



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 31st Legislature  
Second Session

Select Special Committee  
on Electoral Boundaries

Tuesday, June 9, 2026  
9 a.m.

Transcript No. 31-2-4

**Legislative Assembly of Alberta  
The 31st Legislature  
Second Session**

**Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries**

Lunty, Brandon G., Leduc-Beaumont (UC), Chair  
de Jonge, Chantelle, Chestermere-Strathmore (UC)  
Ganley, Kathleen T., Calgary-Mountain View (NDP)  
Gray, Christina, Edmonton-Mill Woods (NDP)  
Rowswell, Garth, Vermilion-Lloydminster-Wainwright (UC)\*  
Sawyer, Tara, Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills (UC)  
Wiebe, Ron, Grande Prairie-Wapiti (UC)

\* substitution for Tara Sawyer

**Support Staff**

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| Shannon Dean, KC      | Clerk   |
| Trafton Koenig        | Law Clerk   |
| Vani Govindarajan     | Parliamentary Counsel   |
| Philip Massolin       | Clerk Assistant and Executive Director of<br>Parliamentary Services |
| Nancy Robert          | Clerk of <i>Journals</i> and Committees                             |
| Abdul Bhurgri         | Research Officer  |
| Rachel McGraw         | Research Officer  |
| Warren Huffman        | Committee Clerk   |
| Jody Rempel           | Committee Clerk   |
| Aaron Roth            | Committee Clerk   |
| Rhonda Sorensen       | Manager of Corporate Communications                                 |
| Christina Steenbergen | Supervisor of Communications Services                               |
| Amanda LeBlanc        | Managing Editor of <i>Alberta Hansard</i>                           |

9 a.m.

Tuesday, June 9, 2026

[Mr. Lundy in the chair]

**The Chair:** All right. Good morning, everyone. I'd like to call this meeting of the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries to order and welcome everyone in attendance. My name is Brandon Lundy, MLA for Leduc-Beaumont and chair of the committee.

I will now ask that members and those joining the committee at the table introduce themselves for the record. We'll begin to my right.

**Mr. Wiebe:** Good morning, everyone. My name is MLA Ron Wiebe from Grande Prairie-Wapiti.

**Mr. Rowswell:** Garth Rowswell, MLA, Vermilion-Lloydminster-Wainwright.

**Ms Ganley:** Good morning. Kathleen Ganley, Calgary-Mountain View.

**Ms Gray:** Good morning. Christina Gray, MLA for Edmonton-Mill Woods.

**Ms Govindarajan:** Good morning. Vani Govindarajan, Parliamentary Counsel.

**Ms Robert:** Good morning. Nancy Robert, clerk of *Journals* and committees.

**Mr. Roth:** Good morning. Aaron Roth, committee clerk.

**The Chair:** All right. Thank you, everyone. We do have a member joining us online.

Please go ahead.

**Ms de Jonge:** Thank you, Chair. MLA Chantelle de Jonge for Chestermere-Strathmore.

**The Chair:** All right. For the record I will note the following substitution. MLA Garth Rowswell is substituting for the hon. Mrs. Sawyer.

A few housekeeping items before we turn to the business at hand. Please note that the microphones are operated by *Hansard*. Members participating remotely should ensure they are prepared to speak or vote when called upon, and videoconference participants are encouraged to have their cameras on if possible when speaking. Committee proceedings are being live streamed on the Internet and broadcast on Alberta Assembly TV. Please set your cellphones and other devices to silent for the duration of the meeting.

With that, I can move us on to approval of our agenda. Are there any changes or additions to the draft agenda? Seeing none, would someone like to make a motion to adopt the agenda? MLA Wiebe. Moved by MLA Wiebe that the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries approve the proposed agenda as distributed for its June 9, 2026, meeting. All those in favour, please say aye. Any opposed? All right. That motion is carried. Oh, sorry. Online?

**Ms de Jonge:** Thanks, Chair. I vote in favour.

**The Chair:** Thank you. That motion is carried.

Moving us on to approval of minutes from the previous meeting, are there any errors or omissions to note in the draft minutes? Seeing none, would someone like to make a motion? MLA Rowswell. Moved by MLA Rowswell that the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries approve the draft minutes as

distributed for its June 2, 2026, meeting. All those in favour, please say aye. Any opposed? And online? All right. Thank you. That motion is carried.

That takes us to agenda item 4, appointment of and service contracts for members of the independent advisory panel. Hon. members, in accordance with the committee's direction at its June 2, 2026, meeting, the committee received correspondence from both the Premier and the Leader of the Official Opposition identifying their nominees to serve as members of the independent advisory panel. The four nominees are: Dr. Gerard Kennedy of Edmonton, Brent Robinson of Okotoks, hon. Monte Solberg of Calgary, and Darwin Durnie of Sylvan Lake. I would now like to open the floor to any comments, questions, or motions in regard to this agenda item.

MLA Rowswell, please go ahead.

**Mr. Rowswell:** I'll move a motion, please.

**The Chair:** Go ahead.

**Mr. Rowswell:** Did you want to bring it up?

**The Chair:** Just getting that on the screen for you.

**Mr. Rowswell:** Okay. I'd like to move that the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries appoint the following individuals to the independent advisory panel: (a) on nomination of the Leader of His Majesty's Loyal Opposition, Dr. Gerard Kennedy and Brent Robinson, and (b) on nomination of the President of the Executive Council, hon. Monte Solberg and Darwin Durnie.

**The Chair:** All right. Thank you, MLA Rowswell, and confirm that is in fact your motion on the screen.

**Mr. Rowswell:** Yeah. You betcha.

**The Chair:** All right. Sounds great. Would you like a brief opportunity to speak to it?

**Mr. Rowswell:** Yeah. The individuals have been nominated as outlined in Government Motion 37 and all are highly qualified to conduct the important work. Appointing the nominees completes the first phase of the committee's work. We have full confidence in the ability of the nominees and the chair to complete their mandate in advance of the deadline of October 22, 2026.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MLA Rowswell.

Is there anyone else wishing to join the debate? MLA Ganley, please go ahead.

**Ms Ganley:** Yes, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to make a couple of comments here. Obviously, two members have been brought forward by the Leader of the Official Opposition, and I think that they're great; the members brought forward by the President of Executive Council, which, for those listening at home, is the Premier, I do have a few concerns. These concerns aren't about the individuals. I don't know these people personally, but I do think that we need to be mindful of a couple of things.

Of course, members will be aware that Mr. Solberg is a lobbyist. Specifically, he is registered to lobby the Minister of Finance. That is relevant in this context because the Minister of Finance is someone who is lobbying the Premier very hard about the loss of his riding under the current maps drawn by the commission. The concern here isn't about any individuals. Lawyers will be very familiar with managing conflicts within their practice, and that's not because they're bad people. Doctors, any sort of professional, will do this in terms of managing conflicts, and the reason for that is to protect

everyone, to protect the individuals, and to ensure that the public knows and understands that there is no conflict of interest.

I would say that with respect to this individual, he is a designated filer on lobbying efforts targeting the Premier's office and Treasury Board and Finance as recently as June 1, 2026. That's, well, just a matter of days ago. It's a pretty clear conflict of interest in this case in terms of determining a map that has a potential impact on those same government ministers and on the Premier and her ability to stay in her role. He's lobbying people who have a direct interest in the map, so what that creates are incentives in the wrong place, incentives to essentially engage in favour trading, in quid pro quos, and that's what generates the conflict of interest.

We hear conflict of interest, and people's eyes sort of glaze over, but this is really critical, right? When we find ourselves in a position where something which was done in a fair way, which has subsequently been thrown out, and now one of the individuals redrawing the map has an interest financially and otherwise in, you know, decisions made by the very people who want him to change the map, I think that that's a pretty big concern. Offering electoral boundaries advantageous to the UCP in exchange for preferential treatment for lobbying clients would be a real problem.

Again, I'm not saying that this is because the particular individual is problematic. I'm saying that because we set up rules around these things for a reason. I mean, at the end of the day, the Finance minister and the hon. Mr. Solberg's lobbying firm have not included – like, how do we know? How do we know when these boundaries come out that that has nothing to do with trading favours on the government dime? I think that the public deserves a little more reassurance than that.

With respect to Mr. Durnie – I am the only member on this committee from Calgary, so I feel that I should represent the people of Calgary. Mr. Durnie submitted, on the second round of the actual boundaries commission, the fair process that is designed to generate an outcome and in this case did, which the UCP has subsequently thrown out. He submitted a map that intentionally sort of carves Calgary up into pizza slices, these long, skinny slices designed specifically so that Calgary voters don't get to choose their representatives. The map is designed so that even if the majority of Calgarians were to vote NDP, that's not the outcome they get. They get an outcome where they get UCP MLAs regardless of how they vote. I think that that's really disrespectful to the voters in Calgary. I think that they deserve a chance to pick their own representatives, whatever that choice may be.

I think that this is incredibly problematic. Purportedly, he submitted this on his own behalf as a, quote, unquote, concerned citizen, along with another individual. It's a 103-page report, which proposed to draw boundaries for every district in the province in the 2025-2026 process.

**9:10**

The maps are highly problematic. Calgary – I mean, it's clearly American-style gerrymandering; there's just no way around it – they would take small slices of the city and then project them outwards towards rural areas, stretching all the way to the Rocky Mountains in some cases. Such maps are pretty clearly, I would say, contrary to the legislation, in particular section 14 of the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act and of the Constitution, which protects the right to vote, which is what is at issue here. Really, the only rationale for drawing the maps like that would be to silence voters in Calgary, so I think that that is incredibly problematic.

I don't know why, out of all the individuals living in the province, the President of Executive Council, the Premier, would choose to pick an individual that she knows holds these problematic views which are in contravention of both the Constitution and its right to

vote and the legislation which ought to govern this process although obviously we're here countermanding the legislation right now.

Yeah, this is incredibly problematic. There's no way to know where these maps came from or why he has this 103-page report, and I just think that the public deserves better. Those are my comments on that.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MLA Ganley.

Are there any other members wishing to join? MLA Gray, please go ahead.

**Ms Gray:** Thank you very much. In debating the motion of who has been nominated by the Leader of the Official Opposition and the Premier of our province, I think it's incredibly clear that the government's two appointees to the supposedly independent advisory panel confirm its plans to gerrymander the electoral maps. It's appointed a person who submitted gerrymandered maps to the legitimate Electoral Boundaries Commission, which, thankfully, were not followed. I will note that the submission was made after the interim, so Mr. Durnie did not submit it to the panel until the interim report came out, the unanimous interim report. I will say, thankfully, that the majority does not reflect the types of absolute dilution of anyone in Calgary or Edmonton.

These appointments that the government is putting forward really seem to be contrary to Government Motion 37, which required the committee to engage in independent advisors. In her letter the Premier said the "nominees bring strong qualifications and a commitment to fair and effective electoral representation," but their commitment and style of electoral representation is counter to what the Premier has said that they wanted to do through this process and through Government Motion 37.

From the beginning we've raised the red flag that the government is looking to secure future election victories by changing the map and putting themselves in a position where they cannot lose regardless of what voters actually want, very similar to things we've seen in the United States. Now we have one nominee who has submitted exactly the type of gerrymandered proposals, so the choice of that individual to be on this independent advisory panel was deliberately done by the government and, I think, speaks to their intentions. The second is someone who is a lobbyist, who works closely with the government, has donated heavily to the government, and will be, in theory, continuing to lobby the government while also working on this boundary commission process.

I think that that puts us in the dark and it puts the public in the dark as to what is being said in conversations and what might be happening. The worry is favour trading. The worry is that somebody who is reliant on the government for business and for contracts in the future, whether that person is making decisions independently for the Alberta public or for the best interests of future clients and current clients. That's why the conflict here is something that the Official Opposition really wants to raise and make sure we're aware of.

Both Mr. Durnie and Mr. Solberg have donated to the UCP. More importantly, we have one who is a lobbyist to the current government, and we have the other who made a submission that is entirely composed of what people fear for worst in this process and the way that this government has thrown out legislation and reinvented the wheel with Government Motion 37, a process, I will remind this committee and the public, which led to the Acting Chief Justice of our province declining to participate because of the irregularity of these concerns. It led to the Canadian Bar Association declining to participate. It led to the Alberta Law Society declining to participate.

Now we hear that through their nominees they are putting forward someone who believes that Calgary should be chopped up with boundaries going all the way from the Rocky Mountains to the other side of the province. The maps that were submitted are ridiculous, I think, and quite shocking and really tell an important story.

Drawing electoral boundaries is one of the most important things in our democracy. The process needs to be fair and independent so that the deck is not stacked in advance or in favour of the ruling party. When the electoral boundaries are rigged, voters can no longer effectively choose their representatives. Alberta voters have the right to a process they can have faith in, and we on the Official Opposition have said from the very beginning that there is very little faith in this process.

We've made clear from the beginning that we are here not because we believe this process is legitimate but because we're doing our best to try to keep Albertans informed about why this is illegitimate, why we think it's unconstitutional, and to try to improve it. You can see from the record of motions made and votes and decisions taken in our meeting minutes or if someone's following along in the committee that absolutely every effort by the Official Opposition to improve transparency or the process to give the public more insight into what's going on has been shut down.

Now, sending off to the independent advisory panel – and putting “independent” in the title does not make it independent, especially when the government is choosing people who have a clear agenda that is counter to what the government has looked at and is counter to what the independent boundary commission developed in their majority report, that the Legislative Assembly should have selected. The government has chosen a chair with recent partisan activities and now UCP appointees with glaring conflicts of interest.

As we debate this motion, I think it's incumbent to really flag that the only rationale for some of these actions is to silence voters in Calgary and to guarantee the UCP a victory in the next election. I express strong concerns and continue to have the deepest of suspicions as to what the government is doing, and at every turn the government is just giving us more evidence as to what their true agenda is and what they are working on doing. It's incredibly frustrating here in the committee and the work that we have done throughout.

Mr. Chair, I needed to register these concerns on the record before we vote on this motion.

**The Chair:** All right. Thank you, MLA Gray.

Are there any other members looking to join this debate?

Seeing none, I am prepared to call the question. I will start in the room. All those in favour of this motion, please say aye. Are there any opposed in the room? Online? All right.

That motion is carried.

All right. Are there any other additional discussion, motions, or questions related to this agenda item? MLA Wiebe, please.

**Mr. Wiebe:** Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to move that the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries direct the Legislative Assembly Office's communications to prepare a media release noting that the members of the independent advisory panel appointed by the committee at its June 9, 2026, meeting be distributed to media by 1 p.m. on Tuesday, June 9, 2026.

9:20

**The Chair:** Thank you, MLA Wiebe. I just want to make sure that is your motion up on the screen. Okay. Just one second. I think we might ask you to please just reread that one. I think there are a couple of different dates in there. Yeah. Please go ahead.

**Mr. Wiebe:** Okay. I move that

the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries direct the Legislative Assembly Office to prepare a media release noting the appointment of the members of the independent advisory panel by the committee at today's meeting to be distributed to the media by 1 p.m. today.

**The Chair:** All right. Thank you. Did you want to take a few minutes to speak to the motion?

**Mr. Wiebe:** Sure. I'll just add that issuing a formal public announcement through the LAO communications would ensure a co-ordinated, accurate, and consistent public communications process, promote transparency and public awareness respecting the work of the committee and the establishment of the independent advisory panel.

**The Chair:** All right. Thank you, MLA Wiebe.

Are there any other members wishing to join the debate on this motion?

Seeing none, I'm prepared to call the question. Starting in the room, all those in favour of this motion, please say aye. Any opposed? And online? All right.

That motion is carried.

I'm prepared to move us on to agenda item 5 unless there's anything else on agenda item 4.

Seeing none, we can move on to agenda item 5, which is compensation and service contract for the chair of the independent advisory panel. Members, at our previous meeting this committee passed a motion directing me as chair of the committee to negotiate a proposed remuneration agreement with the chair of the independent advisory panel and bring forward the proposed agreement for consideration at this meeting. As this committee has not yet made a decision regarding compensation for the chair, it may be appropriate to move in camera to discuss potential details of a remuneration agreement.

I saw MLA de Jonge's hand. I don't know if MLA Ganley was going to make the same motion, but MLA de Jonge, do you want to go ahead?

**Ms de Jonge:** Thank you so much, Chair. I'd like to move that the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries meet in camera to consider the chair's recommendations for remuneration for the chair of the independent advisory panel and that only the following remain in attendance: (a) required staff from the Legislative Assembly Office and (b) two staff members from each of the government caucus and the Official Opposition caucus designated in accordance with the committee's direction on May 4, 2026.

**The Chair:** All right. Thank you, MLA de Jonge. Just confirming that's your motion up on the screen.

**Ms de Jonge:** Looks right.

**The Chair:** Perfect. Did you want to speak briefly to your motion?

**Ms de Jonge:** Sure. I just think conducting these discussions in camera allows committee members to have a candid and a thorough discussion regarding the applicants and protects their privacy, as we did last meeting. It's consistent with established committee practice when considering remuneration and confidential information. So I'd like to – yeah – move that motion.

**The Chair:** Okay. Great.

Are there any other members wishing to join the debate on this motion? MLA Ganley, please go ahead.

**Ms Ganley:** Yeah. All I would like to say here is that I understand it's standard to go in camera in these instances. I do think that in light of everything surrounding this and the fact that this process is illegitimate in the first place, I have concerns about going in camera and about how much business is going to be handled in camera, but I suppose that is that. The government has the majority. I do think it's just worth pointing out one additional time that we don't need to be spending this money at all. We spent a million dollars on this process already, and now we're talking about spending another half million dollars. I wanted to put that on the record.

**The Chair:** Okay. Thank you, MLA Ganley.

Are there any other members wishing to join the debate?

All right. Seeing none, I'm prepared to call the question. Those in the room, all those in favour of the motion, please say aye. Any opposed? And online? All right. That motion is carried.

[The committee met in camera from 9:25 a.m. to 9:53 a.m.]

**The Chair:** Hon. members, the committee has now returned to the record.

Are there any comments, questions, or motions members would like to make in regard to this item of business? MLA Rowswell, please go ahead.

**Mr. Rowswell:** I'd like to move a motion if we can bring it up on the screen.

**The Chair:** Yeah. We'll get that on the screen for you.

**Mr. Rowswell:** Okay. I'd like to move that the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries approve remuneration for the chair of the independent advisory panel for conducting the business of the independent advisory panel as follows: (a) \$500 for each day the chair serves four hours or less, (b) \$750 for each day the chair serves more than four hours but less than six hours, (c) \$1,000 for each day the chair serves for six hours or more, and (d) \$5,000 for each calendar month in which the independent advisory panel chair serves.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MLA Rowswell. I assume you're confirming that is your motion on the screen?

**Mr. Rowswell:** Yes. It is.

**The Chair:** Perfect. If you had a couple of minutes to speak to your motion, please go ahead.

**Mr. Rowswell:** I think this is a standard motion approving remuneration for a chair of an independent advisory panel as outlined by the chair of the committee in camera, and approving this motion ensures that the chair, who is highly qualified and experienced, which everyone agrees with, is appropriately compensated. Now, the per-day meeting amounts are self-explanatory. The monthly stipend recognizes the ongoing responsibilities of an independent chair that exist outside of formal meetings, including preparation, reviewing materials, co-ordinating with administration, and providing strategic direction between meetings. That's ongoing work that a chair has that the others don't.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MLA Rowswell.

Are there any other members wishing to join? MLA Ganley, please go ahead.

**Ms Ganley:** Yes. I'm looking at the daily rates here, and there are a number of instances in which folks on different panels, for

instance human rights commissions, are compensated in a daily rate. The LAO is, I think, familiar with this. The \$5,000 additional a month is a little different to me, and I think in a moment of an affordability crisis and when we're redoing work that the government has already paid for, it's pretty shocking, if I'm being perfectly honest. I would love for anyone to flag for me an instance in which this has ever been done before, in which someone who is on a panel is getting a daily compensation rate and in addition to that they are getting this monthly compensation rate.

Mr. Chair, I mean, the mover of the motion said that this was standard. I don't think (d) is standard at all. I don't think the idea of having a monthly compensation rate in addition to daily compensation rates is normal. I also wonder what is meant by "calendar month" and whether that means that if someone were to sit in three days in a month – like, say we came back on September 3 or October 3 – the chair would be compensated \$5,000 for that month for three days. I think those are all big concerns.

I'd love to know sort of where this came from in terms of the negotiations. Like, look, I understand that this is someone who has experience and qualifications. I get that, but for instance someone who sits on another panel, like the other panellists on this panel or someone on the Human Rights Commission or something like that, also has those qualifications. So this additional \$5,000 seems kind of wildly out of line to me. I think that when we're talking about a process which was completed, which was already done, this is just the UCP coming back because they didn't like the results of the independent commission, because they got a little too independent. This is, honestly, a bit wildly inappropriate. So if someone could indicate to me any time this has ever been done before, I would love to know that.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MLA Ganley.

Are there any other members wishing to join our debate on this motion? MLA Gray, please go ahead.

**Ms Gray:** Thank you. Jumping in while we wait for the answers that my colleague has just asked for, I think I will say that in moving his motion, the member opposite talked about this being standard. It is not standard. Secondly, talked about the monthly stipend as being clearly needed for prep work and other things, but the daily compensation covers that. It says, "serves four hours or less," not "attends meetings." So if the chair is taking calls and does three hours of work, there is section (a) that will ensure he is paid. If he does more than that, there will be that that is paid. It would be helpful to get the response of where the monthly stipend practice has come from and if this is standard or not. Was this compensation used for the previous chair? I will note that there are five potential months, including this one, before that October 22 deadline that we are in theory working towards.

Looking at the compensation motion that's in front of us, I really just want to repeat that this process and what the committee is doing on Government Motion 37 is unnecessary, is illegitimate, and is a waste of money given we had a full majority report out of an incredibly intensive consultative process where it was – I think it was the first- or second-highest level of engagement we've ever had on a boundaries commission with public engagement. The Official Opposition has consistently opposed spending additional public funds on this pointless do-over just because the UCP has decided to reject the recommendations of the independent, nonpartisan Electoral Boundaries Commission. I think that we have said at previous meetings and we repeat again that the UCP should scrap this process and accept the independent commission's majority report because there's a complete lack of

trust, and this is a very costly exercise to enact gerrymandering, which is not in the public interest.

**10:00**

The question is: section (d), \$5,000 for each calendar month in which the independent advisory panel chair serves. Can the chair who negotiated this or the LAO who is supporting provide an example where compensation like this has been used before? The Legislative Assembly Office has been doing business like this for decades. If the chair can provide more information to the committee, that would be helpful as we make the decision on this motion.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MLA Gray. I would refer to the comments made by MLA Rowswell on the rationale for the stipend.

I'm happy to entertain additional thoughts from our committee members on this motion. MLA Ganley, please go ahead.

**Ms Ganley:** Yeah. Since it seems like no one can provide an answer to this question, I would say that it's reasonably clear, then, that this hasn't been done before.

I just want to point out for the record that, as my colleague indicated, each day the chair serves six hours or more – let's just imagine a scenario in which the chair works for six hours a day throughout the month of July. There are roughly 20 working days, so that would be \$20,000 for those 20 working days plus a \$5,000 stipend, so we're looking at \$25,000. I think most Albertans would consider that a bit egregious for someone that would be arguably not even working full-time. I mean, I'd certainly love to – anyway, I think the \$1,000 for each day is designed to cover it. I don't think the additional \$5,000 is necessary. I am really concerned that if we wind up in a situation where, say, this report's back on October 3, we wind up paying for June, July, August, September, and October plus the daily remuneration.

I just think this is a bit egregious, and I do have concerns since the government can't indicate any instance in which this has been done before. Like, we now have one person on the panel who is lobbying someone who has an interest in the outcome of the map, we have one person on the panel who submitted transparently gerrymandered maps, and now we have a chair whose compensation is over and above anything previously on the record with this extra \$5,000 a month, and no one can indicate to me any time that this has ever been done before. We are increasing the compensation for the chair in an instance in which the government has an interest. I mean, this entire process is illegitimate, but it just seems to go from bad to worse, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** All right. Thank you, MLA Ganley.

Are there any other members wishing to join? MLA Gray, something new to add, please?

**Ms Gray:** Only to suggest that the question being asked around the monthly stipend is one of the very most basic. We're just asking if you have examples where this has been done before or can explain, as the chair who negotiated it, why this was included. I realize you were not the mover of the motion, but you negotiated this, so very plainly I will just say that the Official Opposition is just asking: when has this been done before?

**The Chair:** All right. I appreciate your commentary and you joining in on the debate, and I was happy to hear from both sides on this, including some of the rationale from the mover and commentary from the Official Opposition, but if there is nothing new to add, I'm prepared to call the question on this motion.

We will start with those in the room. All those in favour of this motion, please say aye. Are there any opposed? And online? All right.

That motion is carried.

Hon. members, now that the committee has appointed the chair and the independent advisory panel members and agreed to the terms of their remuneration, the committee should consider terms of reference for the independent advisory panel members which could serve as guidelines to the panel in their role as appointees of the committee. A draft document proposing terms of reference was circulated to committee members prior to today's meeting.

Are there any questions, comments, or motions in regard to this item of business? MLA Wiebe, please go ahead.

**Mr. Wiebe:** Yeah. Thank you, Chair. I'd like to move that the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries approve the draft independent advisory panel terms of reference as distributed at the committee's June 9, 2026, meeting.

**The Chair:** All right. We're going to get that on screen for you, MLA Wiebe, shortly, I assume. MLA Wiebe, do you mind just confirming that is your motion as moved?

**Mr. Wiebe:** That is my motion.

**The Chair:** Perfect. If you'd like to take a few minutes to argue the motion, please go ahead.

**Mr. Wiebe:** Yeah. This motion directs the LAO to approve the terms of reference of the independent advisory panellists. It is an independent arm's-length process with clear rules in place to protect the integrity of the electoral boundaries review.

**The Chair:** All right. Thank you, MLA Wiebe.

Are there any other members wishing to join in on this debate? MLA Gray, please go ahead.

**Ms Gray:** Thank you. I'd like to make an amendment. Apologies; I'm just reviewing my language because we're doing a lot of this on the fly. I would like to amend, and specifically the amendment would make a change to the terms of reference document. Mr. Chair, is that something I can move now?

**The Chair:** Sorry. Just looking at the table here. Could the terms of reference themselves be changed through a motion? That would be in order?

**Ms Robert:** Yes, that would be in order. There are a few different ways to do it, but you could perhaps move that they be approved with the following exceptions or by adding the following things. That's okay.

**The Chair:** Okay. Thank you for that clarification.

Please go ahead, MLA Gray, with your amendment.

**Ms Gray:** Thank you. The motion be amended by adding the following. After "the mandate of the Panel as set out in Government Motion 37" I would like to add the phrase "taking note of the addendum to the majority report of the 2025-2026 Electoral Boundaries Commission."

**10:10**

**The Chair:** All right. Thanks for everyone's patience. Sounds like we have your amendment up on the screen now. MLA Gray, if you want to read it into the record and make sure that it's correct.

**Ms Gray:** Thank you. I move that the motion be amended by adding the following after “meeting”:

with the exception that the following be added in section 2 of the terms of reference . . .

By adding the following.

. . . after “the mandate of the Panel as set out in Government Motion 37”: “, taking note of the addendum to the majority report of the 2025-2026 Electoral Boundaries Commission.”

That is correct.

**The Chair:** Thank you. Please go ahead in support of your amendment.

**Ms Gray:** Thank you. This was intended to be a straightforward amendment, essentially just bringing into the terms of reference the language that has been used in the Legislature and throughout the debate, which is that this committee and the work of the independent advisory panel is happening because of the addendum to the majority report, so simply asking that in the terms of reference we make sure that the addendum is highlighted as being key to this process. This amendment simply matches what the Premier has said in a number of cases, what the Government House Leader has said, what this committee has also indicated.

I can’t imagine that there’s an objection, because we all know that the addendum to the majority report is the crux of why we are here. I include it in the terms of reference, though, because you’ll recall, Mr. Chair, that at the very first meeting of this committee we tried to get exact clarity on what the independent advisory panel will do and use to influence and inform its work, and specifically to really try and drill down into: will this new independent panel start redrawing the maps from scratch or, based off the majority, with the influence of the addendum, is that going to be their starting point?

I think it’s important that we include this in the terms of reference, and I genuinely believe that this mirrors the understanding that the government has put out and the way they’ve tried to frame the work that’s happening. So I don’t think this is groundbreaking, but I do think it’s really important to cover some of these basics and make sure we’re really clear in the terms of reference.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MLA Gray.

Is there anyone wishing to join the debate? MLA Rowswell, please go ahead.

**Mr. Rowswell:** Yeah. Government Motion 37 established an independent advisory panel for the purpose of conducting an independent review and providing its own advice and recommendations to the committee. As an order of the Legislature Government Motion 37 carries significant weight, and this amendment attempts to provide different, more restrictive direction. The purpose of this committee is not to direct the work of the panel, as the opposition is trying to do with this amendment.

**The Chair:** All right. Thank you, MLA Rowswell.

MLA Ganley, please go ahead.

**Ms Ganley:** Yeah. Mr. Chair, with the greatest of respect, that’s absolutely absurd. The government’s song has been over and over again on this matter that the only reason we’re doing this is because of the addendum of the chair. They have misquoted the addendum of the chair repeatedly and suggested that it was an intentional attempt to get it to move to 91 seats, which clearly it was not. It was the words of a chair desperate to avoid a violation of the rights of the people of this province, the right to vote in specific, and to suggest that somehow putting us within the four walls of what the Government House Leader has said, what the Premier has said, is ridiculous or is offside.

Mr. Chair, there is, in my view, very little worse than a government who deliberately uses legalese and complicated language to try to obfuscate what they are doing from the public, and it is ridiculous. My colleague has moved a motion to simply bring this within the words of what the Premier has said. She has said on the record, and I can find the quote here – I’m quoting the Premier from *Hansard*, April 21: “It will be [a] new commission” – that’s not entirely accurate – “that will take the direction from the Legislature, which includes looking at the majority report [based on] . . . the modifications proposed by the judge in his addendum.” So we are simply trying to get the members to stick within the addendum, to stick within what the Premier has said. She’s the leader of your party, not the leader of my party, so, yeah, I think that the member’s comments are absurd, and I think that everyone should support this just, like, most basic amendment to make this process a little bit less egregious.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MLA Ganley.

Are there any other members wishing to speak to the amendment?

**Ms Gray:** I would simply call us back to the comments of our chair at this committee at the first meetings, when we were trying to get clarity on exactly how the independent advisory panel would proceed, and the chair recommended that the committee could decide about these issues and address some of the ambiguities in Government Motion 37. We should be providing clarity to the panellists now, before their work gets under way, and making clear that they are working within that addendum and specifically recommendation 5.

10:20

Note that my language is not even overly restrictive. It is simply asking the terms of reference to include that our independent advisory panel, which is not independent but that is its title, take note of the addendum to the majority report. It is incredibly telling that the government members don’t even want to take note to the addendum. I can only interpret that their intention is to gerrymander entirely, to turn Calgary into a pizza with pie slices out to Rocky Mountain House on one side and the Saskatchewan border on the other perhaps. It’s ridiculous and, in this case, I think that the government members would be better served to just accept this. The panel members can take note of the addendum and continue about their work, and we get a little bit more clarity. I genuinely think that to do otherwise is for the government to admit that their intention is to gerrymander and to redraw the maps from scratch. It’s incredibly transparent at this point.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MLA Gray.

Are there any other members wishing to jump in?

All right. Seeing none, I’m prepared to call the question on the amendment. For those in the room, we are voting on this amendment. All those in favour, please say aye. Are there any opposed? And online?

That amendment has been defeated.

**Ms Gray:** On the record, please, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Yeah. All right. A recorded vote has been requested. We’ll start with those in the room who are in favour of the amendment. Please raise your hands.

**Mr. Roth:** Hon. Ms Gray, hon. Ms Ganley.

**The Chair:** All right. Those in the room who are opposed to the amendment, please raise your hands.

**Mr. Roth:** Mr. Wiebe, Mr. Rowswell.

**The Chair:** For those members participating remotely, please turn on your cameras and microphones if you wish to vote. When the committee clerk calls your name, please indicate whether you are in favour or against the amendment.

**Mr. Roth:** Ms de Jonge.

**Ms de Jonge:** Against.

**Mr. Roth:** Mr. Chair, total for the amendment, two; total against, three.

**The Chair:** All right. Thank you.  
That amendment has been defeated.

We can continue deliberations on the main motion. Is there anyone else wishing to join the debate? MLA Ganley, please go ahead.

**Ms Ganley:** Yes. I, too, have a motion, Mr. Chair. Sorry; just let me pull up the language here. I am looking to have the committee, essentially,

approve the terms of reference amended as follows . . .

What I am looking to do is

. . . remove section 3 as it currently reads,

which is the confidentiality. It says that “Panel members shall treat as confidential all information and data received or produced in the course of their duties and must not disclose such information except (a) as required to carry out the work of the Panel, including with other Panel members and authorized support staff, or (b) to report to the Committee in accordance with Government Motion 37.”

It would be removing all of that language  
and replacing it with:  
3. . . .

And it’s titled Publicity.

The independent advisory panel members must disclose to the committee all information received by the panel members in the course of their duties, and the committee shall make that information publicly available except for portions of the information that contain the following: (a) personal contact information other than the name and municipality of the submitter, (b) personal information about the identifiable third party, (c) profane or obscene language.

I guess that can remain confidential.

The purpose of this particular motion is just to put back on the record that which should be on the record in the first place. I just want to be really clear that the point here is that the panel’s work should not be being conducted behind closed doors.

**The Chair:** MLA Ganley, happy to let you motivate, but I just wanted to confirm that that is your amendment up on the screen.

**Ms Ganley:** Just double-checking the language here. Yes, that’s correct.

**The Chair:** Perfect. Please go ahead and continue with your motivation.

**Ms Ganley:** Yeah. Essentially what this does is – what was in there previously would have required the members of the panel to keep confidential information which should very clearly be public. I will point out that the commission’s hearings were on the record. You can get a record of what was presented to the commission, how they made their decisions.

This is different. This is different than the commission. We have a normal process. The normal process is fair. Albertans have input. It respects their right to vote, and there is an outcome, and might I remind everyone that the majority of the members in the fair process are appointed by the UCP, by the government. The

government just seems to feel that their chair got a little too independent in this case because – well, for whatever reasons.

This is a redo of that process. It is already incredibly questionable, incredibly sketchy. It is an illegitimate process, but this change is designed to at least, I guess, make it public so the panel’s work can’t be conducted behind closed doors.

The UCP’s proposed term on confidentiality, the one which I am striking, would keep secret attempts by outsiders to influence the panel’s work. Not only is it the case that the UCP voted down our motion to require the panel to report to the committee instances in which someone attempted to interfere inappropriately in their work; now the UCP want to bring forward terms of reference that would make it impossible for them to tell us if someone tried to interfere inappropriately. That’s highly problematic. It’s completely inappropriate. Like, again, sunlight, the best disinfectant, is desperately needed in this case.

This respects that some information is confidential. I get that some information is confidential, but attempts to interfere with the panel shouldn’t be confidential. The public should absolutely know about them.

Mr. Chair, need I remind you that we already have evidence of exactly that. We had a commission that, for the first time in ages, worked incredibly hard to get a unanimous interim report. Then the final report looks like the interim report as one would expect, a lot like it, anyway, with some tweaks for feedback that they received from people. That’s exactly how the process is supposed to work. Then suddenly we find ourselves with this minority map, maps that fell out of the clear blue sky. Who knows who drafted them? How did they get the information to draft them? Good questions all.

We also have members of the Premier’s staff circulating the minority maps before the report was released. One might wonder where they got them. We have members of the Premier’s staff circulating them. We have MLAs, UCP MLAs, presenting to the commission, submitting portions of what turned into the minority maps with government classified notifications on them, with a restricted notification that clearly would strongly suggest that these were produced within the government.

Yeah. Mr. Chair, this has been an incredibly problematic process. We clearly have indications of previous attempts to intervene. Future attempts to intervene should be public. I think that’s incredibly basic, and I would urge all members to vote in favour of this.

10:30

**The Chair:** All right. Thank you, MLA Ganley.

Is there anyone else wishing to join in the debate on this amendment?

**Ms Gray:** I’ll speak briefly just to support this amendment. Instead of including a confidentiality section in the terms of reference, I fully support something that will make sure that the panel’s work is not conducted behind closed doors, that attempts to influence and information that is created through this process and discovered through this process should be publicly shared.

We have made this case at multiple meetings, that we need to have the clarity and we need to improve trust. We need to have line of sight. And now we have the government appointing lobbyists and others who have submitted gerrymandered maps to the previous process as panel members. This amendment really just adds some sunshine, as my colleague said, adds some light, adds some transparency, and I will be supporting it.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MLA Gray.  
That amendment is defeated.

**Ms Gray:** A recorded vote, please.

**The Chair:** A recorded vote has been requested. We'll start with those in the room who are in favour of the amendment. Please raise your hands.

**Mr. Roth:** Hon. Ms Gray, hon. Ms Ganley.

**The Chair:** All right. Those in the room who are opposed to the amendment, please raise your hands.

**Mr. Roth:** Mr. Wiebe, Mr. Rowswell.

**The Chair:** For those members participating remotely, please turn on your cameras and microphones if you wish to vote. When the committee clerk calls your name, please indicate whether you are in favour or against the amendment.

**Mr. Roth:** Ms de Jonge.

**Ms de Jonge:** Opposed.

**Mr. Roth:** Mr. Chair, total for the amendment, two; total against, three.

**The Chair:** All right. Thank you.  
That amendment is defeated.

We can continue our debate on the main motion. Are there any other members wishing to join that debate?

Seeing none, I am prepared to call the question on the main motion, and we'll start with those in the room. All those in favour of the motion, please say aye. Are there any opposed? And online? All right.

That motion is carried.

**Ms Gray:** Recorded, please.

**The Chair:** All right. A recorded vote has been requested. Those in the room who are in favour of the motion, please raise your hands.

**Mr. Roth:** Mr. Wiebe, Mr. Rowswell.

**The Chair:** All right. Those in the room who are opposed to the motion, please raise your hands.

**Mr. Roth:** Hon. Ms Gray, hon. Ms Ganley.

**The Chair:** All right. For those members participating remotely, please turn on your camera and microphone if you wish to vote. When the committee clerk calls your name, please indicate whether you are in favour or against the motion.

**Mr. Roth:** Ms de Jonge.

**Ms de Jonge:** In favour of the motion.

**Mr. Roth:** Mr. Chair, total for the motion, three; total against, two.

**The Chair:** All right. Thank you.  
That motion is carried.

Are there any other questions or comments related to this agenda item? Seeing not, I'm prepared to – oh, sorry. MLA Rowswell, go ahead.

**Mr. Rowswell:** I'm wondering, given the time, if we should maybe ask for an extension of 30 minutes.

**The Chair:** Sure. I guess we can give ourselves that runway if that makes sense. We have a request to extend our meeting time by half

an hour to 11:30. Does anyone oppose that request? All right. Seeing no objections, our meeting time will now end at 11:30.

All right. I can turn us to next steps. This is agenda item 6. In accordance with Government Motion 37 this committee is responsible for considering requests of the independent advisory panel for support and access for information to carry out its mandate.

Starting here on agenda item 6, I see MLA Wiebe's hand. Do you have any motions or commentary to make, MLA Wiebe?

**Mr. Wiebe:** Yes, Chair. Thank you. I'd like to move that the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries (a) authorize the chair of the committee on behalf of the committee to communicate with the chair of the independent advisory panel on procedural items laid out in Government Motion 37 clause C(f), including budget and resources, so that the panel can conduct its work as laid out in Government Motion 37 clause (e), and (b) direct any correspondence between the chair and the committee on behalf of the committee with the chair of the independent advisory panel that falls outside the scope of subsection (a) that requires the chair to forward the correspondence to the committee for a response to be answered by the committee.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MLA Wiebe. I think we're pulling it up on screen. Okay. I think we're just making a quick grammatical – lots of faith in MLA Wiebe. I'm sure he read it correctly. We'll just make sure it matches what's on our screen.

Maybe while we're waiting for that, MLA Wiebe, did you want to provide some commentary?

**Mr. Wiebe:** Sure. Thank you, Chair. This motion makes it clear that the chair of the committee can communicate with the chair of the panel on procedural items, including budget and resources. While the chair already is empowered to communicate with the chair of the independent advisory panel via *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, this motion reinforces that with respect to Government Motion 37. This motion does not give the chair the ability to make decisions on his own. Government Motion 37 is clear that only the committee has the ability to make decisions.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Okay. Thank you, MLA Wiebe.

I think we're moments away from it popping back up in the correct grammatical form, so I will open the floor for discussion on this motion.

**Ms Ganley:** Since my similar motion will now be out of order, I fortunately happen to have an amendment. The amendment would read as follows: that

the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries amend the motion: "(b) in respect of all communications that are within the scope of clause (a), require the chair to provide a copy to all committee members of all written correspondence and report to the committee members all conversations, and."

The "and" is because, obviously, there'll be a final section after it. Did you want me to wait for that to come . . .

**The Chair:** Just pulling it up right now.

**Ms Ganley:** Okay. The purpose here is – and I'm well aware that the chair is authorized to communicate. I think the concern here is that because in this case the chair is, shall we say, not an entirely neutral observer and is, in fact, a UCP MLA, I think it is necessary to ensure that communications be on the record, that other members of the committee be aware of all communications.

Again, I will remind us that the history on this is that we had a unanimous interim map. First time in years. Both sides agreed on a

fair outcome, which is – I mean, let’s face it – rarely the case these days. The outcome was based on submissions of the public. The final maps looked a lot like an interim map with adjustments, and then we got these minority maps. There are questions, especially arising from Premier staff having them before they were published. There were questions arising from the fact that MLAs submitted them watermarked, as though they were government documents. That’s incredibly problematic. It raises suspicions.

**10:40**

All we’re asking here is that if there is indirect communication between a partisan MLA and the chair of a committee that is supposed to be doing something independent – obviously, it isn’t actually. Again, we are here, despite the illegitimacy, trying to make the process better. All that we’re asking is that those comments be made in public. Mr. Chair, I might say that if you’re not embarrassed of your actions, you shouldn’t be embarrassed to put them on the public record. Those are my comments.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MLA Ganley.

Are there any other members wishing to join the debate on this amendment?

**Ms Gray:** I support my colleague’s amendment. She originally intended to move a motion that would have very clearly asked that all communication between the panel and the chair be shared with all members of the committee because there are multiple parties represented on this committee. In the absence of being able to move that very clear motion, I think this amendment is incredibly reasonable. I think it’s important to be able to share with the committee members what’s happening. We’ve been consistent from meeting one until now, that we need to be aware and informed about what the panel is requesting, what assistance it claims to need, and what is happening with the process. I think it would be best if we’re all kept in the loop on what decisions are being made because it is in the public interest to make sure we have that level of transparency.

If government members do not support this amendment, I would be very interested to hear examples of what communication with the panel they see our chair having that is not disclosed to us as committee members. More information on that would be very helpful at this point.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MLA Gray.

Are there any other members wishing to join the debate on this amendment?

All right. Seeing none, I’m prepared to call the vote on the amendment. We’ll start with those in the room. Those who are in favour of the amendment, please say aye. Those in the room who are opposed to the amendment, please say no. And online?

That amendment has been defeated.

**Ms Gray:** Recorded, please.

**The Chair:** All right. A recorded vote has been requested. Those in the room who are in favour of the amendment, please raise your hands.

**Mr. Roth:** Hon. Ms Gray, hon. Ms Ganley.

**The Chair:** All right. Those in the room who are opposed to the amendment, please raise your hands.

**Mr. Roth:** Mr. Wiebe, Mr. Rowswell.

**The Chair:** All right. For those members participating remotely, please turn on your camera. When the committee clerk calls your

name, please indicate whether you are in favour or against the amendment.

**Mr. Roth:** Ms de Jonge.

**Ms de Jonge:** Against.

**Mr. Roth:** Mr. Chair, total for the amendment, two; total against, three.

**The Chair:** All right. Thank you.

That amendment has been defeated.

We can continue discussions on the main motion. Is there any other member wishing to join the debate on that motion?

Seeing none, happy to call that question. We’ll just pop it back up on the screen again. A bit of a lag going this morning. All right. There we go. All those in the room who are in favour of the motion, please say aye. Any opposed? And online?

That motion is carried.

All right. We’re still on agenda item 6, next steps. Members, in accordance with Government Motion 37 this committee is responsible for considering requests of the independent advisory panel for support and access to relevant information to carry out its mandate. Last week we received a request from the chair of the panel, Justice O’Ferrall, requesting that the Legislative Assembly Office and the office of the Chief Electoral Officer provide support to the panel.

Does anyone have any comments or motions they wish to make in this regard? MLA Rowswell, please go ahead.

**Mr. Rowswell:** Yeah. I’d like to move a motion.

**The Chair:** Please proceed.

**Mr. Rowswell:** Okay. I’d like to move that

the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries direct the Legislative Assembly Office to provide administration support to the independent advisory panel for the purpose of the panel carrying out its mandate.

**The Chair:** All right. We’re popping that up on the screen for you just so you can confirm that is your motion. Looks like it’s there now. Perfect.

If you’d like to speak to it, please go ahead.

**Mr. Rowswell:** Yeah. I just think it’s a request. It’s good for the LAO to in a nonpartisan way help them out in supportive ways. The Legislative Assembly Office already possesses the expertise, the infrastructure, the procedural knowledge to help them out with this, so I think that it’d be a prudent thing to approve the request from the chair.

**The Chair:** All right. Thank you, MLA Rowswell.

Are there any other members wishing to join in the debate on this motion?

All right. Seeing none, I am prepared to call this question. Starting with those in the room, all those in favour of the motion, please say aye. Any opposed? Online? All right.

That motion is carried.

Are there any other additional motions? MLA Rowswell, please go ahead.

**Mr. Rowswell:** I’d like to move that

the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries request the office of the Chief Electoral Officer to provide advice, information, and assistance to the independent advisory panel for the purpose of the panel carrying out its mandate.

**The Chair:** Okay. Perfect. Please go ahead if you wish to make . . .

**Mr. Rowswell:** Yeah. Very similar reasons, I think. You know, they'll probably need the help and to work with them, and they have the expertise on providing information that would be useful to the panel, so I think it'd be a good thing to support them in this way.

**The Chair:** All right. Thank you, MLA Rowswell.

Are there any members wishing to join in on this debate?

Seeing none, happy to call this question. All those in favour in the room, please say aye. Any opposed? All right. And those online?

That motion is carried.

We can continue on with our agenda item here. Do any other members wish to make any motions? MLA Gray, please go ahead.

**Ms Gray:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Yes. I would like to move a motion, submitted to the clerk as motion 9, I believe, that the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries require the chair of the independent advisory panel to provide the committee with a summary of the independent advisory panel's activities every four weeks from the date of the passage of this motion, which includes the following information: (a) a list of the date and duration of each of the independent advisory panel's deliberation meetings; (b) a list of any external discussions or consultations held by the independent advisory panel, including the names and positions of the stakeholders with whom the panel has consulted; (c) a list of all submissions and documents requested by or received by the panel.

**The Chair:** All right. I think we do have that up on the screen. Member Gray, just want to confirm that is your motion.

**Ms Gray:** That looks accurate to what I read. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Okay. Yeah. Please go ahead and support.

**Ms Gray:** Thank you very much. In this meeting so far we have discussed the remuneration for the chair, which, I think, we've identified was decidedly unstandard. The government was not able to provide examples of where that plan has come from. We've also discussed that Albertans do not trust the legitimacy of this process. By having the panel report regularly to the committee, we can make sure what activities the panel is doing, what rules are being followed, who is being consulted. It will also provide us with an opportunity to course correct or respond to the panel if it identifies concerns.

My motion is intended to minimize the likelihood of secret communication between panellists and unknown third parties or political staff by requiring the panel to disclose proactively who is contacting it, who it's meeting with. Obviously, Mr. Chair, you will recall that we have raised similar concerns before. We have attempted previous motions, which the government has not supported. This is entirely in the name of transparency and procedural fairness and to try to eliminate or reduce perceived influence in this process.

**10:50**

I also note, Mr. Chair, that at this meeting, unlike previous meetings to an extent, the government members seem to be just not responding to things, not putting on the record their position other than the recorded vote, which the Official Opposition has to force. I think that the government should at the very least be able to articulate its position on so many of these issues. It's incredibly frustrating, not just for me as a committee member but for Albertans who are watching this process because it seems so destructive to our democracy, how these decisions are being made.

Again, I will just say that this motion is an attempt to bring a little bit more insight and awareness to us about what the panel is doing. It does not strike me as onerous. I believe this information is generally logged anyways, given the detailed information that you can find in the current boundaries report, and I hope that all members will support this level of transparency.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MLA Gray.

MLA de Jonge, I see your hand. Please go ahead.

**Ms de Jonge:** Thank you so much, Chair. I just want to speak to the motion. You know, first, the independent advisory panel has been given quite a significant and very time-sensitive mandate under Government Motion 37. I think that the members of that panel should be focused on conducting their review, their analysis, and their final report preparation rather than preparing these reoccurring reports to the committee every four weeks. I think that that sort of regular reporting on internal deliberations and activities of an independent advisory panel creates unnecessary oversight of a body that's intended to conduct its review independently, and I think that those interim activity reports create this unnecessary administrative burden and really divert time and resources away from their substantive work, that the members opposite spoke to earlier.

The members do know at the conclusion of its work the independent advisory panel will provide its final report to the committee, and that will include a summary of panel activity, so when that report is submitted, all members of this committee can review the panel's findings and the overall work in a comprehensive manner. For those reasons, I'll be voting against this motion.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MLA de Jonge.

MLA Ganley, please go ahead.

**Ms Ganley:** Yeah. I have multiple comments, but I think the first thing I'd like to do is ask of the chair and the table: it's my understanding that the things that are listed here would be generated in the standard course, in any event, for these sorts of deliberations.

**The Chair:** I might ask the table to weigh in.

**Ms Robert:** Thanks, Mr. Chair. This is a bit of a unique situation. I think I've been saying that over and over again. This type of committee has never been struck before, so I don't know who will be writing the panel's report. I understand that the EBC had hired a report writer. It wasn't the Legislative Assembly Office that wrote it, so I don't think I can speak to what might be included, unfortunately. Sorry.

**The Chair:** Thank you to the table.

MLA Ganley, do you wish to – yeah. Go ahead.

**Ms Ganley:** Yeah. That is fair. This is a very nonstandard process, as has been noted multiple times by the Legislative Assembly Office, by the Chief Justice, by the Canadian Bar Association, by the Law Society, by pretty much everyone who knows about process things. So yeah, it is a new thing. I mean, generally these are things that aren't unusual. The date and duration of each of the independent advisory panel's deliberation meetings: like, they're going to have to know that to bill anyway, right? They're paid based on one rate for under four hours, one rate for four to six, one rate for over six hours, so they're going to have to track and send that anyway, that list of external discussions or consultations.

Honestly, Mr. Chair, I am absolutely flabbergasted that any member of this Assembly would suggest that this shouldn't be on the record. This is a panel which is recommending boundaries for MLAs

to draw. The right to vote is fundamentally affected. We're spending half a million dollars to redo work that was already done, and they're saying that spending a few extra minutes to report what discussions occurred, what submissions or documents were received is somehow egregious. This is obviously information that's going to have to go through the LAO somewhere, and I think it is absolutely egregious that any Member of the Legislative Assembly, any member of this committee would suggest that the public shouldn't have access to these documents, especially when we already have indications of government members, of Premier's staff trying to interfere with the drawing of electoral boundaries.

We already have an illegitimate process. This is, I would say, one of the most basic requests that could be made. To suggest that the oversight is unnecessary: it is necessary oversight, extremely necessary, demonstrated by the history of this matter, demonstrated by the fact that members of this Assembly should respect the right of Albertans to vote. Oversight by the public is what we do here. We call it democracy. So to suggest that that is unnecessary is extremely problematic.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MLA Ganley.

MLA Rowswell, please go ahead.

**Mr. Rowswell:** Yeah. You know, all this information is going to be in the final report, so all this motion is doing is having it every four weeks, which just adds more responsibility and time. Like, we're going to get the final report, and all this information that you're asking for will be in there, so I think it doesn't serve any purpose on the ongoing basis.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MLA Rowswell.

MLA Gray, please go ahead.

**Ms Gray:** I'm surprised that MLA Rowswell is stating as fact something that the LAO obviously keeps telling us is a unique process, Government Motion 37. We've never seen this before, so I think getting this information every four weeks and being able to check in, to have an idea of what's going on, is absolutely appropriate.

I will be supporting the motion that I have moved. I suggest that all members should strongly consider supporting this because the record right now from government members is to vote against every single effort and even the minutest level of transparency. If we accept the premise of MLA Rowswell that we can anticipate seeing all of this in the future, why not see it as the process is developing, again, to give us that opportunity to minimize any secret communications and to give us an opportunity to course correct or respond if there are concerns.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MLA Gray.

Are there any other members wishing to join?

If not, happy to call the question. Those in the room who are in favour of this motion, please say aye. All right. Is there anyone in the room who is opposed to the motion? Please say no. We'll go online. All right.

That motion is defeated.

**Ms Gray:** Recorded, please.

**The Chair:** A recorded vote has been requested. Those in the room who are in favour of the motion, please raise your hands.

**Mr. Roth:** Hon. Ms Gray, hon. Ms Ganley.

**The Chair:** Those in the room who are opposed, please raise your hand.

**Mr. Roth:** Mr. Wiebe, Mr. Rowswell.

**The Chair:** For those participating online, please turn your camera on, and when the committee clerk calls your name, please indicate whether you're in favour or against the motion.

**Mr. Roth:** Ms de Jonge.

**Ms de Jonge:** Opposed.

**Mr. Roth:** Mr. Chair, total for the motion, two; total against, three.

**The Chair:** Okay.

That motion is defeated.

Is there any other discussion or motions in relation to this agenda item? MLA Gray, please go ahead.

**Ms Gray:** Thank you so much. Directly out of the debate on the last motion – if the clerk can bring up that motion that was just up on the screen, we can use that as the starting point. I would like to move a motion that keeps (a), (b), and (c) the same, that starts with the same opening that “the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries require the chair of the independent advisory panel.” Let's change that to: “that the final report of the independent advisory panel include,” and then just have those three things.

11:00

**The Chair:** Sorry to interrupt, MLA Gray. This portion of our agenda was not waived, so you would need to request majority support.

**Ms Gray:** Okay.

MLA Rowswell, you just said that all of these things will be in the final report. You stated that as fact here in the committee. I am proposing to move a motion that just simply says that

the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries require that the final report of the independent advisory panel include . . .

and then these three things. That's it, just a motion to do exactly what you announced would happen, in particular because we heard from the LAO that they can't say what will or won't happen. Government Motion 37 is completely open to interpretation, and our attempts to try to clarify what's going on seem to be shut down at every turn.

My request to this committee is to support – okay. The government members defeated my last motion and as part of the argument said that it's all going to be in the final report anyway. All right. Let's move a motion and make sure it's all in the final report anyway.

**The Chair:** I'm happy to give you a little runway on getting a chance to present some of your arguments, but before that we do need to consider a vote on whether to allow for this motion to come from the floor. This is a majority vote. All those in favour of permitting this motion, please say aye. Any opposed, please say no. Online?

Permission is defeated.

Okay. Are there any other motions under this agenda item? MLA Ganley, please go ahead.

**Ms Ganley:** Yes, Mr. Chair. I will move on to the next motion though I do have to say that members stating on the record that it'll be in the final report and then refusing to allow a vote on a motion that would put it in the final report kind of tells us everything we need to know about their intentions. It's highly problematic and absurd to defend it on that basis and then refuse to back up your words with actions. It's absolutely egregious.

I would like to move us on to motion 10, which was previously submitted because apparently when it comes to things the opposition wants to do, we have different rules. Motion 10 is that

the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries requests that the independent advisory panel's recommendations, including any maps, comply with clause C(e)(ii)(B) of Government Motion 37 by adhering to the recommendations provided in recommendation 5 of the addendum to the final report of the 2025-2026 Electoral Boundaries Commission report that "restoration of the two electoral divisions should:

- (a) have no impact on any electoral division in Airdrie or containing territory south of Airdrie's southernmost border, with the exception of Drumheller-Stettler;
- (b) have no impact on any electoral division north of the North Saskatchewan River in Edmonton;
- (c) result in all electoral divisions south of the North Saskatchewan River in Edmonton reverting to the map outlined in the interim report, with the possible exception of including Nisku in Edmonton-South East if the all-party committee wishes to restore Leduc and Beaumont being in the same electoral division; and
- (d) consider restoring an electoral division mostly consisting of Clearwater County and western Mountain View County as an electoral division with [section] 15(2) status under the Act."

That is what the motion reads, and I'll just wait for your guidance before I speak to it.

**The Chair:** Yes. We have it on screen. Just confirming that is correct.

**Ms Ganley:** Yes. That looks to be correct.

**The Chair:** Okay. Perfect. Yeah. Please go ahead and speak to it.

**Ms Ganley:** Okay. Mr. Chair, I just want to be really clear that I am moving this motion. We're not talking about good here; we're talking about bad and worse. So this whole process, Government Motion 37, this committee: it's cheating. It's a question of degree. What this motion is attempting to do is to hold the government to their word. On April 21 the Premier said, and I am quoting *Hansard* here:

It will be the new commission that will take the direction from this Legislature . . .

Obviously, I think she meant the advisory panel, which reports to the MLA committee, because there is no new commission, but I think we all understand what she's referring to.

. . . which includes looking at the majority report as the base, with the modifications proposed by the judge in his addendum, and they will come up with a conclusion about what that should look like by the fall, and then we will have an opportunity to debate it here.

I will quote also, Mr. Chair, the Government House Leader, again in *Hansard*, April 21. He was the mover of this motion, so presumably his words should be trustworthy with respect to what it was meant to do. He was the mover of the motion, would be an authority intended to, and this is his interpretation.

The Premier has been very clear, as . . . others who have discussed this, that it's important to make sure that Albertans across the province have effective representation, which is done with the proper number of seats. That is why the commission and the judge of the commission recommended going to 91 [seats].

That's not quite accurate, but I think, again, we know where he was going, which was in the addendum. We're following those recommendations.

Those are quotes from both the Premier, who is presumably in charge here, and the Government House Leader, who was the

mover of the motion in question, indicating that all the government is trying to do here is add in the two additional seats.

Now, that's still bad. It's still the case that the Legislature and, again, the Premier decided on 89 seats based on the data that was before the commission. They already had this information. They made their choices. They don't like their choices for whatever reason, so now they've come back. They claim that it's just about these two additional seats. But despite what the Premier has said repeatedly and on the record, despite what has been communicated to the public by the Minister of Justice, among others, who is, helpfully for him, no longer bound by the rules of the Law Society, despite all of that, when we came in to meet as a committee, the chair was unable to confirm, in response to multiple questions, whether or not that was going to be the case, whether or not what the Premier said was true. I think the public deserves to know. Was what the Premier said true, or was it not true?

I will move this motion, which would make it clear that it is, in fact, about this addendum; it is, in fact, about the 91 seats. Like, again, to be clear, I don't think this makes it good; I think it makes it slightly less bad. For better or worse my colleague and I are here. We're participating in an illegitimate process, and the intention is to minimize the damage to this province, to its people, and to free and fair elections, which we should all care about, so that's what I'm trying to do with this.

The right thing would be to adopt the report of the majority and to implement the maps therein outlined, but barring that, I think the public deserves to know how brazen the UCP plans to be in their gerrymandering. They claim it's about rural representation. They claim it's about these extra two seats. If that's true, then I'm asking the government members to put their actions, their money, where their mouth is and just make it clear that what the Premier said is true and avoid doing what one of your appointees wanted and carving my home city of Calgary up like a pizza in an attempt to dilute the voices and the votes of people in Calgary. Calgary is a major city in this province. It has over a million people. It contributes significantly to the economy of this province, and the people of Calgary deserve to have their votes respected. I don't think that should be a real question.

**11:10**

This just outlines what was in the addendum. It outlines what the Government House Leader and what the Premier have said that they are going to do. The committee was unable to answer whether those things were true or not, so I would just like the committee to vote that that is what we're going to do. Well, I guess they're going to gerrymander a little and not a lot. That's what I'm looking for here.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MLA Ganley.

MLA Wiebe, I see your hand. Please go ahead.

**Mr. Wiebe:** Mr. Chair, I think we stated before that Government Motion 37 established an independent advisory panel for the purposes of conducting an independent review and providing its own advice and recommendations to the committee. As an order of the Legislature Government Motion 37 carries significant weight, and this motion attempts to provide different, more restrictive, direction. The purpose of the committee is not to direct the work of the panel as the opposition is trying to do here, so I will be voting against this motion.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MLA Wiebe.

Is there any member wishing to join the debate on this motion? MLA Gray, please go ahead.

**Ms Gray:** The chair specifically told us as members of the committee that when there is ambiguity in Government Motion 37, we, the committee, should provide clarity, and this motion provides clarity for the panellists now before their work gets under way. It makes clear only what the government has been saying to the public, and I'm very curious why you would not want the panel to do what your Premier, your House leader, other MLAs, the Justice minister a number of times have told the public that they would do in the legislative Chamber but also on radio interviews and in media.

I think making this clear is an important part of what's happening. The chair has told us that this committee would be the ones to address any issues with ambiguity in GM 37. By the way, there are major issues of ambiguity with Government Motion 37 as evidenced by every single time the Official Opposition asks for clarity about what is going on; no one, including the chair, can respond to us.

I think that my colleague's motion makes complete sense and only puts on the record what has been committed to by the Premier and government members, and you will note that the bulk of the motion is really just restating recommendation 5 of the addendum of the final report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission. We've heard repeatedly that the government is interested in supporting addendum and recommendation 5. This is their opportunity to support that.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Member Gray.

Is there anyone else wishing to join?

All right. Seeing none, I am prepared to call the vote on this motion. In the room, all those in favour, please say aye. In the room, all those opposed, please say no. Online?

That motion is defeated.

**Ms Gray:** Recorded, please.

**The Chair:** All right. We have a request for a recorded vote. Those in the room who are in favour of the motion, please raise your hand.

**Mr. Roth:** Hon. Ms Gray, hon. Ms Ganley.

**The Chair:** All right. Those in the room who are opposed to the motion, please raise your hands.

**Mr. Roth:** Mr. Wiebe, Mr. Rowswell.

**The Chair:** All right. Online, I understand we might have lost camera with MLA de Jonge, but I've been assured by the table that we can still record your vote.

Please go ahead, Clerk.

**Mr. Roth:** Ms de Jonge.

**Ms de Jonge:** Opposed.

**Mr. Roth:** Mr. Chair, total for the motion, two; total against, three.

**The Chair:** All right.

That motion is defeated.

Are there any other motions or conversations related to this agenda item? MLA Gray, please go ahead.

**Ms Gray:** Thank you very much. I would move a motion submitted in advance to the committee clerk – I believe it's motion 11 – that the members of the independent advisory panel disclose to the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries every instance if any of the following contacts or attempts to contact them: (a) the Premier or any person employed in the office of the Premier

or who has a role as an adviser to the Premier; (b) a member of Executive Council or any person employed by a government department; (c) a Member of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta or any person employed in the office of a member.

**The Chair:** All right. Just confirming, MLA Gray, that is, in fact, your motion on the screen.

**Ms Gray:** Yes, I believe that it is.

If this panel and this work is truly independent, the panellists should not be communicating with MLAs, the elected officials who are going to have strong opinions about what's happening, including people employed by the Premier and the government. All communications should flow through the LAO, and we've tried to do that through the motions we've tried to pass here but also through Government Motion 37. There is no legitimate reason for the panel to contact any of the persons that this motion would capture, and if the UCP intends for the panel to truly be independent and not subject to influence and favour trading for a favourable gerrymandered map, they should vote with us to pass this motion and address the concerns that Albertans have with this abnormal process.

The irregular process was called out by the Acting Chief Justice of Alberta, the Canadian Bar Association, Alberta Law Society, and numerous experts, and this motion attempts to address one of the primary concerns. If it is necessary for the independent committee to talk to MLAs, the committee should create a formal consultation process for MLAs and maybe other stakeholders and the general public to provide feedback about Alberta's electoral boundaries. These discussions should be documented and made public and should not happen in secret.

I think that this motion is required to address concerns about the irregularity of the process and to support transparency. If government members do not support the motion as I have moved it, again, I would ask: what would be examples of when you believe an MLA can and should contact the independent advisory panel members? I am very interested to hear about it.

**The Chair:** All right. Thank you, MLA Gray.

Are there any members wishing to join? MLA Rowswell, please go ahead.

**Mr. Rowswell:** Yeah. Government Motion 37 already establishes the panel as an independent body with a defined mandate. There's no evidence before the committee suggesting that additional reporting requirements of this nature are necessary. Additionally, this is a clear partisan attempt to question the integrity of the panel members and the process. The opposition may be here to play games, but we're not. The panel should be free to carry out its mandate without having their integrity called into question. The specific inclusion of the Premier and the Executive Council members in subsection (a) while omitting equivalent opposition actors creates the impression that the motion is intended more to advance the partisan narrative than to establish balance and effective reporting framework.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MLA Rowswell.

MLA Ganley, please go ahead.

**Ms Ganley:** I am not really sure why I'm having to explain this to the member, but the opposition doesn't get a Premier or members of Executive Council. That's how our system works. Whoever is elected to the government, i.e. the party with the majority of seats, gets to have a Premier and members of Executive Council. We couldn't include the opposition's Executive Council or staff employed by the Executive Council; we couldn't include the

opposition's Premier or staff employed by the opposition's Premier because there is no such thing. I'm a little baffled.

We have included a Member of the Legislative Assembly and any person employed in the office of a member. That includes both the opposition and the government. Members of the Legislative Assembly are the things that both sides get. They are the staff that both sides get. To suggest that this is somehow unequal: well, yeah, it had to be framed differently because the opposition doesn't get ministers. That is kind of how the system works. It doesn't apply unequally; it applies equally.

11:20

I would add there's just no legitimate reason for any person in any of these roles to be contacting the independent advisory committee. There really isn't. Again, we have a map that was submitted by a UCP MLA to the independent commission that was marked as though it was a government-protected document. So there is reason, I think, to have concern.

There's just no reason to vote against this. What we're saying is that partisan people on both sides ought not to try and interfere with the decision of the independent advisory panel. I don't understand what could possibly be wrong with that. These discussions should be documented and made public.

You know, the members keep saying: "Well, we want the independent advisory panel to be independent. We don't want them to be penned in by the public statements of the Premier." And now we're saying: "We don't want them to be independent. We want members of the Premier's staff to be able to contact them to tell them what the Premier wants," to tell not just the chair.

I mean, we have members of the Premier's staff and we have members of the Minister of Finance's staff being allowed to communicate directly with a member of the independent advisory panel, with the chair, who is arguably being compensated in excess of what is normal, with a lobbyist whose clients have an interest in the decisions of both the Premier and the Minister of Finance.

Like, this is the most basic level of transparency that we are asking here, the most basic reassurance to the public that their right to vote is something that the government cares about, and I would really urge members to reconsider your position. If your problem is that we have said "members of Executive Council," I don't know how we can change that because we don't have an Executive Council, so there's no way to – but everyone is captured. All of the politicians and all of their staff are captured on both sides. It's just that because government ministers have staff that are titled differently, they have to be included differently.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MLA Ganley.

MLA Gray, I believe. Are you wishing to join?

**Ms Gray:** Yes. Thank you. Just to be really clear, this applies equally to all elected officials. It is a nonpartisan motion. It is attempting to bring some transparency. Counter to what the member opposite suggested, I am in no way questioning the integrity of the panel members with this motion. I am in fact questioning the integrity of MLAs, people employed in the Premier's office, members of Executive Council given the behaviour we've seen up until now. Yes, this is being put into place because we're worried about bad actors. The bad actors are the UCP caucus, staff, and others that I am worried about and that I think the public is worried about.

I think this is a straightforward motion. I hope all members will support it.

**The Chair:** All right. Thank you.

Are there any other members looking to join on this motion?

All right. With that, happy to call the vote. All those in favour of this motion, please say aye. Are there any opposed to this motion? Please say no. And online?

That motion is defeated.

**Ms Gray:** Recorded, please.

**The Chair:** We have a request for a recorded vote. Those in the room who are in favour of the motion, please raise your hands.

**Mr. Roth:** Hon. Ms Gray, hon. Ms Ganley.

**The Chair:** All right. Those in the room who are opposed to the motion, please raise your hands.

**Mr. Roth:** Mr. Wiebe, Mr. Rowsell.

**The Chair:** All right. I'll ask the clerk to call on our online participant.

**Mr. Roth:** Ms de Jonge.

**Ms de Jonge:** Opposed.

**Mr. Roth:** Mr. Chair, total for the motion, two; total against, three.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

That motion is defeated.

Are there any additional motions or comments on this agenda item? MLA Ganley, I see your hand. Please.

**Ms Ganley:** Yes. I would like to move another motion. This motion has been presubmitted. It shows up as motion 12. I will read it in, and I will attempt to be quick because we're down to five minutes remaining. The motion reads that

members of the independent advisory panel disclose to the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries . . .

That would be us.

. . . every instance in which an organization, lobbyist, or consultant lobbyist, as defined in the Lobbyists Act, contacts regarding any matter that relates to the independent advisory's mandate.

And I can wait for that to get up.

**The Chair:** Okay. It looks like we have it now if you would like to just confirm.

**Ms Ganley:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Okay. Please go ahead.

**Ms Ganley:** Again, I just want to point out that this isn't about concerns, necessarily, about the members of the panel. We're asking that the members of the panel report the bad acting, not that they are the bad actors. We're asking that the members report the bad acting because we have evidence of a government trying to interfere. We have legislative evidence. We have some evidence coming forward on the record. Again, it's not about the people in question. It's about managing the conflicts of interest. These rules exist to protect everybody, including the people with the conflicts. I mean, favour trading is bad. Like, I think we all know that it's unfair, so what we're trying to do is ensure that that's not what's happening, that the government isn't attempting to trade government trinkets for benefits for their party.

When sitting in government, regardless of who the member is, a member is supposed to serve the public. Not serve their party; serve the public. That's what we are attempting to make sure that we're doing. It's extremely concerning that the UCP has appointed a lobbyist as one

of their nominees, but what we're trying to do is reassure Albertans that they can have at least a little bit of trust in the process and prevent additional lobbying efforts and prevent favour trading. The government shouldn't give out contracts to people based on what those people can do for their political fortunes. I don't know why anyone would quibble with that, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** All right. Thank you.

Any other members? MLA Wiebe, please go ahead.

**Mr. Wiebe:** Yeah. I would just say that lobbyists are already subject to disclosure and registration requirements under the Lobbyists Act. The existing legislative framework provides transparency regarding lobbying activities. All members of this committee agreed that the chair has the qualifications and experience to do the job, and I believe that the panel members were nominated for their experience and discretion. So I will be voting no.

**The Chair:** Thank you, MLA Wiebe.

MLA Ganley, go ahead.

**Ms Ganley:** Mr. Chair, might I just add that, as has been pointed out multiple times, this independent advisory committee doesn't exist anywhere else. It's a brand new thing that the government made up, so it definitely isn't covered by the Lobbyists Act in the sense that when that act was written, this didn't exist. To suggest otherwise is – I don't know – somewhere between gross incompetence and intentional misleading.

**The Chair:** All right. I'll maybe ask – "gross incompetence" is a little strong to speak about a colleague.

Are there any other members wishing to join the debate on this?

Seeing none, we'll call the question. All those in the room who are in favour of the motion, please say aye. Any opposed, please say no. Online? All right.

That motion is defeated.

**Ms Gray:** Recorded.

**The Chair:** We have a request for a recorded vote. Those in the room who are in favour of the motion, please raise your hands.

**Mr. Roth:** Hon. Ms Gray, hon. Ms Ganley.

**The Chair:** All right. Those in the room who are opposed, please raise your hands.

**Mr. Roth:** Mr. Wiebe, Mr. Rowswell.

**The Chair:** And if the clerk would ask our online participant.

**Mr. Roth:** Ms de Jonge.

**Ms de Jonge:** Opposed.

**Mr. Roth:** Mr. Chair, total for the motion, two; total against, three.

**The Chair:** All right.

That motion is defeated.

In 10 seconds: is there any other business?

Seeing none. Date of the next meeting, in four seconds, will be at the call of the chair.

I will now ask for a motion to adjourn. MLA Wiebe. Moved by MLA Wiebe that the June 9, 2026, meeting of the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries be adjourned. All those in favour, please say aye. Any opposed? That motion is carried.

[The committee adjourned at 11:30 a.m.]





