

[Deputy Chairman: Mr. Musgreave]

[8:33 a.m.]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to call the meeting to order. We have enough people here to make a quorum, so we'll start.

The first item of business is Bill Pr. 12, the German-Canadian Cultural Association (Edmonton) Act. We have some people here presenting the petition, and the city of Edmonton are intervening. First of all, I would call on Mr. Clegg to give us a report on the Bill.

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, this is my report on Bill Pr. 12, the German-Canadian Cultural Association (Edmonton) Act, pursuant to Standing Order 99. The purpose of the Bill is to exempt certain lands owned by the association from municipal and school taxes. Although there are some precedents for exemptions for associations, it will be for the committee to determine on the facts whether the association falls within the same type of operation as those that have been granted exemptions.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clegg, would you swear in the witnesses please?

[Messrs. Walker, Szczechina, Traynor, and Wolter and Mrs. Fritz were sworn in]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we could call on Mr. Welz to make your presentation.

MR. WELZ: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, hon. members. I am not aware whether you have all been provided with a copy of the brief that we have presented. It is my intention this morning to read this particular brief into the record. It is my understanding that the witnesses will then be adopting the portions of the brief that are in fact factual.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Welz, if you'd prefer, you can sit down in the committee. It's up to you, as long as we can hear you.

MR. WELZ: On November 4, 1982, three Edmonton area German-Canadian ethnocultural associations executed a declaration of amalgamation to establish a new centre for the following purposes. The purposes were: to preserve and promote the heritage and culture of all persons of German language origin living in Edmonton and Alberta; to display the individual origins of German-speaking people that came to Alberta in the past, their accomplishments benefiting the province of Alberta and the people; dedicated to the preservation of the German language and the variety of people speaking German, their various life-styles, cultures, sports, and history; for the collection and storage/preservation of books, documents, pictures, and cloth, accessible to all interested parties; to actively promote and instruct the German language in educational courses to all interested parties; to provide facilities for the membership or meeting and social events on the official basis and leisure time gathering of individuals for relaxation and friendship. That will greatly assist in creating an environment for greater understanding in the ways and lives of people speaking German and people speaking other languages living in Alberta.

The terms of the declaration of amalgamation, which incidentally has been tabled with Mr. Clegg, were approved by the members of the three founding organizations, and the German-

Canadian Cultural Association (Edmonton) was incorporated under the Societies Act as a nonprofit organization on September 13, 1983. The three organizations which amalgamated to create the new association each have a proud tradition of serving the citizens of Edmonton.

The Edelweiss Club was the oldest of the three founding organizations and was incorporated by an Act of the Legislature which received Royal Assent on May 9, 1906. Prior to its formal incorporation the Edelweiss Club had existed as an active community organization and took an active part in the festivities associated with the proclamation of Alberta as a province. The other two founding organizations of the German-Canadian Cultural Association (Edmonton) were the Phoenix Club, which was founded on December 18, 1955, and the Friends of Berlin (Alberta Association), which was founded in 1963.

The founding organizations each owned their own club facilities, and their memberships agreed to amalgamate and transfer their assets to the new association. This was done for the express purpose of establishing a community centre for all interested community associations whose goals and objectives are similar to those of the three groups which executed the amalgamation agreement.

The bylaws of the association provide that the membership is open to any person of acceptable moral standards, 18 years of age and over, regardless of race, colour, creed, sex, religion, or nationality, who is willing to subscribe to the club's objectives and abide by the club's bylaws. An initiation fee of \$10 is levied, and the present membership is approximately 900 families -- that is, not individuals but families.

At the present time the association owns three separate properties. Two of these properties are located in the city of Edmonton, and the third is situated in the summer village of South View. The association is requesting tax exempt status in respect of their new community cultural centre at 8310 Roper Road, Edmonton, Alberta, which was opened on April 9, 1986. The centre is presently used for the provision of recreational, social, educational, and cultural activities to the members and the community at large. The association presently still owns the former Edelweiss clubhouse, which is situated at 9663-101 Avenue, Edmonton. This property has been leased, pending disposition. The third property is a 2.59-acre parcel which is adjacent to Lake Isle and is presently being utilized by the membership of the association and the summer village of South View as a community recreational facility.

The 1987 city of Edmonton levy against the new cultural centre is \$32,594.69. This figure includes the local improvement charges of \$8,692.42. The association is not seeking exemption from the payment of any local improvement taxes which may be levied pursuant to the provisions of part 4 of the Municipal Taxation Act. The association considers these charges as a part of the initial capital cost of the property and is consequently not seeking exemption from the payment of this portion of the tax levy. Insofar as that is concerned, I have been advised by Mr. Walker and Mr. Clegg that an amendment may be required in order to clearly outline in this Bill that we are not seeking exemption from this. The property is presently classified by the city as a nonresidential use, and it is listed as a "cultural community facility -- other."

The association presently generates part of its revenue by the imposition of an annual membership levy. In 1987 the membership levy was set at \$50 per family. The association has a private liquor licence and therefore generates revenue from the sale of alcoholic beverages and also from the operation of a restau-

rant facility on the premises. An additional source of revenue comes from the leasing of the facilities to their members for private functions such as weddings and banquets. This latter use of the facilities is an economic necessity in order to enable the association to meet its financial obligations, including the payment of such overhead items as insurance, utilities, and taxes. The association was not incorporated for the purpose of providing facilities to its members for private functions and is therefore presently applying for tax exempt status in order to reduce its dependence on this additional source of revenue.

The construction of the new community cultural centre was paid for primarily from a building fund which was established for this purpose and disposition of the former Friends of Berlin and Phoenix Club facilities in the city of Edmonton. Members of the community also donated considerable time and money towards the construction of the centre, and two grants totaling \$450,000 were received from the provincial government under the cultural component of the community recreation/cultural grant program, which is administered by Alberta Culture. This represents approximately one-third of the cash costs of the building to date and does not include the volunteer time that also went into the construction of the centre. We have also applied casino revenue towards the construction and improvement of the centre.

When the association applied to the parks and recreation advisory board of the city of Edmonton for the funding from Alberta Culture, they made a commitment that their facilities would be made available to the community at large. The association has honoured this commitment and has made its facilities available to various community organizations at little or no charge, including, inter alia, the following. The Swiss Men's Choir utilize the facilities for weekly choir practices and pay a nominal fee of \$12 per evening to assist in defraying the janitorial costs. The Edmonton Swiss Society has held their children's Christmas party at the centre at no charge. The Edmonton Opera Guild has on two occasions now presented an excellent program of songs and were provided with facilities gratis, notwithstanding the fact that they used them for their fund-raising purposes.

The German Theatre Montreal utilized the facilities at no cost to bring German theatre to Edmontonians; all admission receipts were retained by this touring theatre group. The German language department at the University of Alberta has presented seminars at the facilities, and the German language club of the University of Alberta is also provided with meeting facilities gratis. The German-Canadian Association of Alberta held their annual arts and crafts display at the centre this year. Edmonton Parks and Rec will be holding a series of workshops and seminars for their field staff at the facility in approximately two weeks' time, and a further series of workshops and seminars are planned for October of this year.

The German-Canadian Cultural Association was also established to support other German-Canadian community organizations and in order to achieve this goal has entered into affiliation agreements with a number of independent societies including, inter alia, the Male Choir Liederkrantz. They are provided with an area to conduct their weekly choir practices gratis and additionally are provided with the banquet facilities several times a year to conduct their socials. All income generated from these socials is retained by the choir to assist in covering their operating expenses. The Ladies Choir Wildrose: this choir is also provided with the facilities for their weekly practices and is entitled to host two socials at the centre annually. The Bavarian

Schuhplattlers: this performing folk dance group have constructed a special practice floor area at the centre in order to conduct their weekly practices. The German-Canadian Cultural Association (Edmonton) receives no revenue from their activities and has agreed to permit them to host an annual social at the centre from which the Schuhplattlers retain all of the income which is generated. The Blauen Funken Mardi-Gras Association: this carnival association has also entered into an agreement with the cultural association whereby the centre is made available to the organization for their four major socials at no charge.

In addition to the utilization of the centre by the aforementioned groups the association itself operates a number of programs which are open to all members of the public. These include a popular German film program during which German language films are presented every second week during the film season, which commences in September and concludes in March. No admission charge is levied to members of the public. Fitness and health programs are also conducted at the centre, and a small admission charge is levied to cover the cost of special professional instructors only. The association is presently establishing a library of German language books and publications, which will be accessible to all of the citizens of Edmonton. The association also promotes their own cultural arts and crafts displays and has a ladies' auxiliary whose bake sales and other activities support two children at Camp He-Ho-Ha. Locker room facilities are presently planned for the Soccer Club Alemania, and an office area has been made available for the German-Canadian Association of Alberta. This latter association is an umbrella association which serves member associations from Edmonton, Calgary, Red Deer, Lethbridge, and Grande Prairie.

The association wishes to expand its present programs and would like to accommodate further requests which they are receiving from the community. Due to the necessity of booking their facilities to their members for private functions in order to generate operating revenue, they are unable to accommodate many of these requests. The private functions by the members are booked many months in advance, and consequently the facilities are occasionally unavailable and requests from community groups must be declined. In terms of the time which would be made available, it has been estimated that there would be approximately 10 to 15 additional weekends available if the tax exemption relief were in fact granted.

The taxes are presently approximately 25 to 30 percent of the expenses that are incurred by the association and as such are a significant portion of the expenses which they do incur. The German-Canadian Cultural Association is not seeking a blanket exemption from taxation as they believe that the leasing of their facilities to one of their members for a private function is in fact a commercial use. The association does not object to paying taxes when the property is used for commercial purposes but wishes to minimize their reliance on this source of revenue. The purpose of the Bill is to establish the exemption from taxation for the facilities as long as the same are used for the provision of recreational, social, educational, and cultural facilities and to facilitate the long-range planning that is necessary for the attainment of the objectives of the association.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do members of the committee have questions? Edmonton Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Welz, to be clear

then, it seems to me as though you want taxes some days and not taxes others. Is that correct? I'm not sure how you would work this.

MR. WELZ: I believe that section 3(4) of the Municipal Taxation Act provides that if a facility is used for more than one particular purpose or one particular use, a portion of the use can be taxed and the remainder is not taxed. Essentially our position is that insofar as we are a closed club and the facilities are not used by the members of the public, we expect to pay taxes. Insofar as we are completely open to the public, we believe that this is a worthy endeavour -- it is in fact a community centre; it is used by members of the public -- and that it should not attract the payment of tax.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Chairman, can I just follow that? I'm not asking about the merits of it, Mr. Welz. I'm trying to establish -- it's not that you want part of the facility free of taxes; it's that you want all of the facility free of taxes some of the time. Is that correct?

MR. WELZ: Actually, the manner in which the facility is set up, there is a restaurant portion. It is our understanding that the restaurant portion, which serves effectively the club members, would be a portion of the facility which would be subject to tax at all times. We believe that the remainder is used more significantly by the public than by the association itself.

MRS. HEWES: Well, then -- if I can just follow that one more, Mr. Chairman -- are you dividing the building as to the application for relief from taxes, or are you dividing the use of the building? Perhaps we might try it along that line.

MR. WELZ: The answer, of course, is that we are dividing it on both lines.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Bow Valley.

MR. MUSGROVE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. These three founding clubs -- Edelweiss, Pheonix, and the Friends of Berlin club -- were those three clubs and their property exempt from taxation prior to this?

MR. WELZ: No, they were not.

MR. MUSGROVE: Okay. The other question I have was that it would appear like the easiest way, if this were to happen, would be to use a percentage of the assessment as taxable assessment and the balance would be exempt. Now, has the association approached the city of Edmonton to see if they would agree to this type of a workable way of solving this problem without using a private member's Bill?

MR. WOLTER: Yes. We have written in the past to the chairman of a committee which was formed to come up with a policy -- this was last year -- and we have received acknowledgment of our letter. But that's where it stands.

MR. MUSGROVE: In other words, you haven't approached the city taxation or assessment department as of now to see if this could be worked out with the city.

MR. WOLTER: No, we have not.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Welz, it seems from the section of the Act that you've quoted that you should be able to achieve the object of your taxing regime via that section, should you not?

MR. WELZ: No, sir, because there is no specific category or exemption granted by the Municipal Taxation Act which would entitle us to exemption at the present time. It is for this reason that we are asking for this private Bill, to establish the principle that, yes, there is an exemption for that purpose. What we then intend to do, of course, is to sit down with the city and in consultation with them determine which portion of the building is in fact commercial and which portion is in fact solely being used for community purposes.

MR. WRIGHT: I see. I guess we can look at the section you referred to and see for ourselves, but can you just read the wording again?

MR. WELZ: Subsection 3(4) provides:

If, by or under this Act or any other Act in force in Alberta, any land or improvement is wholly or partly exempt from assessment or taxation, or both, while or if it

- (a) is used for,
- (b) is chiefly or mainly used for, or
- (c) is required and used for,

a specified purpose, then, notwithstanding any such Act, the land or improvement is subject to assessment to the extent that the use thereof does not come within the exemption and any taxes levied in such a case are due, payable and recoverable in respect of and against the entire property affected by the exemption as if no exemption existed.

MR. WRIGHT: Oh, I see. It's the other way around. We can make you exempt, and yet you will still be subject to taxation for the purposes which do not fall within the terms of the exemption granted in this Bill.

MR. WELZ: That is my understanding. Yes, sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Member for Red Deer North.

MR. DAY: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Could somebody indicate to us, either from the German-Canadian Cultural Association or from the city, what is the status of similar ethnocultural associations in Edmonton who have similar types facilities?

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, with the exception of the Jewish Community Centre, the ethnocultural groups in Edmonton are all taxed and assessable. There's one other exception in the form of the St. John's Institute, which was also exempted by private Bill of this Legislature and which is perhaps comparable, perhaps not. It's more of a religious institution.

MR. DAY: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Member for Vermilion Viking.

DR. WEST: Yes. I guess rather than ask questions on the technical aspect of taxation laws, I would like to ask a question philosophically. I'll ask first by asking you a question on the usage of your facility. Do you hold wedding receptions at your ...?

MRS. FRITZ: Yes, we do.

DR. WEST: Do you hold anniversaries -- 50th anniversaries, wedding anniversaries?

MRS. FRITZ: Yes, we do.

DR. WEST: Do you have open dances?

MRS. FRITZ: Yes, we do.

DR. WEST: Do you have public meetings? Do you allow the hall open?

MRS. FRITZ: Yes, we do.

DR. WEST: Any political events, speeches during ...?

MRS. FRITZ: No, we haven't.

DR. WEST: Do you have guest speakers that come in and talk about various issues?

MRS. FRITZ: Yes, definitely.

DR. WEST: If I go throughout Alberta and look at every community that's out there and take out the word "cultural" and put in "a service to the community" run by different service clubs or different organizations, would you not be the same?

MRS. FRITZ: No, I think we offer more than just regular service; it is culture centred. We do cater to cultural events that are really strictly culture and arts, besides weddings and dances. In fact, the city Parks and Recreation Department held a seminar this morning in our centre. I think this does make us different compared to a regular centre that you can visit.

DR. WEST: Would you not agree or disagree -- you can either way -- that the connotation taken by such a Bill as this would have ramifications across this whole province, that for the sake of holding a few cultural events, arts or recreation things, run by service clubs and that, a lot of communities would fit under the same brackets?

MRS. FRITZ: Excuse me, sir, but for the very same reason, if we were not burdened with this amount, we could cater more programming and cultural events that are geared to juniors, like children, and seniors, which we're not able to do at this time due to a financial burden. I cannot speak for other centres which might have the same burden, but we're here to present our own cause at this time. Thank you.

MR. WELZ: Perhaps I could add to that. There were formerly three separate German associations. Each of them owned their own facilities and each of them elected to effectively disband, to give up their assets to create a new facility which was to be used by the entire community. It was not to be used by their mem-

bers. It was for this purpose; it was a community centre. It was because we had indicated that we were going to be a community centre that our facilities were going to be open to the public at least 50 percent of the time. It is for these reasons that I believe we were granted \$450,000 from the Department of Culture through the CR/C program. I believe that is a distinction. It does serve as a distinction that here we had a number of separate groups that elected to band together to create a brand-new facility, and it was to be a community facility as opposed to a club facility.

DR. WEST: Just one following thing. Community facilities pay taxes, you know, in a lot of communities.

MRS. FRITZ: We're speaking for community leagues. No, they operate on city-owned land, and they don't pay taxes.

MR. ADY: A couple of questions. First of all, do you make any distinction in charges for your facility between members and nonmembers? In other words, if one of your paid membership wants to hold a wedding reception or celebration, do they pay a different rate than a person who is not a member?

MRS. FRITZ: They pay the same. If you're a member or non-member, you pay the same charges, which is strictly ...

MR. ADY: On page 6 of your presentation you indicate that Edmonton Parks & Recreation will be holding some workshops in your facility. Do they pay for the use of the building for that?

MRS. FRITZ: They only pay for food they consume that they order ahead of time -- sandwiches or coffee. That's all.

MR. ADY: But no rent?

MRS. FRITZ: There's no rental charge for a room or anything.

MR. ADY: Okay, one last question. The people who are presently using your facility who you would like to eliminate -- in other words, they're the ones that are paying this overhead that you are paying your taxes with. Where are you getting these people? Are you soliciting and advertising for people to use the hall in order to generate this income, or are they just coming? And if you eliminate them, how will you go about eliminating them? Will you tell them, "We don't want you anymore"? I don't understand who they are or where they're coming from or what you'll do with them when you don't have them anymore. Can you explain that?

MRS. FRITZ: We do not advertise to rent or hold functions. It seems to be word of mouth and members that come in -- people that walk off the street and say, "Can we hold a reception or wedding here?" If we're available, if we have the time available, yes, they can hold it.

MR. WOLTER: Maybe I could answer that specific. Yes, we do have a few banks and about six or seven strictly nonmember organizations which have been booked, and we would like to eliminate those because this takes away space from our own community members. That causes a hardship, because they say what do they have to do -- for example, using a bank -- where our members, our community members cannot have their own functions. We would like to eliminate these, yes.

MR. ADY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. DROBOT: A question, perhaps, to Mr. Clegg. Are not exemptions usually based on religious grounds, with a cultural tie-in possibly? Is this so or not?

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, as Mr. Walker from the city explained, there are only a couple of precedents in this kind of area. The only one which is a combination of a cultural facility and community-use facility is the Jewish centre in Edmonton, which has very extensive sporting facilities and recreational facilities, on the basis that it was providing a similar program to the YMCA, which is tax exempt. Most of the other exemptions are in fact religious based or educational based. The St. John's Institute, which this committee dealt with last year: the exemption is based on the requirement that their lands be used for religious and educational purposes. Apart from those, there are not other precedents for exemptions for cultural organizations.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton Mill Woods.

MR. GIBEAULT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The representatives of the association mentioned that the taxes are now something like, if I recall, 25 percent or 30 percent of your expenses. Could you tell us what that means in dollars, roughly?

MR. WOLTER: For 1987, \$32,500.

MR. GIBEAULT: Just reading through the presentation here, most of the various organizations that seem to take advantage of the facility at the moment, other than perhaps the parks and recreation department of the city, have a fairly close link to the German community. I am wondering if there is much other use of the facility by the broader community.

MR. WOLTER: The intention mainly is to cater to the German-speaking community. However, we are open to any . . . No, the answer is we have not had too many other ethnic communities using the facility. On the other hand, we did have to book private functions to create revenue. We have requests from the -- one example is a German association, Germans from Russia. They're presently very strongly asking us to use the facilities, which at this stage we cannot accommodate, but that's one strong group with about 100 families. The Swiss Society would like to use it more often. However, we are unable to give it free of cost, as we have to create revenue to pay some of the expenses, and taxes are a high burden.

MR. GIBEAULT: At the moment, is the centre fairly extensively booked? Is it used most evenings, say, most of the time?

MR. WOLTER: It is completely booked for 1987.

MR. GIBEAULT: I'm wondering then, if that's the case, does the centre find itself in a situation where it feels that if it has to continue paying these taxes of \$32,500 a year and if it's fully used at the moment, is that going to have any negative impact if it has to continue to pay those taxes?

MRS. FRITZ: May I answer that? Sir, in respect to the expenses of the facility, the only reason why they are low is the high volunteer component that we have, and this is a strain on

the volunteers. If we take this volunteer impact away from the centre, we would have serious financial problems.

MR. GIBEAULT: Then you'd probably alternatively have to increase the fees that you charge for using the facility. Is that the case?

MRS. FRITZ: If we weren't faced with a tax burden, we wouldn't have to do this at all.

MR. GIBEAULT: I'm wondering -- maybe a question to the representative for the city. If this private Bill is approved, would the city expect that similar Bills might be brought forward by the other ethnocultural groups in the city? If so, what would be the total tax loss that the city might be faced with if all the ethnocultural groups in the city asked for same status?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gibeault, I wonder if we could complete the questions of the German-Canadian club and then have the city make their presentation, and then we'd ask questions. We have 20 minutes left to deal with this particular hearing, and then we have to go on to the next one. The next person . . . I'm sorry, go ahead.

MR. GIBEAULT: I'll ask one more question first of the association, and that is: has the association made any representation to the provincial government to have them consider a program of compensation to municipalities in the province for such centres as yours?

MRS. FRITZ: I think it has been numerous times unsuccessfully. I think the city at this stage is involved in some issues of taxes where other cultural centres will see a \$1 a year lease and are seeking exemption, of what I don't know. But we have for years asked for some type of relief or exemption, and we just can't seem to get anybody to address this issue to be resolved.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But the original \$450,000 cultural grant came from the province though, did it not?

MRS. FRITZ: It did.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The next question, Member for Edmonton Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Are you a nonprofit organization?

MRS. FRITZ: Yes, we are.

MR. WRIGHT: The three component clubs, Club Edelweiss and two others, did they own their premises?

MR. WOLTER: They did.

MR. WRIGHT: I know Club Edelweiss did. And do you still get rent from those premises?

MR. WOLTER: The Friends of Berlin and the Phoenix property have been sold, three years ago, and this money was used to build the new facility. The Edelweiss: we're not receiving any rent yet, but it is being leased, and they're having some problem getting the permit. The question here is other organizations of similar -- I'd like to point out that the Edelweiss, which was in

operation for about 80 years, was one of the first clubs. The Friends of Berlin were very proud, but they were also a club at the time, and so was the Phoenix club. And we'd like to distinguish from the previous standing that we did have, which was being just a club. This was given up, I always said, for the big idea to be a community centre to serve all German background people, predominantly, from Edmonton and area. Right now we do have the Alberta association, which represents all of Alberta, and this was the aim. That's what I'd like to stress, that we think we are not a club or a community per se. We have combined all of the people, and we therefore think it's a little different.

MR. WRIGHT: My last question, Mr. Chairman, is: would you say that your premises at present are chiefly used for community purposes?

MR. WOLTER: I would say they're used 80 percent, 90 percent, for community purposes, yes.

MR. YOUNIE: As I understood your initial arguments then, one of the purposes of the tax exemption will be to in fact increase the level of nonprofit community-oriented services and decrease the number of profit-making, commercial-oriented services, and that much of your commercial activity is aimed towards trying to pay your taxes.

MR. WOLTER: That is correct.

MR. YOUNIE: And you would like to reduce that and increase the amount of community activity?

MR. WOLTER: Correct.

MR. ADY: I notice on page 5 of your brief you mention casino revenue. Obviously, you operate some type of casino to raise revenue in your facility. Is that what we're talking about there?

MR. WOLTER: We have received one casino ever in our existence. We had one last March.

MR. ADY: Okay. When you received your \$450,000, obviously you had to apply for that through some municipality, and probably it was the city, who then applied to the provincial government to receive that grant. As you know, there's an ongoing annual payment per capita into the city under that program. Do you continue to receive any part of that grant on an ongoing basis?

MR. WOLTER: They have made up an application to the CRC again under the operations portion, but we have not received any reply on that yet.

MR. ADY: You have not received any other funds except the original capital grant?

MR. WOLTER: Except the original capital for the construction of the centre.

MR. ADY: Okay, one last question. Do you receive an annual grant from the provincial Department of Culture for your association?

MR. WOLTER: No, we do not.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Walker, would you like to ask any questions on behalf of the city of Edmonton of the German-Canadian club before you make your presentation?

MR. WALKER: No, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well then, we'll hear from you, Mr. Walker, and then hear from the city's intervention.

MR. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, hon. members, first of all, in response to Mr. Gibeault's question, if the other ethnocultural groups in the city of Edmonton were to apply for similar tax relief, the total cost to the city would be \$1.5 million per annum in lost tax revenues. This does not include the recreational groups such as the Edmonton Rugby Union and various soccer clubs, et cetera. The city of Edmonton opposes the passage of this Bill in its entirety, not just being satisfied with an amendment to deal with local improvement levies.

By way of history, as you are probably aware, on November 13, 1984, the province of Alberta passed the Jewish Community Centre of Edmonton Act exempting that facility from municipal assessment and taxation. The city had six basic reasons for opposing that Bill. The city felt that it was not fair of the province of Alberta to deprive the city of its tax revenues without the city's consent. The city pointed out that the exemption from taxation creates a perpetual grant or a perpetual subsidy. In this case before you today, it would be in the amount of approximately \$25,000 per year. The taxpayers would be footing the burden in terms of an additional tax on the remaining taxpayers without necessarily concurring with the objects of the organization receiving the exemption. It did create an erosion of our tax base, and it would also create a bandwagon effect, so that other groups would line up. Now, a strong argument was made by the Jewish Community Centre that they were like the YMCA, in the process of providing services to the community at large. Thus the Bill was passed over our objection, and the bandwagon effect is starting to take place, obviously. For the same reasons that we opposed the Jewish Community Centre Bill, we oppose this Bill.

At this point I wish to clarify one thing: we are not opposed to the objects of this organization. I'm not opposed to the objects of this organization. My wife is of . . . I apologize, Mr. Chairman. The \$1.5 million evy is approximately \$300,000 per year. It makes quite a difference, but the figure is still considerable.

As I was saying, the city doesn't oppose the organization; I don't oppose the organization. My wife is of Germanic heritage, my daughter studies German, and I personally am highly in favour of the objects of this society. On the other hand, as a lawyer employed by the city of Edmonton I have an obligation to represent the city when its public rights are being threatened, and this is one area where representation is needed. The German-Canadian community association considers itself unique, and it is unique. But it's not unique in the sense of being the only ethnocultural association that could ask for similar relief and that has asked for similar relief. Groups have applied for aid through the city in quite large numbers. Some of them are the Hindu cultural society; the Italian Cultural Society; the Dutch Canadian society; the Sikh Society of Edmonton; the Jewish Community Centre, after the private Bill was passed, I

might add; the Edmonton Scottish Society; the Hungarian cultural centre; the Edmonton Chinese multicultural centre; the Order of Ahepa, which is the Hellenic or Greek community; the Slovenian Canadian Association; the St. John's Institute, after the private Bill was passed, again; the Ukrainian National Federation of Canada; the Ukrainian Catholic entity; and the German-Canadian Cultural Association as well.

Now there's one common denomination to these groups, and that is that they are primarily ethnocultural organizations, and you might wonder how the city deals with ethnocultural organizations. The city has a grants policy for such groups. The city takes the position that forgiveness of taxes is a grant of a particular nature but is still a grant.

The city has set up several boards: the Art Gallery review board; the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board; the social services advisory board; and for grant applicants who don't fit under the above boards, the Executive Committee of city council. The city has certain checks and balances built into its grants policy, and one of them is the appointment of a grants co-ordinator that's supposed to do certain things. The grants co-ordinator is supposed to ask questions such as: will the grant be used for operating assistance? Does the group receive other city funding? Are the activities provided to a broad cross section of the citizens of the city? Are they high-quality activities? Are they activities duplicated elsewhere? Is other government funding being received?

The grants co-ordinator also looks at the financial statements, at the details of the programs, at the percentage of the total time that is spent on nonethnic programs, the breakdown of the building use, at multicultural outreach programs and the participation there -- such as Heritage Days and K Days -- at the list of directors, at the annual report, at the constitution and bylaws, at the review of the leases. The review of the leases is important, because some of these ethnocultural groups occupy city-owned space which is exempt, and in that situation a rent is charged by the city which is equivalent to the taxes that would otherwise be charged. Following this fairly rigorous, we submit, review by the grants co-ordinator, a proposal is made to the Executive Committee, and the Executive Committee then determines whether or not a grant will be given.

Now obviously, Mr. Chairman, this particular committee hasn't had an opportunity to conduct such a review and probably isn't interested in conducting such reviews for each application. But the city has a mechanism for conducting such reviews, and the city does its best to be consistent and fair to all such ethnocultural groups. The system isn't perfect. For a while, the city attempted to initiate a cultural commission to be a sort of umbrella grants-granting group on behalf of the city. For legal and other reasons, the cultural commission was unable to get off the ground, and so the system that I described continues in place.

You're probably wondering at this point: how do these associations fare when they apply to the city for relief? Well, to make a long story short, tax penalties have by and large been forgiven; current taxes have not. The Hungarian Cultural Society, the Jewish Community Centre, the Edmonton Scottish Society, and others have received a forgiveness of their penalties but not of their current taxes. The St. John's Institute received no forgiveness of its current taxes. The Dutch Canadian Club, the Hindu Society, and the Sikh Society received no forgiveness of their rents, which are equivalent to taxes. I suppose that's the real problem: because we don't forgive taxes, these groups apply to this body for another form of relief.

Now, as I mentioned, we have some reasons. We feel that to grant relief would be to grant a perpetual subsidy out of the city's coffers, which creates a hardship on the city and on the remaining taxpayers. But in addition, I wish to point out that there are perhaps some procedural problems with the bandwagon effect of private Bills being used to grant tax exemptions, and one of them is that legislation is already in place. The Municipal Tax Exemption Act provides a mechanism for private nonprofit groups in the delivery of educational and other charitable services to apply to the Local Authorities Board of Alberta. The Local Authorities Board then reviews these groups in much the same type of hearing as we have had today and makes a recommendation to cabinet for or against tax relief. This short-circuits that process, and I only wish to point out that on the Jewish Community Centre an application was made through the Local Authorities Board under that Act. No such application has been made here.

And finally, I would like to point out a comment that we have about this group, and that is: you have heard in evidence that they're not a club, that they are an association. That evidence is inconsistent with the public record on file with the companies branch of their corporate objects and their constitution. Article (j) of their objects allows them to purchase, sell, manage, lease, mortgage, dispose of, or otherwise deal with the properties of the club. This is after the amalgamation, after the association was set up, and they are allowed to deal with the properties of the club. Article (e) of their objects allows them to provide a meeting place for the consideration of and discussion of questions affecting the interests of the club. There are similar situations in the bylaws. Paragraph (1) of bylaw 1 talks about people being willing to subscribe to the club's objectives and to abide by the club's bylaws. Those people may become members.

It's our submission that it is a group or a club of a private character, one that although engaged in the delivery of services to the community, that is obviously secondary to its private nature, which is to a certain segment of the community in Edmonton, not to the community at large.

And finally, I also wish merely to point out that according to the financial statements filed by the association and on file with the companies branch as a public record for the year ended December 31, 1985, the costs to the association for that year were \$216,335. Now, you've heard evidence that the costs of the association in paying taxes were 25 to 30 percent. I'm not much of a mathematician, but I know that 25 percent of \$216,000 is a lot more than \$30,000. The revenues in 1986 were . . . I apologize; the net earnings, not the gross revenues, in 1985 were \$346,674. Of that is included a grant of \$250,000. Without the grants the net earnings of the association per year are around \$90,000. That's after the payment of taxes. So it is simply our position that although every association is worthy of relief, this particular association has been a good taxpayer and has been a good fund-raiser and a good viable entity, and we don't see what is about to change in the future to make it different, and we disagree with the characterization of the delivery of public services.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the Bill ties in this exemption as long as the property is used in accordance with the association's objectives. Don't forget that those objectives can be changed. There is a mechanism under the Societies Act whereby the objectives of the society could be changed, and this group, as a committee of the Legislature, has no method of ongoing review, either of those objectives being constant or of the uses of the

property being constant, all of which are things that the city looks at very carefully each year in the delivery of its grants program to its groups. Please allow us to continue to deliver grants to the ethnocultural associations as we see fit after our review is conducted and as we can afford it, and please do not pass this Bill.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton Strathcona.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, just a note on the St. John's Institute. If my memory serves me, the reason that was accorded the status was chiefly because it was represented as, and we believe it to be, basically a students' residence but didn't fall within the exemptions under section 25 of the Municipal Taxation Act, because it was not owned by the student or the university.

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, that's absolutely true, and I might point out that once again the St. John's Institute had been exempted by private Bill many years ago. The application before this committee of a year ago was sort of an expansion site which continued use, and although it was exempted by the Municipal Taxation Act had been exempted by another Act of the Legislature.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, so I don't think that's quite the bandwagon effect you're talking about stemming from the Hillcrest Jewish Community League situation. That's just by the way.

My question, though, really is: I take it there is no bylaw that specially makes this site subject to taxes.

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, this site is subject to taxes by the operation of section 3 of the Municipal Taxation Act.

MR. WRIGHT: The general taxation rule, yes. But if it is a nonprofit organization and if its site does not exceed five acres and if it is used chiefly for community purposes, then unless there is such a special bylaw under section 25 of the Municipal Taxation Act, as I read it, it's exempt from tax anyway. So can someone clear up that puzzle?

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Wright is referring to section 25 of the Municipal Taxation Act, which grants an exemption for properties that are chiefly used for community purposes. It's the position of the city assessor and of the city law department that this facility is not chiefly used for community purposes legally.

MR. WRIGHT: I see. So you would take issue with Mr. Wolter on that point.

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, yes we do.

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Chairman, my first question is: does the city collect a levy mill rate for recreation?

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, the city does not have a special mill rate for recreation.

MR. MUSGROVE: So the grant purposes that you suggest that you are now giving to the ethnic group are out of general revenue of the city.

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

MR. MUSGROVE: Now, is this a prescribed grant? Is it something that they can depend on year after year? Does it fluctuate or can it be withdrawn?

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, the groups that I mentioned have received the forgiveness of their tax penalties. That is provided for under section 106 of the Municipal Taxation Act, which makes it a discretionary decision of council based on equitable grounds. It would be an invalid exercise of council's powers if it were to allow for future grants under that section, and it must be looked at annually by city council.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Red Deer North.

MR. DAY: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Walker has suggested a possible discrepancy with this 25 to 35 percent figure which was brought forward by the German-Canadian association's saying that that's the approximate percentage of the tax bite based on their revenues. Could we get a comment from the German-Canadian association on that?

MR. WOLTER: Mr. Chairman, the figures quoted were for '85. We did not own that cultural centre at the time. That's what I'd like to make you aware of. The '86 figures are different, but the quote that Mr. Walker made was for '85. At that time there was no cultural centre.

MR. WELZ: Sir, I might add that in 1986 the financial statements as of December 31, 1986 -- I'm going through my notes to attempt to locate them -- indicated that the total expenses were \$148,000, and I believe that the total amount which is shown as being payable on those statements for licences, fees, and taxes is somewhere in the vicinity of \$41,000, or slightly in excess of that. So I believe the mathematics were correct. It is approximately 25 to 30 percent.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are there no more questions from the committee? Would the city of Edmonton like to make their closing statement please? I'd ask both of you to be brief, because we're running a little late.

MR. WALKER: Mr. Chairman, I don't think we need to make a closing statement.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. The German-Canadian club, do you wish to make closing remarks?

MR. WELZ: Yes, sir. The only statement that we would like to make is that it is our intention to continue to apply for grant programs that enable us to better deliver our services to the city. As such, it is our intention to continue to be subject to their review. Also, insofar as we have adopted the position that insofar as the facilities are used for the private purposes of the members, we believe that they should be taxed, and certainly we expect that the assessment department will be watching us to ensure that if the facilities are used for any other purpose, they will in fact be taxed. Additionally, if they are used for commercial purposes, then of course this Bill would not exempt the facilities.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Thank you to all of you. We'll now move on to the next item of business.

I should point out to the committee members that the next four Bills are all exactly the same. So when Mr. Clegg makes a report he will give you just one report, but it applies to the four Bills. Likewise, when the petitioners make their presentations, it applies to all the four Bills.

Mr. Clegg.

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, this is my report on Bill Pr. 15, Lake Bonavista Homeowners Association Ltd. Tax Exemption Act. The same report applies to Bills Pr. 16, Pr. 17, and Pr. 18, which are of the same structure.

The purpose of these Bills is to exempt lands owned by the associations in question from municipal and school taxes for so long as they are used for recreational and social purposes. There is no model Bill on this subject. The request arises from the novel nature of the developments involved. The city of Calgary has indicated its support for these Bills.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clegg, will you swear in the witnesses please?

[Messrs. Cameron and Shields were sworn in]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Cameron, are you going to make a presentation?

MR. CAMERON: Mr. Chairman, hon. members, I have prepared a presentation that I was going to originally just deliver to the Assembly, but if you would prefer, I'd like to read it, perhaps with you folks having a copy so you'd understand what we're doing.

I'm Neil Cameron. I represent the Lake Bonaventure Residents Association. With me is Burton Shields, who represents the Parkland Community Centre Calgary Ltd. Absent today are Mr. Rod Kneller, on behalf of Lake Bonavista, and Mr. John Manolescue, who represents Lake Midnapore. The Bills we're requesting are essentially all the same, however, and any questions you had perhaps could be asked of myself or Mr. Shields on behalf of all four community associations.

I have prepared a brief history of what took place. Basically, the four community associations were established by Keith Construction after extensive negotiation with the city of Calgary in order to ensure that the community associations would be given relief from taxation. To accomplish this end, the community associations were included under the protection of Public Utilities Board order 25860, which is an annexation order and which essentially provided that properties under the order which consisted of over 20 acres were to be taxed at the same rate that would apply to properties in the municipal district of Rocky View. On this basis the communities would be taxed as if they were farmland and would therefore receive a nominal tax assessment.

In 1984 the city of Calgary realized that a number of properties which were originally included in order 25860 had effectively changed their status but were still able to escape taxation because of the broad wording of the order. Shopping centres and other large-scale commercial projects were able to avoid municipal tax rates as long as they did not subdivide below 20 acres. To combat this situation the city appealed to the Local Authorities Board in 1986 for a clarification of order 25860,

requesting amendments to the order which would effectively place all commercial properties under municipal tax rates.

The city was not originally aware that the four community associations were caught in its proposed amendments. However, after a number of 11th-hour meetings with the city, the city agreed to insert a proviso in its application to the effect that PUB order 25860 would continue to apply and offer tax relief to any properties designated urban reserve or direct control. And that is the present status of our communities at the present time: two of the communities are designated urban reserve and two are direct control. Therefore, for the time being we will be taxed as if no amendments to order 25860 had been made.

However, the city intends to apply for the full abolition of order 25860, and unless a mechanism is in place to safeguard the communities, they would be subject to full municipal taxation. The city has acknowledged that this would not be good for either the communities individually or for the city itself and has agreed to support us in our application for a private Bill granting the communities tax-exempt status. A copy of the city council's resolution confirming that they have no objections to the Bill is on file on this matter. The city has come to this conclusion after acknowledging that none of the other alternatives available to us would guarantee relief from taxation without incurring other downside repercussions. And I've included on the attached page the alternatives that are available.

The first is a 99-year lease from the city. This would have meant that the communities would convey the fee title ownership of the lands back to the city for \$1, and in turn, the city would lease the lands back to the community associations for \$1 per year. In addition, the city would pay all taxes. While the \$1 per year payment was attractive, it meant giving away our present fee title ownership, and there was no guarantee that an innocent breach of the lease would not result in forfeiture of the lease or similar problems associated with leaseholds.

A second alternative was an amendment to the Municipal Taxation Act. The amendment would give city council the authority by bylaw to raise the current five-acre tax exempt ceiling on properties such as ours. We saw this as being a long, drawn-out battle which may never get off the ground because of basic problems at the provincial level with giving such powers to municipalities across the board. We saw such an amendment as being beyond the abilities of four small community associations, and one which would be best brought forward by one of the large municipalities such as Calgary or Edmonton.

A third alternative was to apply for a ministerial order. This would set down rules as to how our properties were to be assessed. Our understanding of such rules is that they exist at the minister's discretion and would be quite easy to change. What our communities and the city of Calgary are looking for is a permanent solution, and it was felt that a ministerial order was not really sufficient to ensure permanency.

The fourth alternative was to apply for an annual grant under which the city would give a grant each year under section 106 of the Municipal Taxation Act in an amount equal to the taxes. This would have to be done on an annual basis each year for each project, and there is no guarantee that future city councils would in fact agree to the grant. The city has also indicated that this is an expensive alternative even for the city, since they would effectively have to pay the school board and provincial foundation requisitions on our properties.

Having reviewed all of the above alternatives, it was felt by both our communities and the city that a private Bill would be

the best route to pursue.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Stettler.

MR. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a question here. Are you seeking exemption as well from local improvement levies?

MR. CAMERON: No, we are not seeking exemptions from local improvement. We met with city council, and it was agreed at our city council meeting that we should include that in our Bill. We were later called back after their legal department had looked at it, and they said that would create a nightmare. We therefore are only going for municipal taxation.

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Chairman, I was just trying to recall a private Bill that we had earlier this year that dealt with Lake Bonavista. Is this now changed?

MR. CAMERON: Well, we may have been getting attention because of our involvement with PUB order 25860, but neither Bonavista nor Bonaventure or any of the communities that are involved here has applied for a private Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Younie.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you. One question. You mentioned that the city put these lands under the Public Utilities Board order. Are these lands actually in the original areas annexed under those orders or did . . .

MR. CAMERON: Yes, they are.

MR. YOUNIE: They are. Okay. I've got some questions about the land itself. They're going to be used for recreational and social purposes. Seeing as you're seeking a tax exemption, if that's granted, will they be open to other communities in the area, or in other words open to the public?

MR. CAMERON: They are not open to the public; they are open to the members of the community. That status was looked at originally by the city as being beneficial to the city. They are lake communities, and the people that live in the area pay all the costs of running the parks and the lake. The city does not contribute either in terms of watering the grass or cutting the grass or maintaining the lakes, and it was felt by the city at that time that this was a convenient route for everyone to go. The associations could themselves control the quality of the parks. If they were opened up and the members had to pay the cost of maintaining them, that would be perceived as being totally unfair, I think.

MR. YOUNIE: So your argument is that if the city is going to charge -- the city is already exempting the major portion of taxes?

MR. CAMERON: Four hundred dollars right now for everybody.

MR. YOUNIE: And the city is already forgoing \$12,000 or so in taxes on the four, I believe.

MR. CAMERON: Well, no, if they were taxed at straight mu-

nicipal rates, it would be substantially higher than that.

MR. YOUNIE: But that is the present status?

MR. CAMERON: Yes.

MR. YOUNIE: The Bill is more concerned with the potential future status than the present status.

MR. CAMERON: We have come this far with the application under order 25860, where we had everybody finally addressing the issue -- both the community associations and the city -- and it was felt that if we didn't do something now that was permanent, it would take another strong city council and strong community associations to really address the issue in the future again.

MR. YOUNIE: What is the cost of maintaining the park area that the city would have to pay if it were in fact a city park?

MR. CAMERON: I can only speak for Lake Bonaventure. We're a much smaller group than the others, but we raise approximately \$88,000 a year, and it's all spent. And that is spent strictly on hiring an employee to do the maintenance and paying for other maintenance duties in the area. So it's a salary plus the general cost of running the community lake, and that's it.

MR. SHIELDS: Mr. Chairman, with respect to Parkland -- just to give a similar scenario. Parkland does not have a lake, but it is a similar facility. The annual revenues there are approximately \$129,000, and for the last three years the park was operated at a break even; in other words, it takes \$129,000 to operate the park.

MR. YOUNIE: Are there improvements in the way of buildings, recreation facilities, and so on, on these lands?

MR. CAMERON: Each one is slightly different. On Lake Bonaventure we only have some picnic tables on a little island. When you go over to Bonavista, what you wind up with is about five or six tennis courts, a much larger lake, a pump facility, and that's hidden by what's called an island. It looks like an island, but its main function is to hide the pumps that circulate the water, keep it partly fresh.

MR. YOUNIE: Okay. But my concern is that these in effect then are private clubs that aren't open to the public. They're for the private enjoyment of the residents' association?

MR. CAMERON: They aren't clubs as such; they are community associations that are looking after their own internal facilities.

MR. SHIELDS: By way of further answer to that, in Parkland, for example, all of the existing sporting organizations hold functions there in which they invite other sporting organizations to participate. Church groups are welcome as guests. There is outside use, but just for someone to come off the street from another subdivision, no, they could not. But the owners in that subdivision pay \$96 a year. In the case of Parkland, if the fees go beyond the \$96, the Parkland residents have no interest in the property and it would revert to the city as a tax burden.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If I owned a home in the area, do you automatically have the right to be a member, or do you become a member as a condition of buying?

MR. CAMERON: You automatically become a member of the association. And as long as your dues are current -- and the dues in each area are a little different, but in Bonavista they're approximately \$96. As long as those were paid up to date, you would have access to the area.

MR. YOUNIE: What's the average value of homes in the area?

MR. CAMERON: Well, I don't think that there is an average. Houses go from probably in the low 90s, depending on the area we're talking about, to \$500,000.

MR. SHIELDS: In the case of Parkland, that would be a range of from \$90,000 to perhaps \$210,000.

MR. CAMERON: So it certainly isn't perceived as being just a certain style of accommodation. Lake Bonaventure is a little bit more towards the top end. It's a smaller lake. It wouldn't really accommodate a community. We only have, I think, with total water about 20 acres, and then 10 acres in land. So there's not enough area nor is there any parking available for anyone to come that isn't a member of the area.

MR. WRIGHT: How did the community come to own the land in the first place? Or maybe I should ask: who does own the land?

MR. CAMERON: The community associations own the land.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. And how did it get to own it in the first place?

MR. CAMERON: That I don't know, although my understanding is during the subdivision process . . .

MR. SHIELDS: At the time of the development by the developer, which was Keith Construction in all cases, part of the concept of the subdivision was to include a park. The parks vary a little bit from subdivision to subdivision, but it came with the subdivision. You have to belong to the park, or the association, as part of owning a home. In the case of Parkland, that park was turned over to a homeowners' association, if you will, or the community organization we represent, in 1979. That facility continued to operate until 1984, when Parkland was singled out for a tax reassessment of \$35,000, being an increase of \$100. And that's what brought the matter to bear. We appealed that assessment. It went on for three years, and finally last year the city withdrew its assessment for those years, and we're back to the \$100. And we're here to try to achieve a permanent solution.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, but was the parkland in each case part of the urban reserve under the Planning Act?

MR. SHIELDS: It may have been taken into account. I don't know.

MR. WRIGHT: No. I mean when you subdivide, isn't 10 percent automatically taken off for public purposes?

MR. CAMERON: That's the city's general plan. I'm not sure if our properties were designated that. They certainly are given a UR designation or direct control.

MR. WRIGHT: I see. So then this is part of the 10 percent, or whatever the percentage is for that?

MR. CAMERON: We don't know that.

MR. WRIGHT: But normally it's for public use?

MR. CAMERON: That we don't know.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wright, perhaps I could help you. I was a member of council when this first proposal came to us, and if I recall correctly, the lake was to be part of the reserve. What we were concerned about on council at the time -- if I remember the lake is zoned R1 or was part of the R1 zoning -- we were afraid that the developer might drain the lake and then build more houses. So one of the restrictions that was put in was that in effect the city would have control over the future zoning of the lake down the road, whenever it would happen sort of thing.

MR. WRIGHT: Was it or was it not part of the . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I honestly can't tell you that, but I know the other problem the city was faced with at the time was the difficulty of getting enough money to run parks, and this struck us as a very unique approach by a developer.

Mr. Clegg.

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, it might be possible to ask the petitioners to find out whether it was part of the 10 percent urban reserve which is generally dedicated to public use rather than restricted community use.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. M. CLEGG: And they could advise this committee so that they can consider that as a factor when the committee considers these Bills.

MR. WRIGHT: I make that request on our behalf.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CAMERON: It may have been that the area was done as a whole, of course, and if that is the case this may not . . . There certainly are park areas in these areas. I don't know if we'll be successful in finding out if this was particularly singled out of the 10 percent reserve for the entire area.

MR. WRIGHT: It's usually a fairly argumentative point when subdivision takes place. I imagine it wouldn't be too hard to find out.

MR. SHIELDS: I think you have to bear in mind this concept came into being in the early 1960s, so that is back a long time.

MR. CAMERON: Well, we'll certainly make inquiries. I couldn't guarantee that we'll be able to definitively say that this was part or was not part of the 10 percent that's usually established. We'd have to look at minutes of the city council, which

may or may not address the issue.

MR. WRIGHT: Oh, I think it's always plain on the subdivision plan. Anyway, if I can just move on. How many acres in each of these subdivisions?

MR. SHIELDS: Parkland has 20 acres, of which I would advise that half of that is the escarpment of a hill that is of no use to anybody for anything else.

MR. WRIGHT: That's in one of them. That's Parkland.

MR. SHIELDS: I believe Bonavista is approximately 70 acres in total and . . .

MR. WRIGHT: No. This is just the park area we're talking about.

MR. SHIELDS: For Parkland.

MR. WRIGHT: It's just the park area in Parkland we're talking about, the 70 acres. The 20 acres . . .

MR. SHIELDS: There are 20 acres in the subdivision of Parkland, and 70 acres in the Lake Bonavista subdivision. I think Mr. Cameron has indicated . . .

MR. CAMERON: There are 30 acres in Bonaventure, most covered in water.

MR. WRIGHT: And how about Midnapore, do you know?

MR. CAMERON: Midnapore is probably smaller than Bonavista, but I don't know the exact area.

MR. YOUNIE: The Act says 50.3 acres.

MR. SHIELDS: Well, that's it then.

MR. CAMERON: The legal description is probably filed with the petition, and it probably has the acreage.

MR. MUSGROVE: Well, my concern has been touched on. If it is part of the 10 percent public reserve, then I don't know how we can handle this in the Bill. If it is, and I quote, "A portion of that park was bought by each homeowner," then this gives a whole different story under the situation. I believe there was another type of private Bill passed at one time where there was public reserve, but a portion of the Parkland belonged to each homeowner. This makes this a lot different situation to deal with than if it were dealing with public reserve as we know it, because public reserve belongs to the public of the city or of the municipality.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, do we have a letter on file from the city saying that they have no objection?

MR. CAMERON: We have a copy of the city council resolution on that matter. This is the route the city would prefer to go, because they do not want to take the parks back. Right now they have no obligation with respect to the parks. When the houses were first established, there was an encumbrance charged against each house, which -- I'll just use Bonavista; it's

a better example -- was \$60. That probably wasn't well thought out by the developer, because the \$60 per year only carried it for about two or three years. They soon found that even charging 2,500 houses \$60 was not going to cover anywhere near the maintenance costs. They've raised that to \$90 now. These charges are paid gratuitously by the people, because the association can only go after the \$60. They can't go after the extra \$30 because there's no mechanism in place to charge that.

The city doesn't want the properties back because they'll be an increased burden to the city and they probably can't deliver the services that are being delivered now by the community associations on a personal basis. So the city favours this route for us to go. That should be stressed, that the city is not servicing the areas and also feels that if they took them back, they would be paying an extra cost for doing so.

MR. YOUNIE: Okay. The homeowners' associations are actually corporations under the Companies Act, not nonprofit associations.

MR. CAMERON: They're more like societies.

MR. YOUNIE: But they are under the Corporations Act, not the Societies Act.

MR. CAMERON: Right.

MR. YOUNIE: Now, I'm wondering who has control in terms of decision-making? For instance, the one has 70 acres. Well, even if they're large lots, in that kind of area, if the homeowners' associations had the authority to subdivide that and sell it as housing lots and develop it, it would in fact turn out to be a very substantial sum of money, yet it would be protected by an Act of the Legislature from paying its municipal taxes.

MR. CAMERON: We're quite happy to build in the protection that would allow the property . . .

MR. YOUNIE: Okay. I wanted to ask two things. Number one, would you have the authority, as a company, to do that, first of all, to subdivide? I'm not interested in anything else. Would you have the authority to do it if you chose?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Could I interrupt? Mr. Younie, if I remember, the land is under direct control and can't be subdivided without approval of the city.

MR. CAMERON: We'd have full hearings before the city.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Clegg may clarify the other point you were raising, though, about the corporation side of it.

MR. M. CLEGG: Yes, I've got a couple of points I want to make, Mr. Chairman. First, for the record, I would advise the members that I do have on file certified copies of the resolution supporting these Bills from the city. Secondly, I understand that these corporations were formed under part 9 of the Companies Act, which is the nonprofit portion of the Companies Act, which was used to form nonprofit corporations. I've discussed with the petitioners, knowing that this would be a concern to members, whether they would object to an amendment to the Bill

which would say that the exemption lasted only for so long as the companies remained on a nonprofit basis. This is to cover the theoretical possibility that they might be continued as business corporations and make some profit from the properties, even if they didn't actually develop them. So I think that the committee's concern in that direction could be and perhaps should be addressed by an amendment.

The further question that I'd like to put to the petitioners is whether they think it's sufficiently clear in the wording "exempt from all municipal taxes and school taxes of every nature whatsoever" or whether it's clear that they are really exempting local improvement taxes from that. We have had previous legislation where we've added the words "but not exempting local improvement taxes." My understanding is that you wouldn't wish to exempt local improvement taxes, and we might . . .

MR. CAMERON: We'd like to, but we didn't want to because the city said that would create a nightmare for them if we did that. We felt our only real concern is municipal taxes. There haven't been any local improvement assessments given to the associations, so we weren't concerned with that.

To take people back a little bit, the history of it probably should be mentioned that took place in 1984, and Burton had touched on it. That is that Parkland for whatever reason -- and I think it was lack of somebody understanding what the notice was that the city had sent out. But they had taken Parkland community association out of the protection of the Public Utilities Board order that it was then under and served a notice. It probably went to a secretary of the association, and she didn't know what to do. There was no hearing, and the property simply came out of the protection of the order. Then the city assessor felt in reading the Municipal Taxation Act that he had to assess Parkland. So where the bill was \$100, it went to \$30,000. So we had an increase of \$29,900 on this poor little park. There's no way we can raise the money. We can't go to the homeowners because we have no charges on their house except for this maintenance charge. So Parkland was effectively going to go bankrupt. A tax notification would have been filed against the property and the city would have taken it back, and they don't want it back. But the city assessor felt because they weren't protected that he had to read section 3 of the Act and he had to tax them. So they were caught in a catch-22, and this is where they are right now. They don't want it. They want to help us, and that's why we're here.

If you tax the people in the area then we could say okay, perhaps that's a different situation. But there's no mechanism that we have to go back to the people in the area.

MR. YOUNIE: I still have a question. If -- and we're dealing in hypotheticals now -- that amendment you're suggesting goes in, I'm still concerned about the mechanism by which it would take affect. If, for instance, there was that theoretical conversion to a profit-making company and the city granted subdividing, would it be automatic and instantaneous that the tax exemption would be canceled, or would it take some kind of court procedure to judge that they'd become profit making and proof required? I feel that it could be held up in the courts for two or three years and all the lots sold.

MR. M. CLEGG: The interpretation of legislation is always open to the courts, of course. But it would be my understanding that the scenario would be like this. If there was in fact a profitability factor introduced in this or indeed if the profit is

involved but no longer used exclusively -- and the word "exclusively" is in there -- "for the recreational and social enjoyment of the members of the association," then the city would be able to and would be obliged by law to bring up again the assessments on those properties and charge taxes. The associations could of course challenge those assessments in the courts as they can always do. They might say, for example: "You've misinterpreted the situation. We're not in a profit-making situation. We are still within the Bill." The courts would have jurisdiction if there was a challenge. But if those events took place, the first action would be that the city would automatically assess the properties as they would have been assessed without this legislation.

MR. MUSGROVE: Well, this gets us back into the question of public reserve, because public reserve cannot be assessed and taxed in a municipality. There is a provision in the Planning Act that you can pay 10 percent cash in public reserve. Now, somewhere there's confusion here, because if this land were originally public reserve, that can only be used for parks and playgrounds and recreation and is not subject to municipal taxes. However, if the company that developed this paid 10 percent of the value of the property in cash in lieu of public reserves, this property could have then become a community association. So maybe that's where some of the confusion is. I don't know.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Chairman, are there any other parklands zoned as park within the district or within the plan that are city owned and controlled?

MR. CAMERON: Yes, there are. There's a number of them, like you have in any community. There are school areas; there are park areas. This is just a specific area. In our case, for instance, in Bonaventure, this is just all water, so there have to be park areas all around.

MRS. HEWES: So, Mr. Chairman, the 10 percent urban reserve could be quite exclusive of this essentially holding pond?

MR. CAMERON: What I'm hearing from the hon. member back here is that if it is originally urban reserve, it couldn't be taxed. The city had no problem in taxing Parkland, and that was looked at by their full legal staff. As to whether they had the authority to tax Parkland, they came to the conclusion they had to and did, just in reading the Act.

MR. WRIGHT: It sounds as if it wasn't in the 10 percent, but you can check it out certainly. But you know, you've said there were three alternatives here -- or four alternatives, I guess -- as to how to treat it. Surely under the Municipal Tax Exemption Act, section 3 is the route you'd normally try. That says that a nonprofit organization "may apply, in accordance with this Act," for an order declaring property "to be exempt from assessment and taxation" -- if it's a nonprofit organization, you are; owns the property, you do -- and the property is used chiefly for "welfare purpose that is to be to the general public advantage or benefit."

MR. CAMERON: I don't think recreational properties would fit into the definition. We looked at that very carefully and felt that our particular use does not fit that section. That would have been preferred from the original date but we . . .

MR. WRIGHT: I see. So you did consider the possibility, and it didn't match?

MR. CAMERON: We've looked at it in the city's legal department. It's not as though we're trying to do anything untoward toward the city. They want to help us, and they've turned their full legal staff over to this thing in finding ways that can work to achieve the purpose. They felt that that was not available and that we'd be challenged if we tried to use that section, as the city would be challenged.

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like note that of course it's not available for public use, and that's probably another reason and probably the dominant reason why it couldn't . . .

MR. WRIGHT: It doesn't say that. "To the general public advantage or benefit" -- and relieving them of a tax burden might be within that.

MR. CAMERON: I have a copy of the Act with me, and I believe there's some other wording in that particular section that disqualifies us: is used for a "charitable, educational, religious, benevolent or welfare purpose." We didn't think any of those things really fit us. We're not religious -- we are, but we're not using it for a religious purpose.

MR. WRIGHT: I suppose "welfare" has to be construed in the context of the other words. All right.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If there are no further questions . . .

MR. CAMERON: The city legal department, when we talked about this particular section with them, said "recreational" should have been used there if they intended that, and they felt that would be challenged.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Cameron and Mr. Shields.

Could we now have a motion from a member of the committee that we now go in camera? Moved by Mr. Musgrove. Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Opposed?

[The committee met in camera from 10:14 a.m. to 10:31 a.m.]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We now require a motion that all the Bills be reported as amended. Do you want a motion on each separate Bill?

MR. WRIGHT: Separate.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wright, all we do is in effect report to the Legislature that the Bills have been recommended by the committee.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. Well, I had a dissenting vote on one of them, which I need recorded. So they should be put separately now in the public . . .

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Chairman, would you call them all in except for 19?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, that would be satisfactory -- all the Bills except Pr. 19. Would someone move that . . .

MRS. HEWES: I'll move that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Edmonton Gold Bar. All those in favour, raise your hand, please. Opposed? Thank you.

Now, Bill Pr. 19. Someone move that? Calgary Glenmore. That's Bill Pr. 19 as amended. Opposed? I'm sorry. All those in favour first. Opposed? It's carried.

Now, I wonder if I could just ask the committee's approval. We've got a new Bill to hear, and we received another petition for a private Bill. We'll have to decide whether or not we want to waive the Standing Orders re advertising and let it proceed. So Mr. Clegg will perhaps . . .

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can give the background of this Bill. This is an application by a Mr. Jimmy W. Chow to permit him to be admitted to the Alberta Bar notwithstanding the fact that he is not yet a Canadian citizen. He is presently considered stateless, although he has resided in Alberta for about 10 years, presumably partly under a student visa and then later as a landed immigrant -- he is a landed immigrant -- and has completed his law degree and his articles, or he is just about to complete his articles. He would not be able to be admitted to the Alberta Bar unless legislation will pass because he is not yet a Canadian citizen. We have asked him to obtain a letter which would indicate the view of the Law Society of Alberta on his application, because it is a provision of the Legal Profession Act that you have to be a Canadian citizen to be a lawyer.

Mr. Chow has asked us if we can deal with this in this session -- whether or not it's passed of course -- and he is hoping we might agree to this, but not wishing to take us for granted, of course, has actually commenced his advertising, so his advertising will be finished by June 15. Because he has done that, it would be technically possible if the committee wished to extend the deadline for us to hear this application, although it will be very, very close to the end of the sitting.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, considering the gentleman in question has been in Canada for 10 years, I'm just wondering what is the sudden urgency of this matter.

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, we haven't had any specific indication as to why he didn't bring the application earlier in the sitting, but the urgency is that he is about to complete his articles and would not be able to practise as a lawyer when he completes his articles unless and until we approve this Bill. The Bill wouldn't otherwise be dealt with until 1988, and his urgency is to open the possibility of being able to practice law starting quite soon.

MR. DOWNEY: Am I to understand then, Mr. Chairman, that he has not yet completed his articles?

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, I do not yet have on file the exact date upon which he completes his articles.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, my recommendation then

would be that it be left over until the next session.

MRS. MIROSH: I have concerns as well. As the Member for Stettler indicated that the man has been here for 10 years, he knows the laws and he could have timed it so that he received his citizenship before he submitted this Bill. I think we have to abide by the laws, and I agree with the member that we should wait until the next session.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Chairman, that reflects my thinking as well. We don't know whether or not this gentleman has applied for Canadian citizenship. Has he?

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, he is not in a position to comply. I have an affidavit here or some background information which does not actually say when he commenced his articles except that he commenced them in 1986. He became a permanent resident of Canada on January 2, '87, which I presume means his landed immigrant status was confirmed at that time, and will be entitled to apply for Canadian citizenship in 1989. It appears that his articles will finish during 1987.

MR. WRIGHT: I take a different view, Mr. Chairman. It's very difficult for stateless people to go through the ropes, because they fall outside so many of the provisions. And while I agree that we shouldn't lightly make exceptions, it does appear that this might be an exceptional case and we should at least get it on the table and afford this man a chance of making his case before we turn him down. So I'm in favour of the way being cleared for him to present his petition.

MR. YOUNIE: I'm wondering, would this committee be available to hear a petition for a private Bill in the fall, or is it possible we might in fact leave him without a chance to practise his profession until next spring if we do not hear it now, making it a year before he can do so? Because you've already confirmed he can't get Canadian citizenship, so we might in fact be leaving him with up to a year before he can start making a living simply because of the rigamarole of changing his status from student visa to landed immigrant to citizen.

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Chairman, what kind of timetable are we looking at advertising this petition? Is that going to take some time before we can hear it or . . .

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chow has advised me of his advertising schedule, which he has commenced. As I said, he didn't wish to indicate that he was taking the committee's decision for granted but merely to make sure that the time delay didn't make it impossible. He will be finished by June 15, which is the second publication of the *Gazette*. So the advertising will be complete by June 15, and it will be possible, if this House is still sitting, for the committee to hear the petition on that date.

As to the Member for Edmonton Glengarry, even if this committee decided to meet after the House adjourned, the Bill of course could not be passed by the House unless it sits again, and nobody knows at this stage whether the House will sit again before next spring.

MR. YOUNIE: So there is potential for making it impossible for him to practise his profession for an entire year if we don't, say, waive the advertising. Also, in terms of the advertising, I

would just wonder how many people are going to consider themselves personally affected by his petition to be allowed to enter the Bar.

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, there is a point of principle which this committee will have to decide, and that is whether the principle in the Act, that being a lawyer and being an officer of the court is something which should require Canadian citizenship, is a dominant principle. That is something the committee would wish to look at, and the Law Society's opinions on that -- we hope to have some comment from them before the Bill is heard. I think we should certainly ask for some comment from them. I think the only question is whether or not the timing of this request is such that we should waive the deadline to allow the petition to be heard. It's difficult to prejudge the issue and the consequences of it.

There are some employment possibilities for lawyers who have law degrees and have taken their articles and are not yet members of the Bar.

MR. WRIGHT: As per Parliamentary Counsel.

MR. M. CLEGG: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Member for Vermilion-Viking.

DR. WEST: Yes, I would say that we should hold this out and over. I think it's presumptuous that he passes, number one, but even in that that's a conclusion we've already come to, there are, as Mr. Clegg has pointed out, possibilities that he can have employment until he gets his citizenship in 1989. And I think this sets quite a precedent. Although it's an inconvenience to the individual, he has to wait till his citizenship papers are done through the Citizenship Act of Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

MR. DAY: This question may be hypothetical or anticipatory, but could Mr. Clegg indicate to us what we might expect from other professions or people in similar situations if we were to pass this particular one?

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, there are very few professions which require Canadian citizenship as a qualification for membership. I'm not in a position to tell you which ones, but I believe most professions do not advert to citizenship as a qualification. I think the Member for Edmonton Strathcona may be able to . . .

MR. WRIGHT: And those that do usually say Canadian citizenship or acceptance as a permanent resident of Canada.

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, for instance, the whole area of guiding in this province is just one industry in itself. The hunting, lease grazing: that whole issue hangs on Canadian citizenship. That's just one in itself, and I was wondering if there were others similar to it that we could be opening a wide door to.

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, from a procedural point of view, the committee might consider that it might be a little unfair on the petitioner at this point in time to be considering the merits of his application if he's not here to argue it. I think the committee should consider whether it is fair to base its decision

not to hear the petition on the grounds of the petition itself. I think the issues before the committee should be whether the matter appears to be sufficiently urgent or whether there are reasonable grounds for the delay to hear the petition rather than on the basis of its merit itself.

MR. DOWNEY: Considering, Mr. Chairman, that to grant the plea of the petition would require waiving of the rules of this committee, in view of the fact that there are other employment opportunities for this individual, in view of the fact that he is educated in law, I would express that I don't see the urgency of the petition and I do not favour a waiving of the rules.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton Glengarry.

MR. YOUNIE: Thank you. I don't think it's uncommon for the committee to waive the stipulation for advertising. It's something that has happened on a sufficient number of occasions in the past that it's not a precedent setting or unusual activity for the committee to consider. Would that be correct?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you asking the Chairman or Mr. Clegg?

MR. YOUNIE: Or counsel. I can remember from last year that we did it at least once, I believe.

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, we've had a number of requests, and generally speaking they've been acceded to providing that the Bill is not heard before the advertising is completed. It is in fact quite a while since this committee recommended that the deadline be extended. We recently allowed a deadline to be extended to deal with a trust company Bill.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I'm beginning to feel very bad about this. We are prejudging all kinds of things without the man being here to answer.

Just last week -- or was it earlier this week -- the Assembly waived the advertising deadlines for a trust company. Well, goodness me, if ever there's a case of the promoters of a company knowing the law and being able to abide by it, there's a case. But because it's a big corporation, it goes through. Here's a man who may be unemployed and on social assistance because we just don't want to waive a deadline that's of no inconvenience to us. It's just not right. All the time we are paying out public money so people can have employment, he is not asking for that. He is just asking for the right to practise law, and we would certainly not grant him that right unless the Law Society were in favour of it. They vet these things pretty carefully. I think we're just standing on form without paying attention to the substance of the matter, to deny this little request, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, to get in here again. There's no guarantee that the Legislature will be sitting by the 15th, which is the soonest the advertising can be completed. If the Legislature is not sitting on the 15th, the petition cannot be considered by the House anyway. This is a very, very late request. On that basis again and speaking only to the item of urgency and practicality, I would suggest that if the opposition members

of this committee want this petition heard, they make a motion and we vote on it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GIBEAULT: Well, Mr. Chairman, as a member of this committee it distresses me to hear that people seem to be more concerned about procedure and form and rules than an individual's personal case here. I thought we were supposed to be a province that valued individual rights and freedoms and so on. I'm distressed that we can't seem to simply come to a quick consensus to hear this man's case and make our judgment. So I second the remarks of my colleague Mr. Wright and the others that we should hear this man's case.

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to mention the way in which this has been dealt with before by this committee, not with respect to a decision but the way in which it's been reached. This committee has not in the past turned down an application for an extension of a deadline without hearing from the petitioner directly. I have not really been able to present Mr. Chow's case today. I brought it forward to the committee thinking the committee might wish to deal with it today. But what we have done in the past is if the committee has been willing to accede to the request to extend the deadline without the petitioner coming to argue, they have done so. If they have felt that they were concerned about the delay or the lack of urgency, they have normally in the past, or always in the past in my experience, given the petitioner the opportunity to come before the committee and explain why he was late and why it is urgent, before they have made a final decision to say no. It's open to this committee to defer the question to the next meeting and to direct that Mr. Chow be given an opportunity to come and plead his case in person before the request is finally dealt with by the committee. That is an option that the committee might want to look at today.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is exactly what I was going to suggest. Perhaps we should table this item till next week to give you all an opportunity to just think about it and then make a decision.

MR. WRIGHT: I so move.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Moved by the Member for Edmonton Strathcona that we table this item until our next meeting. All those in favour . . . I'm sorry.

MR. WRIGHT: So that the petitioner can appear.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, let's just table the issue until next Wednesday and deal with it then. Is that agreeable to the committee? All those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Thank you.

If there is no other business that anyone has, we will . . . [interjection] I'm sorry. Did someone move we adjourn? Thank you.

[The committee adjourned at 10:49 a.m.]