stage at a time. Often parts of all four are going on simultaneously, but if there is to be a reasonable degree of success this process will occur. No doubt exceptions can be found, but in my opinion in such cases, it is due more to "good luck" than "good management".

I have stressed the importance of the involvement of local people in development programs, particularly in the early stages and what I called the testing stage of the planning. Let me remind you again that the people with specialized training and information are equally important. May I also point out that even when all the available facts are assembled, there are many unfilled gaps. The most significant gaps in our knowledge today are facts about our human resources, and the inter-relationship of these facts.

In spite of this lack of information, programs and policies are being and will continue to be developed on the basis of the best information available. Because the best available is sometimes not good enough, mistakes will be made, but it is better to make a few mistakes than to do nothing.

During recent years, we have been hearing more and more about the so-called problem areas of Manitoba. Recognition that problem areas exist in Manitoba, as well as other parts of Canada, dates back to a good deal farther than the last few years, but the problem in the last three or four years has become a little more clearly defined. This identification has led to the passing of the "ARDA" legislation, as well as other policies. However, a greater clarification is certainly needed. The primary, although not exclusive, intent of this legislation is to try to do something about these "problem areas" of Canada. It has been my good fortune to have had the opportunity in the two and a half years since I came back to Canada to spend a considerable amount of time in one