

[Chairman: Mr. Bogle]

[4:08 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd like to officially declare the meeting open. This evening we're going to receive a presentation from the Chief Electoral Officer, Mr. Pat Ledgerwood. We're pleased he's with us; you'll all appreciate what a busy schedule he has now with the senatorial election race officially under way. We're going to go through the process as it exists today. Please ask any questions of Mr. Ledgerwood that come to mind while he's going through his presentation. The intent is that at some future time after the senatorial elections have been concluded and once we've got a good schooling in where we are and how we've gotten here, we'll be bringing Mr. Ledgerwood back for future discussions. So are there any questions any of you have before we begin?

Pat, over to you.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think this committee has a very, very interesting task, and I think you'll find it very rewarding when you come through with your recommendations. I can tell you now that no matter which way you go, you're not going to get 100 percent support from all the electors of Alberta.

What I thought I would do is maybe just start with a basic background on the '83-84 commission. The commission was struck in December of '83, and consisted of the chairman, Justice Dixon, from the Court of Queen's Bench in Calgary. The Speaker nominates an individual, and initially it was the Hon. Ralph Steinhauer. However, he became ill and was replaced by Mr. Olsen, an Edmontonian. The Chief Electoral Officer is a member of the commission, and there were four politicians: the hon. Bill Payne from Calgary, Tom Chambers from Edmonton, Henry Kroeger from Chinook, and Grant Notley. So a seven-member commission.

The '84 commission was given redistribution rules, and their basic task -- we had 79 electoral divisions at that time, 37 urban and 42 rural -- was to increase the number of electoral divisions from 79 to 83; to increase the urban from 37 to 42 and reduce the rural by one, from 42 to 41. The legislation directed that there be an urban at Medicine Hat, St. Albert, Sherwood Park; Lethbridge would have two; Red Deer two; Edmonton 17, and Calgary 18. St. Albert already existed but was a rural. There was an electoral division called Edmonton-Sherwood Park, which was a rural. Basically, we ended up converting two rural to urban, so this left us one rural short. We went from 42 to 40, one short. So they created a new electoral division, Westlock-Sturgeon, and I'll brief you on that as we go through. Any questions on what the task was of the '83-84 commission?

The commission had about 10 meetings before their final report and then one meeting afterwards when they adjusted after the public hearings. The items they were looking at: voter convenience, and I think this is self-explanatory; community interests; communications; physical features; population density, and this will be a key area that I think this committee will be looking at; voter input; whether the boundaries were going to be understandable; clean boundaries; any changes -- were they really necessary, and was it practicable? So those are the nine basic points that they kept in mind as they went through their deliberations.

Any questions on the considerations that the '83-84 commission were looking at?

MR. CARDINAL: Just one question. Effective representation was not considered as one of the . . .

MR. LEDGERWOOD: The rules at that time were that there was no restriction on the rural ridings, but the urban ridings must be within plus or minus 25 percent of the mean.

MR. CARDINAL: Okay.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: When the commission started off their first meeting or two, it was basically to discuss the ground rules and how they were going to approach their task. They decided that they would break the area basically into Calgary, Edmonton, and rural. Once they decided that, they then contacted the town planners in Edmonton, Calgary, Red Deer, Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, St. Albert, and the county of Strathcona. They either received formal briefings from the town planners or written submissions, so they knew exactly what the town planners envisaged for their particular area of responsibility. They advertised in the local papers that the commission had been established and invited submissions. They received a total of 74 submissions. What they did with the submissions was come into the office of the Chief Electoral Officer, and we prepared maps for the commission explaining exactly what the submission was in the area, the electors that would be moving from one electoral division to the other; basically, just the ramifications of what the submission was.

After their 10 meetings the commission came up with their interim report, which they distributed widely. It went to anybody that had put in a submission. It went to all the returning officers. It went to political parties, media, anybody that had an interest. After the interim report had been distributed, then they held public hearings. They held six public hearings the last week in August.

I mentioned that the commission was struck in December. They had their first meetings in January. The interim report was released on July 11. They had six public hearings the last week in August in Grande Prairie, Athabasca, Edmonton, Red Deer, Calgary, and Vulcan. They received about 63 submissions at those public hearings. They considered the inputs at the public hearings and came through with their final report, which again received wide circulation.

The only change made to the commission's final report was the name of two electoral divisions. They changed Sturgeon to Westlock-Sturgeon and Cypress to Cypress-Redcliff. Other than that, the final report submitted to the Speaker by the commission was accepted by the government. It was assented to on May 27, 1985, and was proclaimed the same day the writ of election was issued for the general election: April 10, 1986. The Election Act was amended so that in the fall of 1985 we were able to conduct our enumeration '85 on the new electoral division boundaries, the 83 electoral division boundaries.

MR. CARDINAL: I have a question on that. Wasn't Athabasca-Lac La Biche created at the same period of time?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Yes. What I'm going to do, once I finish this, Mr. Cardinal, is go ahead and review what the commission looked at in Edmonton, what they looked at in Calgary, and what they looked at in the rural areas. Then I have some overlays which I will pull down, and I'll show you exactly the changes they made at that time in Calgary, Edmonton, and the

rural.

MR. CARDINAL: Okay.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Then the top maps will roll down and we'll show you the current situation, in that the numbers the commission worked at in 1983-84 have been changed and there are 115,000 more electors on the list of electors now than there were before the commission that used the 1982 general election figures. So what we're looking at here now is 1,550,867 electors. That's based on the figures from the enumeration '88 and those individuals that were added to the list of electors either on polling day or during the revision period. Now, you'll appreciate that if somebody moved from A to B and was enumerated at A and put their name on the list of electors at B, they appear twice. But when we figure that there are close to 200,000 Albertans that meet the age requirement, this is, I think, a fairly realistic figure. We know that there are about 200,000 individuals over 18 that are not on the list of electors, but we don't know whether they're Canadian citizens or whether they meet the residency requirement. So this is a figure that we use: the list of electors from the last general election.

On the urban side we have 974,914 divided by the 42 urban ridings, which gives us an average of 23,212. The rural figure of 575,953 divided by the 41 rural electoral divisions gives us an average of 14,048. If you're looking at an overall average, take our 1,550,867 divided by 83, which gives us 18,685. We were asked about Calgary and Edmonton. Calgary has 433,311 electors and 18 electoral divisions, so they have an average of 24,073. Edmonton has 386,577 with 17 electoral divisions for an average of 22,740.

Are there any questions on the numbers or any of the flip charts that we've had a look at to date?

MR. CARDINAL: I just have a question: how do you arrive at what urban is when the complete constituency is within their municipality? If that's . . .

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Okay. The Election Act specifically identifies urban ridings. Generally they are cities, but I think you appreciate that the hamlet of Sherwood Park is also on the urban list. Now, where we run into problems, of course, are unique areas like Fort McMurray, where 69 percent of the electorate live in the town of Fort McMurray, or Grande Prairie, where 67 percent live in the town of Grande Prairie. Fort McMurray and Grande Prairie, of course, are both rural ridings. Remember that we have 16 cities in Alberta. So if you look at the breakdown of urban ridings, of course they don't collate with the cities. That may be something the commission may want to look at: whether we have a unique riding called urban/rural, for example.

Mr. Chairman, what I'd like to do now is go to the map of Calgary and just show you what the commission was looking at when they started with Calgary. There's been a lot of development in two areas: Calgary-McCall, which was our largest electoral division at that time, 42,524; and also in the southern part of Calgary, Calgary-Fish Creek, where the number was 33,321.

Are there any questions on this map and the figures?

MRS. BLACK: Are these current figures?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: No. What these are, Mrs. Black, are

the figures from the 1982 general election. The '83-84 commission was required to use the figures from the 1982 general election.

What the commission basically did, looking at the map on this overlay, was take Calgary-McCall and divide it into two electoral divisions, Calgary-McCall and Calgary-Montrose. They looked down in the south -- and you can appreciate the black lines that are now showing the city limits of Calgary at that time. When you look down here, you can see the Calgary-Fish Creek boundary was here and the city limits are now here. So they basically took part of Calgary-Fish Creek and part of Calgary-Glenmore and created the new electoral division of Calgary-Shaw. If we look at this new electoral division of Calgary-Shaw, we took this area from Calgary-Glenmore and then basically this area from Calgary-Fish Creek. In the case of Calgary-Montrose, the new area, new city limits -- and then they took this part out of Calgary-McCall.

Now, because there were some other areas that they had to look at as far as the numbers go, they made other changes. One of the interesting things in Calgary is that there was very little change in the population. So you look at Calgary-Egmont, Calgary-Elbow, Calgary-Buffalo, Calgary-Currie, and Calgary-West, basically no changes, and even Calgary-Bow, the only change was adding in the new city limits. So fairly static in this area of Calgary.

Calgary-Millican was very small, so what the commission did was take this area from Calgary-Forest Lawn and put it into Calgary-Millican. The new boundaries for Calgary-Millican are shown in black. I apologize for the maps; they are more designed for a little closer study.

What they did in Calgary-Mountain View -- because Calgary-McKnight was up to 29,000, they had to reduce Calgary-McKnight. What they did was take this area out of Calgary-McKnight and put it into Calgary-North Hill; then they took this area out of Calgary-North Hill and put it into Calgary-Mountain View. Calgary-North West, of course, expanded into this area.

The other changes were fairly minor, where we moved one side of the highway to the other or one side of the community to the other. When the commission were working with the town planners, they also worked with the community leagues or equivalents, so we tried to keep communities intact. Basically, those were the major changes in Calgary.

Any questions on the changes? Tom will remember these very well because he was on Grant Notley's staff at the time and traveled with the commission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One question. If I remember right, the legislation gave the commission the flexibility to go up to a municipal boundary or not to do so. In all of the examples you have used so far in Calgary, you've gone to the new boundaries.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: In the case of Edmonton and Calgary they stayed within the municipal boundaries. I think they made the determination -- and you can correct me on this -- that whatever the boundaries were at May 1, 1984, those will be the electoral division boundaries. You may remember in your area that Hardieville was part of Lethbridge, but because it was after the commission had sat, although Hardieville was actually part of the city of Lethbridge, it remained in Taber-Warner until the new commission. Now, in the case of the city of Edmonton they can't annex -- I think it'll be about another 15 years before

they can change their boundaries -- whereas the city of Calgary from time to time permits annexation. So you will end up, no matter when you do your commission, that you'll have people in the annexed area who are living in basically the city limits of Calgary but are still part of the rural electoral division, in that in the legislation sense they've not amended the legislation every time there's been a change to a municipal boundary. When we get into the other overlay, I'll get into some of the changes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: In Edmonton a couple of areas of concern numberswise: Edmonton-Meadowlark over 29,000, Edmonton-Whitemud almost 28,000, and Edmonton-Mill Woods approaching 30,000. So they looked at that, and of course the legislation required that Sherwood Park become an urban riding.

I haven't used these pens since the last commission. I think they're a little dry.

MR. SIGURDSON: We'll have to get you some new stuff, Pat.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I checked them out and they worked fine, but not too long.

Okay. So if we can start at the bottom here, what they basically did in Edmonton-Mill Woods -- the boundary was formerly here -- was move the boundary down and create Edmonton-Mill Woods, which was basically the bottom half of the former Edmonton-Mill Woods. Then they took this area from the old Edmonton-Avonmore and moved Edmonton-Avonmore down to here. Then they created a new Edmonton-Gold Bar which included this portion of Edmonton-Avonmore. Edmonton-Strathcona remained the same. They moved this area of Edmonton-Whitemud, a very dense population, into Edmonton-Parkallen, and created the new Edmonton-Whitemud, staying always on the south side of the river. They took the physical features into account and made the determination both in Edmonton and Calgary that unless absolutely necessary, they would not cross the river.

The problem in this area is very low voter population, so they looked at various combinations and they decided that they would leave Edmonton-Highlands and Edmonton-Norwood. Edmonton-Beverly would be the same except it would incorporate the new area, as would Edmonton-Belmont. So they basically left this corner of Edmonton the same. Edmonton-Centre they moved over, and took this portion of Edmonton-Glenora and put it into Edmonton-Centre. They took this portion out of Edmonton-Glenora and moved it into Edmonton-Kingsway. You remember Edmonton-Meadowlark, at 29,252 far too high? So what they did was take this area of Edmonton-Meadowlark and put it into Edmonton-Glenora, and then took this area of Edmonton-Meadowlark and put it into Edmonton-Jasper Place. So that changed that corner. St. Albert is now a separate electoral division. The city has expanded out, so they looked at Edmonton-Calder and Edmonton-Glengarry and tried to equalize that by taking this portion out of Edmonton-Calder and putting it into Edmonton-Glengarry.

So you can see a lot of changes as you go through and start looking at the maps. It's quite a domino effect: as you change one, then you have to change others. Any questions on the fact that in Calgary they created two new electoral divisions? Edmonton the same number; just changed the boundaries.

Okay. Moving over to the rural, you can see that some of the numbers are very low: Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, Cardston, Taber-Warner, Cypress-Redcliff, Little Bow, Bow Valley, Chinook. The commission was looking at a way to try to increase the numbers, but if anybody is familiar with this area, the commission didn't have that much flexibility on numbers. I'll show you how they did make some changes.

When we get up into the central core, the numbers are fairly reasonable, looking at the averages. But when you get up to St. Albert -- St. Albert at 34,910, Stony Plain at 25,000, Wetaskiwin-Leduc at 28,000, and Clover Bar at 20,000. When I put the overlay on, you'll see what they did here and how they created the new electoral division of Westlock-Sturgeon. As I mentioned, Athabasca-Lac La Biche is high at 23,569 -- remembering that over two-thirds of the electorate are located in the city of Fort McMurray. Grande Prairie, again very high, almost 25,000, but 67 percent are located in the city of Grande Prairie.

Starting at the bottom of the map, they looked at Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, and although it was low, they decided to leave it the same. The city of Lethbridge had annexed some areas which impacted on Taber-Warner and Macleod.

Cardston -- and you'll note Cardston here at 9,761 -- includes the Blood Reserve. So when we're talking later on about the low number at Cardston, that number does not include the Blood Reserve, and depending on which publication you look at, there are 1,800, plus or minus, qualified electors who reside on the Blood Reserve.

Down in this area just east of Milk River: a very strong submission by the individuals there that said they did not relate to Medicine Hat or to Cypress, that the kids went to school in Milk River, that they listened to the Lethbridge radio stations and read the Lethbridge papers. They did not want to be part of Cypress. They wanted to be part of Taber-Warner, and so the boundary was changed and this area of Cypress was moved into Taber-Warner. So the changes around Lethbridge are as a result of changes to the municipal boundaries.

The changes in Medicine Hat were really not significant, because although they changed the boundaries, the areas were really not densely populated. They gave up X number of square miles on one edge of the city for X number on the other. So although the boundaries changed, the number of electors basically didn't change.

Getting up into this area: Chinook very low; Drumheller with some flexibility. So they took this area of Drumheller and moved it into Chinook. The decision was made fairly early that they would not separate any Indian nations or reserves. The former boundary of Little Bow, between Little Bow and Drumheller, ran right through the reserve, so the decision was made that they would move the boundary to the northern boundary of the reserve so this area became part of Little Bow.

When they got into Red Deer, and Red Deer had to be given two seats, they had 30,560 electors, below the 25 percent average if they split it in half for two urban ridings. They had to go outside of the electoral division in order to get the numbers, so they had to take from Innisfail in order to give Red Deer-North and Red Deer-South, as they called them, the minimum numbers of the average minus 25 percent. That impacted down here so that this area of Three Hills had to go into Innisfail. As well, over in this area it followed that they wanted to keep all of the reserve, so they removed the Hobbema reserve totally into Ponoka-Rimbey, and they changed the name from Ponoka to Ponoka-Rimbey.

In this area they made a series of changes in that they took this portion from Stettler and moved it into Chinook, this portion from Stettler and moved it into Wainwright. Camrose was very high for a rural at 22,166, so they took this area of Camrose and moved it into Stettler. Vermilion-Viking benefited. They took this portion of Camrose and moved it into Vermilion-Viking.

Lloydminster: basically the same, except there was a very small group of people here who said that they did not relate to Lloydminster, that they shopped in St. Paul, the kids went to school in Elk Point, the county boundary was here; why didn't they become part of St. Paul? So they moved these electors up into St. Paul.

Clover Bar at 20,000 was high for a rural, so they took this area of Clover Bar and moved it into Vegreville. So we've come around now to the point where we're getting close to the city of Edmonton. We've got Wetaskiwin-Leduc at 28,000-plus, Stony Plain at 25,000-plus, St. Albert at 34,000-plus. So they took St. Albert and, in accordance with the instructions, made it an urban riding. We had this area north of Westlock, and that's where they created the new electoral division. They took the old St. Albert, which went up to here, and put it into Westlock-Sturgeon. They took this area out of Athabasca-Lac La Biche and they took this area out of Redwater-Andrew to create the new Westlock-Sturgeon. In order to balance the numbers, they took this area from Clover Bar and put it into Redwater-Andrew.

Down in the southern part you remember Wetaskiwin-Leduc was very large, so basically they reduced it by about half the landmass area. They took this portion of Wetaskiwin-Leduc and put it into Drayton Valley. Stony Plain was very large. They took this portion of Stony Plain and put it into Whitecourt; they took this portion and put it into Barrhead. You can see there's getting to be a lot of green on the map as the changes are going. So Whitecourt and Barrhead benefited from Stony Plain.

Lesser Slave Lake remained exactly as it was. Up in this area we have Grande Prairie at 24,000, Spirit River-Fairview at 9,400, and Smoky River at 8,895. What they did is they took this area of Grande Prairie and put it into Smoky River, and then took this area of Smoky River and put it into Dunvegan, and then this area of Grande Prairie and put it into Dunvegan. You may wonder about the boundaries. We're talking about clean boundaries. This is a nice clean boundary in that it follows the river. This boundary happens to be coincidental with IDs 19 and 20 in this area. Also, you've got the Saddle Hills up in this area.

The other change they made was over in the Athabasca-Lac La Biche area. Lac La Biche-McMurray was fairly high numberwise, so they took this area from Lac La Biche-McMurray and added it to what was remaining of Athabasca after they gave up their numbers to create Westlock-Sturgeon. They created a new electoral division of Athabasca-Lac La Biche. Have I confused you? No?

Those are the boundaries as they ended up after the public hearings and on the final report. The commission worked long and hard, and the agreement was a unanimous agreement. There was a lot of give-and-take as they worked through. The public inputs played a big factor in the decision-making.

Okay. Any questions on how they got to where they ended up?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I possibly should have asked the question

earlier, Pat. You mentioned the criteria that the commission looked at. Could you bring that out again please? Was any consideration given in that ranking to the number of municipalities, school boards, hospital boards, things like that? Because being an MLA is more than representing people; we are also representing other levels of government and services. If, as an example, a hospital board has approval to build a new hospital, you spend an inordinate amount of time working with that board through that process. So I'd just ask the question whether that was factored in in any way.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: It was factored in, but I think you appreciate that there are 421 separate municipal entities. To try and make the boundaries coterminous with the municipal boundaries is . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No; sorry. That wasn't my point. I just wondered if when you looked at a constituency like Lesser Slave Lake, you looked at the number of reserves, the number of settlements, town and village councils, the ID council, the hospital boards, and if that had a bearing on your final decision.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I guess the greatest number of submissions were from municipal authorities, so that was certainly a factor. For example, this area where they changed the northern boundary of Lloydminster; that was a direct result of municipal input, to move that boundary to be coterminous with the municipal boundary.

One of the problems the commission had, of course, was that -- you talk about hospital boards, but a hospital area may not coincide with the school district, which may not coincide with the municipal district, and of course doesn't coincide with the federal electoral district boundaries. So certainly those factors were considered.

MR. SIGURDSON: In fact, just a point in Spirit River-Fairview becoming Dunvegan is that without any input -- if my memory serves me correctly, there wasn't any input from the improvement district. However, the commission brought the southern boundary of Spirit River-Fairview, which was just a straight line as you can see, down to the boundary of the improvement district or the municipal district.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: No. That's improvement districts 19 and 20. It's also the tourist area boundary.

MR. SIGURDSON: That was one of the clean boundaries in your considerations.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Uh huh. Okay; let's bring us up to where we are now. Looking at Calgary, you may remember that when the '82 commission were looking initially, Calgary-McCall was 42,000-plus and now at 29,000, Calgary-North West at 30,000, Calgary-Fish Creek at 30,000, and Calgary-Shaw at 28,000. So you can see where the development is in Calgary.

The area here: Calgary-Elbow, not building very much; Calgary-Buffalo, building now because they are tearing down some of the older single-dwelling homes and putting in high rises; Calgary-Currie, not much change; Calgary-West, a little bit of construction; Calgary-Millican, up significantly; Calgary-Forest Lawn, not much of a change; Calgary-Montrose grew just

about the way the city planner briefed the commission. So if you look at Calgary and the figures that I gave you, you can see that the commission will have to look at changing the boundaries. Now, whether the committee will recommend that additional seats be established will be something that the commission then can work through.

What I've given Bob Pritchard are maps of Calgary, Edmonton, and the rural with my handwritten numbers on there, just my working copies of the maps, and also blank maps. Maybe, Bob, if you want to pass those out so that if anybody wants to mark them up . . .

MR. BRUSEKER: Patrick, before you go on, the city of Calgary just recently annexed a bunch of land all around it. Do you have maps that show the new city boundaries?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: No. These are the boundaries as of May 1, 1984, so that may be something that the committee want to look at: how are they going to address changes in municipal boundaries between electoral boundary commissions?

MRS. BLACK: But those are the current year's election numbers?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Those are the 1989 general election numbers.

MR. SIGURDSON: On the flip chart I think you had the urban breakdown with the average, plus or minus. It's not on the Calgary map; I'm just wondering if we'd . . .

MR. LEDGERWOOD: If the committee requires any maps, we keep an inventory of about 15,000 maps. I think most of you are familiar with them from your campaigns. We have the large maps similar to the one on the left. We have maps of this scale, 1:25,000, and 1:40,000. We also have desk-top size maps and also the eight and a half by 11. If the committee requires any of those maps, we can get them for you very quickly.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to now go to the city of Edmonton. You may remember, from the earlier map, when we talked about a couple of the high-density areas -- Edmonton-Whitemud, Edmonton-Mill Woods, Edmonton-Meadowlark, Edmonton-Jasper Place -- you can see that those are still the high-growth areas. The commission will have to look at just how they're going to change those boundaries. Also, the areas that were static before, Edmonton-Norwood and Edmonton-Highlands, are still very static. Edmonton-Beverly and Edmonton-Belmont are increasing as the city expands out to the new city limits. Edmonton-Glengarry is also growing fairly rapidly. Edmonton-Calder is not too far behind, and we know about housing developments going in there. One of the things that the commission looked at was the growth potential in the areas. You can see that some of the areas -- if you look at the '83 report at the back, the estimated number of electors, you can see that they intentionally had some areas very low, and they're now very high. That was the result of the input from the city planning officials. So again in Edmonton growth around the periphery, the centre, is fairly static.

Any questions on the numbers as they relate to the city of Edmonton?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess we have Sherwood Park's numbers

here, don't we?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Yeah. The boundaries for Sherwood Park are as they are now because this area was programmed to become an industrial park, and the county of Strathcona was very adamant that they wanted that particular area to be included in the hamlet of Sherwood Park. They presented a very good case to the commission, and they accepted their rationale.

MR. BRUSEKER: With respect to Edmonton and Calgary, when we look at making our future proposals for the new boundaries, I wonder if in the past they went to the developers and said, "Okay, what have you planned for Edmonton-Mill Woods, and what are your projections for, you know, a growth of another 5,000 people or whatever." Did they consider that at all?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: What they did is they went to the city planning departments, and the departments gave them briefings on main transportation corridors, new power lines, new sewer lines, where the developers planned to develop. For example, the city of Edmonton can tell you now where they're planning to put their LRT stations, where they plan to put their sewer lines into the new areas -- they have that detail -- transportation counts in areas, how they intend to increase the transportation corridors. They'll give you a two-year, a five-year, and a 10-year program. We found that they were very, very optimistic. You must remember that in '83 things had changed quite a bit from what they were in the late '70s and early '80s when they made these initial plans.

Okay; these are the current numbers for the rural electoral divisions, and these numbers, of course, are available in the copy of the '89 general election report which you all have. We've got extra copies of the '05-82 report that will give you the boundaries and the changes since 1905. We've also got copies available of the '82, '86, and '89 general election reports. The '79 general election report, unfortunately, doesn't have any maps with it, so we're talking about polls, but they don't really mean that much because you can't relate to an area within the electoral division.

This is the current map. As you can see if you look down on the southern part of the province, Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, Cardston, Cypress-Redcliff, Little Bow, and Chinook are all below 10,000. You look at Medicine Hat: 29,589. This is why I suggest that the commission may want to look at coming up with, rather than an urban and a rural, maybe three designations: rural, urban, and an urban/rural. Certainly in this area you have to address it. Now, Lethbridge is fine: Lethbridge-West at 21,805 and Lethbridge-East at 18,970 -- certainly in the ballpark for the urban ridings. The corridor area is fairly static from the figures that you saw in relation to the 1983 commission. Some growth in Banff-Cochrane. Some growth in Wetaskiwin-Leduc, Stony Plain, and Westlock-Sturgeon. Again, as you look at the transportation corridors into Edmonton and Calgary, you can see that that is where the growth is taking place. There's not really . . . Yes, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You earlier mentioned -- you used Cardston as an example, where there are plus or minus 1,800 residents on the Blood Reserve who are not enumerated but are eligible. Are there other examples that quickly come to mind of constituencies where the figures are really being thrown out by the

lack of enumeration?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: One of the problems that we run into with the Indian nations is that so much depends on the local chief and the local council in that sometimes they will designate members of the band who will do an excellent enumeration; other times they will do a very poor enumeration. Sometimes they'll use a band list which is not even current, so you run the full gamut on those. Again, I think the enumeration in '89 was a good enumeration. The weather wasn't that bad. The enumerators got out and did their job.

Now, as you know, we had a court case in Calgary-Millican. One of the big problems there was that in the Chinese-Canadian community those particular individuals did not answer their doors. They did not put their names on the list of electors.

MS BARRETT: If I might say, we have the same sort of problem in the inner-city core of Edmonton-Highlands. Quite frankly, most people won't enumerate. Most people will not even go into the inner city, into the tenements, because they're afraid. God knows, we've tried hard.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Well, you can find the same thing in Calgary-Buffalo.

MS BARRETT: Is that right, eh?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Yes, we're certainly aware of that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mike, did you want to get in on this?

MR. CARDINAL: Athabasca-Lac La Biche also has one reserve that won't get enumerated, but some do go out and vote; very few.

MRS. BLACK: We found that out also at the university at the married residences. They were not enumerated.

MR. SIGURDSON: In fact, there was a court challenge from Edmonton-Strathcona in '79, wasn't there, based on the lack of enumeration for the '79 campaign?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Yeah. They didn't enumerate Lister Hall. There were arrangements made for the university residences.

MRS. BLACK: Well, our whole university was not enumerated.

MR. SIGURDSON: This one prompted a court challenge in 1979 after the '79 campaign.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: But, unfortunately, these are the figures that we'll have to go with unless the committee recommends that special provisions be made to estimate the number of qualified electors in various ethnic areas.

MRS. BLACK: When was the enumeration?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: In September of 1988, September 15 to 30, with the revision period the Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of the second week in October.

MR. SIGURDSON: Maybe what you could do for the committee is point out or highlight those constituencies where there is the possibility of there being some problems with respect to enumeration, such as Calgary-Buffalo, Edmonton-Highlands, Edmonton-Strathcona, Cardston, just so we can keep it in front of our minds. If you could highlight those . . .

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Okay. Basically, in the corridor area you are going to have problems in Calgary-Buffalo and Calgary-Millican. On the other side of the river it seems we've got a fairly good enumeration, but in Calgary-Buffalo, Calgary-Millican, and maybe even the northern part of Calgary-Elbow, not good co-operation from the electorate.

MRS. BLACK: And I think a portion of Calgary-Currie probably.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Maybe a portion of Calgary-Currie.

Now, in the university area you have a very transient group. We do the enumeration in September. Generally those that are in residence are well-established and we can get their names on the list of electors. If there is an election held before the end of May of the following year, fine; otherwise we are into a new ball game. The same thing in Edmonton. You are going to find problems in Edmonton-Highlands, Edmonton-Centre, Edmonton-Norwood, over at the university, of course, Edmonton-Strathcona, and even down into the northern part of Edmonton-Parkallen. As you know, all university students make a decision as to whether their place of ordinary residence is their home where their parents are or the temporary location they are residing in while they are attending school. So although many of them didn't put their name on the list of electors in Edmonton-Strathcona, for example, their parents may have put them on the list in Camrose.

Now, in the rural areas there are 42 Indian nations, and I think, as Mr. Cardinal explained, each one is different. Because you couldn't get on the Blood Reserve last fall doesn't mean that we couldn't get on the Blood Reserve now, because there is a new chief and a new council, to the point where the Sarcee Band co-operated fully. But in the 1986 general election, on polling day the chief called the returning officer and said: "You had planned to set up a poll in Big Bull Hall. I'm sorry; the council didn't check with me. That hall is not available." So I talked about other buildings on the reserve and he said, "No, nothing is available on the reserve." So the returning officer said, "Okay, fine, I'll set up some polls off the reserve." Well, within 10 minutes all the election staff she had planned to use on the reserve and would hope we could use off the reserve called in that they were all sick. So there she was on polling morning, having to set up new polling locations and get new election officials.

The same thing happened in Athabasca-Lac La Biche and Bonnyville. So a lot depends on who's got the responsibility at the time. It's something the commission will want to look at numberswise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you identify the rural constituencies that really stand out re numbers? You've identified, I think, these six urban ridings in Calgary and Edmonton, in addition to Cardston. Are there others that stand out in your mind with large numbers or not?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Well, you can even look at Ponoka-Rimbey, where they have four bands. At the 1988 general enumeration one band co-operated fully, one almost fully, one we got good support from, and one band we couldn't get any co-operation from at all.

MR. SIGURDSON: Perhaps following the senatorial election, when your staff has a little more time, would it be possible to get a history of enumerations and give us the numbers so that, you know, maybe we could then look at the problems that have been experienced since these boundaries were created? I don't know how many enumerations there have been since these boundaries were created.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Two.

MR. SIGURDSON: Only two. Oh dear.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Only the '85 and the '88. Now, I can tell you from the '88. I could tell you that tomorrow. We polled each of the returning officers to find out where the difficulties were, so I have that data now.

MR. SIGURDSON: That would be helpful, I think.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I can provide that to the committee.

MR. CARDINAL: What projected economic shift to the population would be considered as far as, you know, economic promotion and stuff like this?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: The '83-'84 commission also looked at that.

MR. CARDINAL: They looked at that. Because you look at, you know, some of the usual projects that are going in rural Alberta. In my riding, as one example, if a project's proceeding there, it could bring in an additional 3,000 population, if I'm a good MLA, or maybe more.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Well, I think if you look at the redistribution rules that the '83-84 commission operated under, there were only four criteria they had, and they built in these other items.

MR. SIGURDSON: Just one point, going back to Fort McMurray. You had said at one point that the McMurray population was located for the most part in the city of Fort McMurray, and you had given 69 percent. Was that under Lac La Biche-McMurray, where 67 percent . . .

MR. LEDGERWOOD: No. This is at the last general election.

MR. SIGURDSON: The last general election. Okay. Thanks.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: One of the interesting things is that 91 percent of the vote comes out of the city.

MR. SIGURDSON: Okay. That's very good. Thanks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other questions?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: You now have the current numbers, you have the maps, and you have the report on the '89 general election which contains all the numbers. Basically that's the current situation so far.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

MRS. BLACK: One thing I was going to ask: when you look at the rural areas, do you have the distance across, say, Peace River in miles?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: We can figure that out very quickly. Each one of these blocks is a township which is six miles by six miles, so it's very easy to count.

MRS. BLACK: Do we have that, particularly for the rural, loaded into a computer somewhere?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: No.

MR. SIGURDSON: Ask any rural MLA. He'll tell you.

MS BARRETT: They usually know. That's right.

MR. CARDINAL: A two and a half hour drive across my riding either way you go. That's going the speed limit and then above.

MR. SIGURDSON: You probably do it in an hour, Mike.

MR. CARDINAL: A two and a half hour drive.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: One of the interesting submissions we had -- I was a commissioner on the federal redistribution when we went from 21 to 26 federal seats. One of our MPs from Calgary was complaining that we really didn't understand the problems of a MP from the city vis-à-vis the problems of an MP from a rural area. He felt he had more problems in that he couldn't have a town hall meeting and get people out and it was impossible for him to visit his people. Well, I took the pointer to the city of Calgary and pointed out that my pointer more than covered his whole electoral district, but if I were to take it up into Peace River, for example, really it didn't cover one township, which is six miles by six miles.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, as an example, one of the biggest challenges facing Members of Parliament in the summer is attending all the parades in the various communities. That is a major task. You take a man like Bob Porter with the Medicine Hat riding. He travels from Bassano and Brooks in the north straight down to Milk River and Coutts in the south. It's a huge area. Of course, every community expects the MP to be there, because each community feels its parade is the most important function. It's not like going to the Calgary Stampede and being in the parade for, you know, Harvie Andre as an example.

MRS. BLACK: I'm glad you used Harvie Andre.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Well, certainly the committee will have to look at the communications and the distances, particularly in the areas that are not very densely populated.

MRS. BLACK: Could we get that information, just on the distance part?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Yeah. There are all kinds of statistical data available as to populations, population centres, census figures. There's a great deal of information the committee can look at in helping them with their deliberations.

MRS. BLACK: I'm just looking at the Peace River.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's huge.

MRS. BLACK: Wow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, our three most northerly MLAs have a special allowance to allow them to charter flights into some of the isolated, more remote communities . . .

MRS. BLACK: You can see why they do that.

MR. BOGLE: . . . and you can see why.

MR. BRUSEKER: Does that apply to Lesser Slave Lake as well?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. BRUSEKER: So it's Peace River, Lesser Slave Lake, and Fort McMurray?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. CARDINAL: Athabasca too.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: But if you look at Peace River as an example, the town of Peace River has the bulk of the electors. Of course, there's only one-quarter that you have the population on. Once you get up into this area -- you know, you get out to Zama, for example, out here, and you're looking at 125 electors. You get down into the colony over here, I think 800 electors in La Crête, but that's a major centre up in that area. It's a very unique situation which you'll have to wrestle with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The one issue I was extremely appreciative of in the last redistribution round -- you pointed out as an example where there's a strong interest from a group of people in an area to be moved from one constituency to another. In that particular case they were asking to be moved from a constituency with less than 9,000 voters into one with over 13,000. But going back a number of years, they were part of the riding they wanted to rejoin. They had been moved out of it to accommodate a population balance, yet they had a lot of natural reasons to want to go back in. I was really pleased that the commission had that sensitivity.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Incidentally, that boundary is the municipal boundary as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Any other questions?

Well, on behalf of the committee, a very special thank you for coming and sharing your time and your knowledge with us.

You obviously have this at your fingertips, and you can pull figures from your head. It's very impressive. I know we'll want to meet with you again in the not-too-distant future, but after the senatorial election so we can again go over some factors and get ideas from you.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Sir, I'll be available on short notice. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I could leave all these maps and things with you if you'd like to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think so.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. Actually, if we're going to be meeting here, it's a good idea to have them right in front of us.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: You see, I think if you're going to be meeting and you want maps, I would give you the next scale map to this, which is about half as large, so you can actually read street names and one thing or another. I'll be glad to make those available to Bob, and he can put them up. Also, I think that rather than use this map, I'll give you a nice coloured map. So if it's agreed, I'll give you the next scale of Edmonton, the next scale of Calgary, and a coloured one here. If you're interested, I'll maybe give you a county overlay so that when you're looking at where should we be making more use of the county lines, you can just see some of the problems. And I'm not sure whether you appreciate the difference between an MD, an ID, a special area, cities, towns, villages, summer villages, Metis settlements, Indian reserves. They're all separate entities.

MR. SIGURDSON: Well, we won't be playing with the boundaries in this committee. I think it is important that we keep in mind all the considerations that have to be made. To that end I'm wondering if you have copies for the two major urban areas and indeed for Red Deer, Lethbridge, and Medicine Hat, and the community leagues or the equivalent of community leagues. I know that the city of Edmonton has the community league maps as well, and Calgary as well, if those could be secured.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Yeah, I think Bob can secure those. I've got the cards of the people that were in situ in '83. You may remember that we had excellent support from those city planners.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. If there are no other questions, why don't we bring the formal part of the meeting to a pause? We're going to have something to eat, and we've asked Pat if he'd like to join us. We can informally continue our discussion and reconvene.

[The committee recessed from 5:24 p.m. to 5:54 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we ready?

MS BARRETT: Bob, I should tell you I need to leave in 15 minutes. There's no problem if Tom's going to stay.

MR. SIGURDSON: Sure, I'm going to stay.



MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm not sure we have that much more to do tonight. We were here, really, to meet with and listen to Pat Ledgerwood, and he's given us his overview. May I just run through the next couple of days briefly?

MS BARRETT: Good idea.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tomorrow morning we've got Associate Chief Justice Tevie Miller coming in at 10. I did send out a memo to each of you indicating that he's limited because of another commitment, so he'll be with us for one hour. I thought we have some administrative matters we could deal with after that, but we wouldn't be meeting for the full day as originally we had thought. Then on Friday morning John Edmunds from Alberta Public Affairs Bureau is coming in to give us the background on weekly newspapers and dailies and the things we should be prepared for in our ads that go out re our committee and the opportunity for public input.

Pam.

MS BARRETT: If that's the case, if we're not going to meet for the full day tomorrow, is there any point in asking if we can have John in later in the day tomorrow and not meet on Friday, which would sure suit me?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, let's try that. We should have thought of that earlier, if we can move it ahead. Everyone's schedule is still open tomorrow?

MR. CARDINAL: Yes, absolutely.

MRS. BLACK: Not tomorrow night.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, but tomorrow afternoon. So, if at all possible, we'll move Friday morning into tomorrow afternoon.

MR. PRITCHARD: I don't think John would be here for more than an hour and a half or two hours sort of thing, at tops.

MS BARRETT: God, that would really be heavenly.

MR. BRUSEKER: We would still probably be looking at finishing around 4 o'clock, then, tomorrow afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, at the latest.

We're working with some other people to come in and give us presentations on background, and one other thing we're trying to gather information on is who else either has done work or is doing work in Canada. We know the B.C. situation. We know work that's being done in Manitoba. We understand that Saskatchewan's working on this process. The thought is that we might want to plan a two-day trip, where we would go over to Regina, meet with people in Saskatchewan, go on to Winnipeg and then back, so that we'd be gone two days, and one day into Victoria and back. So we can sit down with people who have been involved in this process. Do you agree with all that?

MS BARRETT: Sure.

MR. SIGURDSON: I certainly don't want to go to Prince Edward Island, but one thing about Prince Edward Island is that they have throughout their province a number of dual con-

stituencies, and I'm wondering if we could just have a report on that. I know it's distinctly different from every other electoral . . .

MR. BRUSEKER: The what number constituencies?

MS BARRETT: Dual.

MR. SIGURDSON: Two members per constituency.

MS BARRETT: A lot of B.C. as well.

MR. SIGURDSON: A lot of B.C. -- but British Columbia is split, dual and single. So if we could just have some information about this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other requests or ideas members have we should try to feed into Bob right away and get responses back. For instance, does Quebec still officially have an upper House? Thinking a long way back to university days, I remember the upper Chamber in Quebec. They were the only province to have one. If they still have one, how functional is it? What does it do? That's something we might want to get some answers to.

MR. SIGURDSON: Is Justice Dixon . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've talked to him. We're hoping he can come in and speak to us so we'd be able to go back to the last one. Tevie Miller is timed before that.

MR. PRITCHARD: They're out of sync.

MRS. BLACK: I'm sorry. I just think it would be beneficial to see what others are doing and cover it soon. There are a lot of factors just from the presentation that Pat showed, considerations they took into account, and we want to make sure we're aware of what's happening in the rest of the country.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Anything else tonight?

MR. SIGURDSON: Just one other thing. At some point we're obviously going to have to have some interpretation from the legal community with respect to the decisions that have been made in British Columbia. Obviously that's being looked at. Is that right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have you got any recommendations?

MR. SIGURDSON: Well, not at the moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because I think that's a key point.

MS BARRETT: I think copies of the decisions for this committee.

MR. PRITCHARD: We've got copies. Actually, I can give them to you right now if you want.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's also getting some help through the legalese contained inside those decisions that we're going to need.

MRS. BLACK: Are you talking about the constitutional Charter of Rights?

MS BARRETT: You know, who would be good on that is Clegg.

MR. SIGURDSON: Mike Clegg would probably be beneficial. I was also thinking of perhaps the people out of the universities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, can we leave it this way? Give some thought to it. If you want to discuss it with other caucus members in your respective caucuses, do that, and then get me some names. Because there's certainly no harm . . .

MRS. BLACK: Maybe we could bring some names forward from the various institutions.

MS BARRETT: This is only the first decision.

MR. PRITCHARD: This is the first one. The other ones that are being done are . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. In any event, there's certainly no problem in having several members of the legal profession giving us their own interpretations. We know there'll be slightly varying views on what is meant and what direction we must or should go in. Okay?

All right. We should have, hopefully by tomorrow afternoon, a draft letter that we're working on that would go out. This would be a letter from our committee to basically the municipalities. I'm so concerned because of the municipal elections. I'm finding in my own case that in speaking with a couple of councillors, obviously they're in an election mode now, so they're not thinking the way they were two weeks ago any more than we would be after a writ is issued. So even though we do our advertising, we're not going to get their full attention, and the thought was for a follow-up letter to municipalities and so on. We want to make sure that no one can come back and say: "We didn't know. You didn't tell us what you were doing." So we advertise widely. Hopefully we can cover that aspect.

Anything else for the night?

MRS. BLACK: Do we convene back here at 10?

MR. CHAIRMAN: At 10 a.m.  
Motion to adjourn?

MS BARRETT: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Pam. All in favour? Thank you.

[The committee adjourned at 6:03 p.m.]