

[Chairman: Mr. Schumacher]

[5:33 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the committee come to order, please? I see a quorum.

I'd like to act with as much dispatch as we can this evening in view of an important event that starts at 6 p.m., I understand.

We're here to deal with Bills Pr. 8 and Pr. 9, both under the petition of the city of Edmonton. I'd like to welcome Mr. Walker and the witnesses with him. I'll ask the Parliamentary Counsel to give us the report on Bill Pr. 8.

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, this is my report on Bill Pr. 8, Edmonton Economic Development Authority Amendment Act, 1987, pursuant to Standing Order 99. The purpose of this Bill is to change the membership of the authority. There is no model Bill on this subject, and the Bill does not contain any powers which I consider to be unusual.

Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to mention to the committee that the Bill was readvertised because during the examination stage the city asked for some changes to the Bill which took it rather beyond the purpose of the original advertisement, and that has been done completely. If I may, I'd also just point out there is a typographical error in section 2 of the Bill. The new proposed section 5(c) refers to "one electorate appointed by the Edmonton". It should read "by the Counsel". Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: "By the Counsel"?

MR. M. CLEGG: Yes, the Counsel is a defined term.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, okay. Mr. Wright, before we proceed with the . . .

MR. WRIGHT: I always look at the ranking Parliamentary Counsel gives the Bill at the outset. I have the one for the convention authority Act, but what was the ranking for the Edmonton Economic Development Authority Amendment Act?

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, they were both the same.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll ask counsel to now administer the oath to the witnesses involved with the matters this evening.

[Messrs. Allcock and LeClerc were sworn in]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Walker, if you'd like to make some introductory remarks concerning Bill Pr. 8, we're at your service.

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Edmonton Economic Development Authority Act was passed in 1982. Since then there has been one amendment that is not very serious. I think the time has simply come to make some changes for the better administration of the authority itself. You'll note that the Bill changes the composition somewhat. The net effect is that there would now be 12 members whereas before there were 10 members, and these members would represent a slightly different configuration than before. In particular, four members would represent the South Edmonton Business Association, the East Edmonton Business Association, the West Edmonton Business Association, and the Downtown Business Association, and the Chamber of Commerce also has a greater

input into the composition of this board than before.

Now, the request for the private Bill amending the Edmonton Economic Development Authority Act was submitted jointly by the president of the Chamber of Commerce, Dr. Brooker, and the chairman of the Edmonton Economic Development Authority, Mr. Snyder, and was approved in a somewhat amended form, although not significantly amended, by city council. The certified copy of the resolution approving this amendment and authorizing me to be here I have filed with the Parliamentary Counsel, Mr. Chairman. I think I would just simply point out that in the opinion of the city of Edmonton council and the Edmonton Economic Development Authority, the proposed changes to the Act are believed to be in the best interests of Albertans residing in the Edmonton region, and we would request this committee to please recommend passage of the Bill in its amended form as before you.

Thank you, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you now like to introduce any evidence in support of the Bill before I ask members to . . .

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, it was not our intention to call any evidence at this point, but Mr. Allcock is here. He is the general manager of the authority and would be pleased to answer questions of the members, or I would be as well, if I may.

DR. WEST: You had said 12. It will increase to 14 actually?

MR. WALKER: Your arithmetic is undoubtedly better than mine.

DR. WEST: That would increase the total membership of the authority to as high as 14.

MR. ALLCOCK: Mr. Chairman, if I might answer. The current membership is 10. The proposal takes it to a minimum of 12 and a maximum of 16. The four are the four business associations which Mr. Walker mentioned, which are an optional-type arrangement.

DR. WEST: With that makeup, going from 10 to 16 at the maximum, would there be any consideration by any outside parties that this committee could be polarized by the city by their appointments?

MR. ALLCOCK: Mr. Chairman, it's generally felt that by expanding the membership and broadening the base of it, there would be a better representation than now exists on the authority.

DR. WEST: But city council gets to appoint a greater majority of these by their . . .

MR. ALLCOCK: City council, in consultation. All members of the authority get appointed in consultation with city council. However, there is a broader base in Chamber of Commerce representation, business association representation, as well as four directly elected by council, but they are nonmembers of council. There would only be two members of city council formally appointed to the authority.

MR. MUSGREAVE: I'd just like to ask a few quick questions. What kind of support did the Bill get in council? Was it

unanimous?

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, unfortunately I don't have the vote on that. It was obviously a majority that passed it, but I don't recall exactly who voted for and who voted against.

MR. MUSGREAVE: I didn't want the names; I just wanted to know the numbers. The other question I had -- Mr. Allcock said it would be better representation. My question is: better representation by who or of who?

MR. ALLCOCK: Mr. Chairman, it is felt to be better representation of the entire business community; number one, because the Chamber of Commerce, who currently have only one recommended nominee on the authority, would now have the opportunity to recommend five, and they certainly are a broad cross-representation of the business community. In addition to that, the business or commercial sector, through the business associations, would now be eligible to have four members on the authority, which previously they did not.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, that brings up my next question. Under 5(b) it's "5 electors appointed by Council in consultation with the Edmonton Chamber of Commerce." Does council in effect have a veto? If they don't like the nominees of the chamber, they don't appoint them?

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, your counsel is nodding yes, and I agree. Yes, they would, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Then likewise the same thing could happen with 5(e)?

MR. WALKER: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jonson.

MR. JONSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps I should know this, but is the funding and support for the Economic Development Authority totally provided by the city of Edmonton?

MR. ALLCOCK: Mr. Chairman, yes, it is.

MR. JONSON: Is it correct that although these people are appointed in consultation with the Chamber of Commerce and with the business organizations, they need not be a member of those organizations?

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, that is correct as well.

MR. JONSON: Third question. I'm sorry; am I allowed that many questions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Carry on.

MR. JONSON: The third question would be: would it be possible to, say, appoint two of the five under the Chamber of Commerce heading without those names being acceptable to the Chamber of Commerce?

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, the answer is yes, it would be possible. The obligation is to consult.

MR. JONSON: In essence, what this Bill does, Mr. Chairman, if I could make one more summary statement -- that is, the city council can appoint whoever they want to the Economic Development Authority.

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, the answer to that is correct, provided that the appointments are done in consultation with the Chamber of Commerce and the four business organizations named and the Edmonton and District Labour Council. I might point out, however, that the hon. member's question presupposes a very theoretical set of facts, and in practice it would be most unlikely that the input from these groups would be totally ignored and not taken seriously by council.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Gibeault.

MR. GIBEAULT: Yes, a couple of questions, Mr. Chairman. In section 5(a) it says "4 electors appointed by the council, none of whom shall be a member of the Council." Does the city have any idea as to who those people might be? Would they be representative appointments in some way, or is it just anyone at all?

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, I believe these would be members at large, if you will. I don't believe there is any plan afoot at the present moment to have them represent certain interest groups within the city.

MR. GIBEAULT: A supplementary question then. I'm just looking at the makeup here. Now, we're proposing to increase it from 10 to up to 16 and we have five that are going to come from the Chamber of Commerce, plus four that represent the different business organizations in the city is nine, plus the other four unknown factors. Then on the other side we have only one representative from the Edmonton and District Labour Council. I wonder what is the city's thinking there. That doesn't sound to me like much of a balance.

MR. ALLCOCK: Mr. Chairman, it doesn't preclude other members, the four other elected members appointed by city council, from being labour representatives nor from the Chamber of Commerce. But we have specifically included one to ensure that that representation is at least at the minimum. But there's certainly an opportunity to have more labour representation through the other categories.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sigurdson.

MR. SIGURDSON: That's fine, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Gibeault addressed my concern.

MR. ADY: I guess I just need some things to be clarified, and part of it's been covered. But just so I for sure understand it, under 5(b) "5 electors appointed by Council in consultation with the Edmonton Chamber of Commerce" -- but in actual fact the Chamber of Commerce may or may not have a voice in it, because council has the last word. Then we move down to 5(e) and four more to be "appointed by Council in consultation with" these four groups on the back page. But again, they're not necessarily going to be drawn from those four associations. Is that just window dressing there on the back page, that those people are even involved? I mean, council has the right to override and just appoint whoever they please, it would appear. Am I right?

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ady's question can perhaps be divided into two. First, the issue of consulting with groups and not appointing from those groups themselves allows for greater flexibility, of course. If a person is suitable and acceptable to the Downtown Business Association but not a member of the Downtown Business Association, that allows a bigger pool of people to draw from than simply a member of the Downtown Business Association.

In terms of the other half of the hon. member's question, about council overriding the wishes of the constituent groups mentioned in section 5, it's certainly true that it can, and I suppose that a council could window dress and go through the motions. As I mentioned earlier, in practice there are certain political realities that make that relatively improbable, and that, although not a legal constraint, does create a certain very practical constraint on them.

MR. ADY: I'm sure there are some political realities. Thank you.

MR. MUSGREAVE: I just want to ask who finances the Edmonton Development Authority.

AN HON. MEMBER: The city of Edmonton.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Okay, the next question I have, Mr. Chairman, is under 5(c). It seems to me there's a misprint or something there. Is there not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I've pointed it out. Mr. Day.

MR. DAY: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Who was asking for the increase in the size of council? Was it the authority itself or was it city council or the business community?

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, the original increase was asked for by the Chamber of Commerce. It was then agreed to by the Edmonton Economic Development Authority. Subsequently, the Chamber of Commerce asked for yet a bigger increase, following some consultation with local businessmen in the city, and that was ultimately acceded to by the city of Edmonton council.

MR. DAY: Was that presupposing that the workload on the existing council was too much and they wanted to increase it or spread it around?

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, the workload was assumed by the members of the authority, not by city council, and the effect of the increase in the board was to expand the base of support and community input into the authority itself.

MR. DAY: The last question, Mr. Chairman. With a possible increase of 60 percent in terms of the size of the authority, is there an anticipated proportional increase in budget?

MR. ALLCOCK: Mr. Chairman, none is anticipated in that proportion.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Walker, just to go back -- and I think this is a reinforcement really -- the amendments were

developed at the request of the Chamber of Commerce in consultation with the Chamber of Commerce and agreed to by city council. That is, the Chamber of Commerce agrees with all of these amendments. Is that correct?

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, Alderman Hewes, the Chamber of Commerce...

AN HON. MEMBER: Not any more.

MR. WALKER: Freudian slip. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Hewes, the ball was put in motion by the Chamber of Commerce. There's no question. I want to make very clear, however, that at one point in time, and I believe it was approximately February 1987, it became a joint request of the authority and the Chamber of Commerce. Subsequently, the Chamber of Commerce had further input into it, and ultimately city council passed the final resolution. This was done in consultation with the chamber and the authority along the way.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Walker, thank you. So all parties who are mentioned here are in support of this amendment. Would that be correct?

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, Alderman Hewes, I believe the correspondence with the Chamber of Commerce would obviously indicate their support, as it was their request. Perhaps Mr. Allcock could speak for the authority.

MR. ALLCOCK: Mr. Chairman, the entire process was initiated originally by the Chamber of Commerce, but throughout its progress it was done as a joint effort with the authority chairman and the authority members. Particularly, the four business associations were a result of a joint meeting between the chamber, the authority, and those business associations. So it has been a consultative process from the beginning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. One other question. Mr. Walker, would you be kind enough to describe to this committee how the city of Edmonton advertises for citizens who might be interested in sitting on any such committee and how those appointments are made? That's in reference to 5(a).

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Hewes, I can't give you the details. I believe that the city clerk's office annually advertises in the local newspapers for people to submit their names to sit on various boards affiliated with the city of Edmonton, following which a committee of council reviews and makes recommendations for these appointments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And those recommendations are to the full council?

MR. WALKER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clegg.

MR. G. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, without showing my ignorance, I don't understand why this Bill was ever brought forward, whenever it was. It was amended in 1982. Now, if I'm understanding everything correctly, this is the city of Edmonton, and certainly they have the authority to appoint anybody to a

board and get the Chamber of Commerce involved in it. Without getting into a lot of details, what was really the reason for this Bill in the first place?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I suppose it increases the size of the board.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's not the original Bill.

MR. G. CLEGG: The original Bill: what was the reason for it? Because the city of Edmonton can in fact have anybody on any committee they want, and under the municipal Act they can pay for them. And they basically have control of this board. So I just want the basics; I don't want any . . . The hockey game is going to be on pretty soon, so I don't want long detail, but what was the purpose of the original Bill?

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, I assume the hon. member is asking me not to use any legalese in answering. The original Bill was the result of a task force that was set up by the city of Edmonton in consultation with the business community. I believe that the fundamental principle behind this authority, as well as the other four authorities that have been created by this Legislature, is to grant a greater degree of autonomy and independence to the volunteer community in Edmonton in certain areas where the volunteer community does a lot of work. Even though it might on the surface appear that city council is still pulling the strings, in actual fact the work is being done by a board of directors who preside over an independent corporation which has a certain degree of control by the city in terms of money, et cetera. But it's still much different from a committee or department of the city, which is under the day-to-day control of city council. This is not.

MR. G. CLEGG: Just a quick supplementary. I'm certainly not here to question how important the Chamber of Commerce or different groups are, because I happened to be in local government myself for 19 years and I know. Being on municipal government, we did appoint many of these boards, and certainly they do fine work and a lot of the decisions made by those kind of people are very good decisions. I'm not questioning that a bit. But why couldn't they, as the city of Edmonton, say to the chambers, or whoever, and all these groups in the back, "Okay, you appoint members and work." I haven't really got my answer, and I don't want to prolong it, but why the Bill?

MR. WALKER: All right. Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member. They certainly could have chosen to go that route, and in actual practice, for years the city had a business development department. But it was felt that a greater degree of autonomy and independence would be necessary. For example, the hiring and firing of the employees and the officers of the authority takes place at the authority level, by the board of directors, not at the city council level. It just simply provides a greater degree of independence than had it remained as a city department. In addition, it allows for greater power than were it simply a committee making recommendations to city council. The powers that are given in the original Bill create a corporation with quite a number of things that it could do without having to have city council give its blessing.

MR. G. CLEGG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clegg at the Table would like to supplement that briefly.

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman I would like to add maybe an explanation that whereas the city has the power to set up departments, boards, and commissions, which are internal and under its control, under the Municipal Government Act it does not have the power to create an independent corporation, which this is. And that is the reason why they had to come to the Legislature for a private Act to create that. They did not have the power it to do it themselves.

MR. G. CLEGG: Well, brother, if you wouldn't have talked, I wouldn't have had another question. But that is my question: why did they have to send it out? I know the rules. But that's why I asked the question originally. Why did they have to go this way? Because once they did it, then they have to do it your way.

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, they had to come to the Legislature to create the authority in the first place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If they wanted an independent authority.

MR. G. CLEGG: Well, my question is: why did they want an independent authority? Why couldn't they do it under the municipal Act with the same results?

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member. Quite frankly, as has already been said, there are certain things that could not be done under the Municipal Government Act. And secondly, the members of the business community that were on the task force that studied the issue felt that it was in their best interest and the best interest of their constituent groups that there be an independent authority, and we simply gave them what they wanted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Musgrove.

MR. MUSGROVE: My question has been answered, thanks, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WRIGHT: Are these all volunteers?

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, all the members of the authority are volunteers, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As those are all the questions, we'll move from Bill Pr. 8 to Bill Pr. 9. Thank you, members.

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, this is my report on Bill Pr. 9, Edmonton Convention and Tourism Authority Amendment Act, 1987, pursuant to Standing Order 99. The purpose of this Bill is to change the membership of this authority. There's no model Bill on this subject, and the Bill does not contain any powers which I consider to be unusual.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Walker, if you'd like to explain the proposed amendment.

MR. WALKER: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Edmonton Convention and Tourism Authority, commonly called Edmonton Tourism, again was created as a separate authority or

corporation in May 1982 by a private Bill. At that time, the total composition of its board was 16 people. In January 1987 the chairman of the Edmonton tourism authority approached the city and asked the city to sponsor a private Bill in this Legislature to do a number of things. Basically, the Bill will increase the size of the board from 16 to 21, for a net increase of five members, and secondly, it will do away with the reference in the original Act to the special events committee of the city, which no longer exists. I believe the policy behind the authority making this request was that it was found that it would create a greater representation, a greater group of people, a larger group of people to do the work of promoting tourism for the Edmonton region.

Again, I filed the motion of city council approving this Bill and asking us to be here, dated March 25, with Parliamentary Counsel. Once again, we believe that the city of Edmonton and the authority itself find that it would be in the best interests of the citizens, the Albertans in the Edmonton region, to have this Bill passed and would ask for your assistance in making that recommendation.

Mr. Leo LeClerc is a member of the board of directors of the authority, and he is with me tonight and will be able to help answer any of your questions, I'm sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jonson.

MR. JONSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The format of this Bill is a little different from the first one, in that those on the authority are appointed by the various organizations. Is there a resolution on file from the tourism authority supporting this amendment?

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member. I have not filed a resolution to that effect. We have a member of the authority itself here to give evidence as to their concurrence. I have in addition a letter which I could file from the chairman of the authority asking for this Bill, if you so wish.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Chairman, could I ask Mr. LeClerc then: was there a motion passed by the authority requesting this change or approving it?

MR. LeCLERC: Mr. Chairman and hon. member, the motion passed by the authority simply stated that the authority wished to have an additional five members to better represent the travel industry. The motion went no further and did not add any codicils to that simple statement, and that's what triggered the approach to the city and subsequently the meeting here.

MR. JONSON: One final question then. In these discussions, Mr. Chairman, was there any consideration of the existing organizations' increasing their membership or some additional appropriate organization providing members, as opposed to city council doing it all?

MR. LeCLERC: Mr. Chairman, if I understand the question, you were asking whether we couldn't have simply asked for additional representation from each of the organizations.

MR. JONSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, or as an alternative, perhaps there are some other interest groups in this industry.

MR. LeCLERC: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member. That's exactly what the authority was concerned about: trying to obtain as much representation as possible from whatever groups

there were over and above the original ones. The way this authority operated is somewhat different from the others that the city of Edmonton has, in that the members are appointed by these organizations. They form the core of the group. City hall then appoints three people, including the mayor, that also are part of the core group, and the core group to this point then nominated whatever other representation they felt necessary and elected five. What the authority wished was to increase that five to 10 to give the authority better cross-section representation.

What this Bill would do as presently worded: it would do that; it would give better representation. It would also provide the city of Edmonton with, in effect if they wished, eight representatives that they influence as opposed to the three they have now.

MR. JONSON: Finally, my standard question. The cost of this authority, Mr. Chairman: is it underwritten entirely by the city of Edmonton?

MR. LeCLERC: If I may, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member. Absolutely not. No, sir. The moneys devoted, invested in tourism by the city of Edmonton are barely 50 percent of what is expended by Edmonton Tourism.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Where does the rest come from, Mr. LeClerc?

MR. LeCLERC: The rest comes from our members, of course. We have approaching 400 annually who are bona fide members of the association. We continue to try to increase them. It also comes from various partnership modes. We go into a variety of types of promotions where we attempt to get partners of various kinds, and we attempt to provide seed money and increase the impact of the promotion through partners of various kinds. The partners may be airlines; they may be hotels; they may be tour organizers. They may be all sorts of various people who are interested in bringing visitors into Edmonton. So, unlike the other authorities, this authority could in effect operate not nearly as well, but it could survive without city hall's investment in tourism. If we did that, we'd fall forward on our swords, of course, in anguish, but we could survive.

MR. MUSGROVE: Is there any provincial money that goes into this funding?

MR. LeCLERC: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member, no. No direct provincial funds go in. The only provincial involvement, of course, is where we can tap into programs that the hon. Mr. Fjordbotten has in his department that are available to all groups in Alberta, and we do tap into those occasionally. But there is no direct funding from the province of Alberta to this authority.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Do I gather, then, Mr. LeClerc, that there is a weakening of the control by the tourist industry if this Bill goes through?

MR. LeCLERC: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member. Could I plead the Fifth Amendment to that question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further questions, hon. members?

MR. MUSGREAVE: You've answered it.

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, to Mr. LeClerc. What's the mandate of the Edmonton Convention and Tourism Authority?

MR. LeCLERC: Mr. Chairman, hon. member, I could read you several paragraphs. It's not necessary. The mandate is to do everything possible to put the Edmonton region forward as a destination for all types of visitors, be they families, private visitors, rubber-tire traffic, conventions, business conferences, boards of directors' meetings, sales meetings, whatever. Anything that can be done to bring visitors into the region is our mandate.

MR. DAY: And how does the authority feel that the additional five members, who would not necessarily be from tourism-related industry, could enhance that mandate?

MR. LeCLERC: Mr. Chairman, hon. members, an excellent question, because you know all these volunteer groups do run into one problem. You do everything possible to get work done by the volunteers to avoid paying for services that you would otherwise have to. In other words, we would prefer not to have to hire expensive lawyers. We would prefer to be able to have a lawyer on the board who would do legal work if we needed it and so forth. We would like to have an accountant on the board. We'd like to have people with special expertise. When you start looking at doing that, you quickly use up your current number of directors.

Also, the kind of people, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Member, that we'd like to get on these boards are very high-profile people who are extremely busy. They travel a lot, and they are not here all the time. So when you set up your various task forces and your committees and so on, if you don't have some extra manpower and womanpower on these committees, you end up with a seven-person committee being a two- or three-person committee. Therefore, the additional directors are quite important that way. You must also remember that you can get all sorts of people that volunteer, and out of any group of whatever number, you will be disappointed in one, two, or three inevitably, and by having some additional ones, we tend to muffle our disappointment a little bit with more manpower.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. West.

DR. WEST: Yes. Is the mayor a member of this committee at the present time?

MR. LeCLERC: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member. Yes, sir, he is.

DR. WEST: And entrenching him in (k) -- oh, that is there now. Is that correct? That's not being changed.

MR. LeCLERC: No.

MR. MUSGREAVE: I just wanted to get back to Mr. LeClerc because he and I were on a transportation panel one day. I just wanted to ask you a question. I think you would agree with me, Mr. LeClerc, that the Fifth Amendment doesn't apply in Canada.

MR. LeCLERC: It does not apply. You want me to answer the question; is that it?

MR. MUSGREAVE: That's okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jonson.

MR. JONSON: Just one other question, Mr. Chairman, and that is: I don't know if I've added up my numbers correctly, but it would seem to me that if the funding of the authority is about 50-50, with this amendment will we have about 50-50 representation on the authority?

MR. LeCLERC: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member. Complex questions that involve mathematics I always pass to the lawyers.

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member. That's absolutely true. The composition from the groups is eight at the present time. The actual city representation would be slightly better than eight. So it's more like 55-45.

MR. JONSON: It was the other way before.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I beg your pardon, Mr. Jonson?

MR. JONSON: It was the reverse before this amendment; is that correct?

MR. WALKER: Yes, that's correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there's no further -- Mr. Clegg.

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, I regret to have to point out an error in this Bill. In section 3 of the Bill, which provides a new section 5.1 to go in the Act, it says:

In making appointments under clause 5(k), the Council shall provide to the Authority a . . . opportunity to make suggestions . . .

That of course should read 5(j.1) not 5(k), because 5(k) is the mayor. Whatever suggestions were made there, we only have one mayor. I'll deal with that on the printing of the statute.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. West, did you have another question?

DR. WEST: We talk of tourism and this committee working in that vein. Would Northlands have any interest in such an organization as this?

MR. LeCLERC: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member. Yes. Northlands, as a matter of fact, appoints a representative. I don't know if that's still in here or not, but they have always appointed a representative to the board. At the moment it's Warren Holte, who's the head man for CFCW in Camrose. I haven't looked at the legalese of this. I don't know if that's been altered or not. I would hope that it hasn't been.

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member. The appointment from Edmonton Northlands would continue and has not been altered by the Bill before you.

DR. WEST: But their position would be diluted by the sheer numbers now?

MR. WALKER: True.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, if there's no further questions, I'll

thank you, Mr. Walker, and the witnesses for their attendance this afternoon.

I think I have one further piece of business. We've received a petition for a Bill to incorporate the Federal Canadian Trust and Bond Corporation. It's of course late, and we cannot proceed unless we have a motion to recommend that the requirements for filing by March 20 be waived.

AN HON. MEMBER: Will we have time to deal with it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We don't know whether we have time or not. There is no way of telling, because we don't know how long the session is going to go. We could well have time.

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, not wishing to take this committee's decision for granted but only to serve its convenience, the petitioners have in fact done their advertising. Well, it will be completed by next Monday. So that if we were to agree to hear them when their advertising is completed, then we would in fact have time to do so.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Chairman, may we know the nature of the Bill? Is it a complex Bill? Perhaps the Parliamentary Counsel can . . .

MR. M. CLEGG: It's a standard Bill in the form required by legislation to create a trust company. The Trust Companies Act specifies the exact form of the Bill, and it follows that form. It's a very short, standard model Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Hewes, you may remember that one of

the first Bills we dealt with last session was a trust company from Calgary, and this would be the same thing. And, of course, it's one of those situations where it can't operate either on our say-so; it has to meet the requirements of the superintendent of trust companies, like insurance companies.

MR. WRIGHT: On the notice point, it requires knowing when the Legislature is going to sit at some point, doesn't it? We don't know much in advance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, except that it was widely advertised that the time for filing petitions for private Bills expired on March 20. It think this is just a situation where the business -- probably the desire to incorporate this company arose after the time, and they're taking their chances. Even if we do waive the notice, it may not pass, depending on what we do, but they are undertaking this on the basis that they're taking their chances.

MR. ADY: What you're saying then is that we don't have an obligation if our time frame won't let us handle it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we can't handle it by the time we rise, then it will die, and they understand that. They're willing to take the chance.

Is there a motion that we -- Mr. Wright. All in favour, please raise your hands. Contrary? Carried.

I will now entertain a motion to adjourn, and I wish to . . . All in favour? Opposed? Thank you very much, members of the committee.

[The committee adjourned at 6:18 p.m.]

