

MEMO: TO JOHN

FROM: ANN

RE: REED PROPOSAL

DATED: April 15/77

As you are aware, I met with John Laskin on Monday, April 11th

He was generally in accord with your suggestions and said that he would be meeting with Hartt to redraft the terms of reference.

The following are his comments to your proposals:

With respect to your comment #1, John indicated that Hartt definitely intends to cover northern development of resources. He stated he would suggest that it be explicitly set out ~~x~~ in ~~the~~ the proposal.

#2, John also agreed that the public hearings would be held mainly in the north. ~~They~~ There would definitely be television coverage and translation into the native dialects. I think they have already arranged for the channel 19 on cable to cover the hearings.

#3. Your comment with respect to paragraph 1(c) was appreciated and he indicated that he would definitely attempt to have the word "use" changed in accordance with your *suggestions*.

#4. John thought that your suggestion on paragraph 1(d) was a very good one and that they had not really considered the intangible costs however, obviously, it was a very important element and should not be left out.

#5. John indicated that paragraph 3 on page 6 was only placed for "window dressing" and it ^{would} does not in any way affect the rate at which the

would
hearings ~~will~~ be held. Mr. Justice Hartt intends to have a thorough review of northern development, not simply the Reed proposal. *He* Agreed that there was no urgency and stressed that this was merely *an addition to appease government people.*

#6. John agreed that it would be a good idea to have proponents of undertakings pay for a portion of the funding of *the* intervenors. He suggested that in this case, however, there was no proponent, since the hearing will cover the entire question of northern development not simply the Reed proposal. *A* later hearing is scheduled to be held on the Reed proposal.

#6. It was indicated to me that the wording the number of *paid* employees who will be participating did not in any way limit the funds that would be given to groups with paid employees. In other words, the fact that employees were paid by the intervening groups would not mean that these groups would not receive funding. John also indicated that should we wish to participate, we would definately receive the funding.