

## Order Paper Questions

(c) Fiscal Year	Car shipments from interior terminals 1959-60 to 1975-76					
	Calgary	Edmonton	Lethbridge	Moose Jaw	Saskatoon	Total
1959-60	1,861	1,500	145	61	1,191	4,758
1960-61	1,053	1,161	274	830	2,256	5,574
1961-62	1,039	772	140	1,123	1,814	4,888
1962-63	1,241	697	217	117	958	3,230
1963-64	698	320	9	1,536	1,225	3,788
1964-65	814	1,775	236	53	481	3,359
1965-66	1,752	1,320	584	135	844	4,635
1966-67	798	506	24	289	93	1,710
1967-68	841	216	64	76	673	1,870
1968-69	2,442	1,819	502	3,265	3,097	11,125
1969-70	861	511	74	282	541	2,269
1970-71	1,159	1,246	79	1,739	1,706	5,929
1971-72	1,678	1,749	404	726	1,514	6,071
1972-73	1,528	1,504	54	1,995	2,303	7,384
1973-74	406	1,623	1,845	810	3,604	8,288
1974-75	1,150	1,876	1,587	2,713	3,062	10,388
1975-76	781	1,969	171	1,020	3,522	7,463
Total	20,102	20,564	6,409	16,770	28,884	92,729

The destinations were not separately identified, however, as the grain was cleaned to export standards, they were shipped to either Vancouver, Thunder Bay or Churchill.

2. Canadian Government Elevators—Unit Trains Shipped: Moose Jaw, 7; Saskatoon, 20; Calgary, 8; Edmonton, 14; Lethbridge, 40; Prince Rupert, Nil.

3. No.

## INDIAN BANDS—PROGRAMME BUDGET

## Question No. 1,823—Mr. Smith:

Does the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development have a policy whereby Indian bands that choose to operate certain programmes for themselves must do so within the budget allotted when the programme was administered by the Department?

**Hon. Warren Allmand (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** No. However, the transfer of programs to Band Councils must be within the limits of the assigned budget. Occasionally new money has been received for such things as band core funding, band work programs and band administration cost. Budget increases have also been granted to cover price and volume increases and we have been able to make some budget adjustments by dropping other low priority activities. Nevertheless, the impact of budget ceilings has effectively placed a limit on the extent to which bands can be given more money for an activity than was available to the department when it managed the same activity.

## CHURCHILL-NELSON RIVER DIVERSION PROJECT

## Question No. 1,825—Mr. Smith:

1. Will funds be made available to the Northern Flood Committee in Manitoba so that they can continue their negotiations regarding the Churchill-Nelson River Diversion Project and, if so, will the Committee receive a guarantee that adequate funds will continue to be provided until their task is achieved?

2. On what date can the Committee expect an official response from the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development regarding the proposal submitted on September 18, 1976?

**Mr. B. Keith Penner (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** 1. Approximately \$1.5 million have been made available to the Northern Flood Committee from the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to enable the committee to develop and negotiate its claim regarding the Churchill-Nelson River Diversion Project. Adequate funding will be continued as long as meaningful negotiations exist between the parties concerned.

2. The Northern Flood Committee completed an extensive set of proposals for consideration by the mediator and the other parties in seeking an agreement on compensation, remedies, alternatives and mitigation measures for the five communities represented by the committee. The proposals were in response to the current and forecasted impacts of the Churchill-Nelson River Diversion and Lake Winnipeg Regulation projects. Those proposals were submitted to Mr. Leon Mitchell, the mediator in these negotiations, in mid-September with copies distributed to the Province of Manitoba, Manitoba