

[Chairman: Mr. Bogle]

[1:10 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I think we'll officially begin at this point in time in any event and welcome those who are present today. We're required to be formal to a degree, as this is a select special committee of the Legislature and, therefore, our meetings are recorded and there will be a copy of *Hansard* available for the hearings held not only here in Calgary but across the province, as well as our committee meetings. But we've tried very hard to keep the meetings as informal as possible. It's important that there be a good exchange of ideas. We are here to learn, to hear from you and see what ideas and suggestions or recommendations you have for us on a very complicated and challenging issue that faces us.

I don't know if we need to go through formal introductions, but we'll do that. Tom Sigurdson, at the far end of the table, is from Edmonton-Belmont; he was first elected in 1986 and re-elected earlier this year. Frank Bruseker represents the constituency of Calgary-North West; he was first elected this spring, and he is here on behalf of the Liberal Party. At my immediate left is Pam Barrett. Pam is enjoying her second term in the Alberta Legislature. Did I say that better, Pam?

MS BARRETT: Finally.

MR. CHAIRMAN: She serves as the House leader for the Official Opposition.

Pat Black, who was first elected this spring, represents the constituency of Calgary-Foothills and is very actively involved in a number of committees in the Legislature. At the far end is Bob Pritchard, who is the senior administrator for the committee. He helps keep us on time and keeps us pointed in the right direction.

MR. PRITCHARD: The "on time" part's interesting.

MR. BRUSEKER: What he means is that that's the biggest challenge he faces.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We also have Robin Wortman, who's in and out - he's not here just now - and Doug and Vivian are with us from *Hansard* and doing the recording.

Let's continue with the introductions, Eleanor, starting with you.

MRS. ART: Okay. I'm Eleanor Art, Calgary-Egmont constituency, David Carter's riding.

MRS. KLAFFKE: And I'm Rena Klaffke. I'm also from the Calgary-Egmont constituency.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Why don't we talk very briefly about why this committee has been struck and what our mandate is, just to elaborate on the letter. After every second general election we are required by statute to create an Electoral Boundaries Commission, which in turn would go out and, following the parameters given to it by the legislation, redraw boundaries of the various constituencies in the province. We would normally be in that process now, as our last redistribution commission reported in 1984; we had a general election in 1986 and of course early this year in 1989. However, a court case in British Columbia which successfully challenged the British Columbia legislation, citing an imbalance

between larger ridings and smaller ridings and using the Charter as its basis, caused the three political parties represented in the Alberta Legislature to determine that before striking a commission, we should, looking at the historical background in Alberta and other factors, looking at the implications of the Charter, come back with some recommendations to the full Assembly so that when we do create our Electoral Boundaries Commission, we'll have input from the committee. Our report is due at the Assembly during the next sitting, the spring sitting of 1990.

So to accomplish our goal, we are going around the province meeting with individuals, with groups, and trying to ensure that there is as much input as possible. We've also had three trips out of the province, and we don't anticipate any further travel outside of the province. We've been to Regina, Winnipeg, and Victoria so that we could meet with those who were involved in electoral redistribution in those jurisdictions and learn from them, see what they did well, where mistakes were made, and how we might benefit from that part of the process. So that's basically the why, as to why we're here.

I would first invite other members to supplement anything I've said, and then we'll proceed with your presentation, Eleanor. Pam?

MS BARRETT: No; I think you've covered it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pat.

MRS. BLACK: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tom, Frank? Gosh, we've got it unanimous. Grab that fast.

MRS. ART: How about that? You did well, Bob.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. We'll go right to your report, please.

MRS. ART: Well, my presentation is very, very brief. We think it appears from our voters' list that our constituency boundaries are quite adequate. We believe that we probably will have approximately 200 more eligible voters with the next enumeration because of a seniors' apartment building which will be going up on Fairmount Drive, and I think there were a few houses built in Kingsland too. There was a vacant lot and no house; it was ripped down and three houses put up. So those would be the only additions to our list.

The only change which we feel might be feasible - I don't know if you're familiar with our riding, but Kingsland sort of juts out on the west side of Macleod Trail. The balance of that little bit along there through Haysboro is in Calgary-Glenmore constituency. But it's all industrial from the LRT tracks over to Macleod Trail with the exception of two high-rise apartment buildings. They're actually on Horton Road. They call it Southland Circle, and there's a total of about 275 in one building and 190 in the other. So we feel it would be feasible to put those two buildings into our riding because they are sort of off by themselves in that industrial area. That would probably give us 700 to 900 more voters in our constituency.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. You appreciate that we are not actually drawing boundaries as a committee. What we are doing - and we've heard from a number of interested parties who have given us concerns they have relative to boundaries. We normally

have the Chief Electoral Officer traveling with us, Patrick Ledgerwood. I'm not sure when he's coming in.

MR. PRITCHARD: He'll be coming later this afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Later this afternoon. I'm sure he will be sitting on the Electoral Boundaries Commission. This is the kind of information that's certainly good for him to hear in an advance kind of way.

There was also a suggestion that when the commission is struck, possibly there should be some hearings held across the province before they sit down and write an interim report and draw boundaries so that they can take all of these things into account, then sit down and do their work, then hold another set of hearings to give people an opportunity for input after they've seen the proposed boundary changes. Then, of course, they submit their final report to the Legislature. That kind of input is most helpful in that setting.

Anyone else?

MS BARRETT: I have a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tom, and then Pam.

MR. SIGURDSON: Just some questions, perhaps. Thank you very much for your presentation. I wonder if you've had any opportunity to think about the variance that some constituencies have, that Calgary-Egmont is right there, smack-dab in the middle. It's one of those constituencies that, going on voter population, probably would not have to change very much. Have you any thoughts on those constituencies that are above 25 percent of the mean and those constituencies that are below? Do you think they ought to be moved one way or the other?

MRS. ART: I think it can be a problem, you know, if it's too large. Like, the population, say, in Calgary-Shaw and Calgary-Fish Creek is much larger than Calgary-Egmont because of all the new building going on there. That's why I thought if we could take that little bit and put it into Calgary-Egmont, then Calgary-Glenmore could move down a little farther and, say, take in Canyon Meadows or something away from Calgary-Shaw.

MR. SIGURDSON: So you think we really ought to be moving towards some kind of average?

MRS. ART: Well, that was just my own personal opinion.

MR. SIGURDSON: Yeah, I know. I appreciate that.

MRS. ART: I think it would be easier for the Chief Electoral Officer if all the ridings were within a . . . Wouldn't it?

MR. SIGURDSON: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the past, Eleanor, looking at the legislation which directed the 1983-84 Electoral Boundaries Commission, the commission was directed to use a plus/minus 25 percent variance for urban ridings, and there were 42 urban ridings. All the ridings in Calgary and Edmonton, in addition to two ridings in Lethbridge, a couple in Red Deer, one in Medicine Hat, and one in - was it Grande Prairie? No, Grande Prairie wasn't called an urban riding, was it? In any event, there was the plus/minus 25 percent factor in the urban ridings.

There was no factor for the rural ridings, so the commission had much greater flexibility. The court case in British Columbia that we referred to suggested that unless there are some very extenuating circumstances, we should stay within the plus/minus 25 percent range. Now, Justice McLachlin didn't define what she meant by those extraordinary circumstances, but obviously, we believe, she was referring to distance and sparse population, as an example.

Anything else, Tom?

MR. SIGURDSON: No, that's fine, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.
Pam?

MS BARRETT: Okay. Eleanor, you'll see in the package that there is this map - it's before the one you're looking at, I believe; that's right - that's got a lot of pink on it. This map shows the ridings that are below the mean average number of voters, 18,000, which would be the mean average in Alberta, by a factor of greater than 25 percent. They are relatively underpopulated compared to that 25 percent average.

MRS. ART: Right.

MS BARRETT: Would you have any recommendations on fixing this so that there was a movement towards representation by population to reduce the amount of pink ridings? Would you have any recommendations?

MRS. ART: Not really. I know it's a problem with the ridings because, you know, they're just not populated, so you have to have larger areas.

MS BARRETT: That would certainly address the big northern ones. Peace River, for instance, doesn't qualify as pink but - I mean, the northern ones. Anything north of Whitecourt is huge. Perhaps you would like to speculate if that constitutes extraordinary circumstances.

MRS. ART: I would say it would, say, in Peace River and Fort McMurray.

MS BARRETT: Any other recommendations? I believe it's the second-last page in this booklet that shows a picture of a map with a lot of purple on it. The purple indicates ridings that wouldn't even meet a 35 percent criterion. In other words, they are underrepresented by a factor of greater than 35 percent. Are there any recommendations you would make to try to bring those ridings into greater conformity with the concept of representation by population?

MRS. ART: I hadn't really thought about it, to be honest with you.

MS BARRETT: By the way, I should tell you the green dots tell you where our tour is.

MRS. ART: Oh, okay. Colourful.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pat.

MRS. BLACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When you look at

the map, as Pam has pointed out, there are differences between . . . The mean population we found from eligible voters was, I believe, 18,000 eligible voters per electoral division. Taking the 25 percent variance factor into account, a lot of our urban ridings, my own included, are over the mean average with the variance factored into it. Pam's quite right; some of the rural ridings are, in fact, substantially under the average for population.

We've listened to some concerns from the rural people as well as the urban people, and I'm wondering if there's any uniqueness you see that distinguishes, say, an urban riding from a rural riding. Certainly I think the rural people feel there is a distinction in accessibility, problems with geographical boundaries, and even the demographics of their own ridings distinguishes them from, say, an urban setting. One thought had come to mind that possibly some of the - like in Calgary. I'll deal with Calgary, the north and the south. Some of those ridings, in fact almost all of them, are over the variance allowed. Could a portion of the ridings be shifted to, say, part of the rural setting, or is there a distinction between an urban and a rural setting that should be dealt with as a concern for our committee? We've certainly heard from the rural people that they feel there is. I'm wondering if you feel there's a distinction. You're almost getting into the centre of the city.

MRS. ART: Why are they concerned? The rural ones do not want to come in with the . . .

MRS. BLACK: Well, they feel their makeup in some regard is different, and they have many, say, municipal districts or many councils that have to be dealt with, where we have one council in Calgary. They have maybe one MLA dealing with five or six councils, where in Calgary we have 18 MLAs dealing with one city council. They feel that's a disadvantage because their member is having to deal with more levels of government than we are in the city. I'm wondering if you have any thoughts on that or if you would have any problem, do you think, with shifting the people from down in Calgary-Fish Creek or Calgary-Shaw out to the outlying areas?

MRS. ART: I don't see where that should be that big a problem. We did have that to an extent. Midnapore used to be in a rural riding. Of course, it was rural a few years ago. Now, I'm sure it's the same with Edmonton, too, and perhaps even Lethbridge and Medicine Hat.

MRS. BLACK: There could be some shifts?

MRS. ART: Uh huh.

MRS. BLACK: Yeah, you're quite right. Midnapore was a rural riding not that long ago.

MRS. ART: Yeah. And with our federal ridings, often they take in part. They have to, because where do you divide that line? I know in one election in Midnapore, one side of the street was in Calgary-Fish Creek, and the other side was in . . . It was confusing, but people just have to sit down, read their map, and find out which riding they're in.

MRS. BLACK: So you don't see that as a problem then?

MRS. ART: I don't think so. Maybe it's more work for the

MLA if he has to work with the different councils, but as far as running the election, I can't see it as a problem.

MRS. BLACK: Okay. Good.

Rena, do you have any . . .

MRS. KLAFFKE: Oh, no. I didn't come to speak. I'm just an observer. I've lots of things running through my mind, but no, I'd rather not.

MRS. BLACK: Well, as Pam pointed out on the map with the pink colouring, you look at a Dunvegan or a Lesser Slave Lake, and you consider that you're probably looking at a thousand square miles to cover, and even though the populations are smaller, you've got a big lake in there and things like that. I look at my riding of Calgary-Foothills, which is, I suppose, probably - what? - 25, 30 square miles, somewhere in there. It's quite a different form of representation. I can access my riding probably much easier than, say, someone from Dunvegan or Lesser Slave Lake. They have different problems up there of getting in and out. When we were out in B.C., they had a fellow who had to have a float plane to get from island to island. In some cases there aren't roadways that would take you through the ridings. I'm wondering if that's a consideration we should be looking at: factoring in some of these differences between urban and rural ridings.

Here I go again on my kick. I'm leading up to my formula. I like formulas. Where there are factors that are involved and they maybe have to be factored in on a weighted average basis or something to determine that - if a Calgary MLA, say, has two school boards to deal with and a rural MLA has five to eight, if that's a fair representation. Possibly in their riding it could be on a scale of one to 10. In mine it would be one, and in theirs it would be seven. If there should be a formula to factor in some of these rural areas and equate them better to the urban centres . . . It's a formula I've been playing with all the way through this committee. I don't know how receptive anyone is to it, but I think it's . . .

MR. BRUSEKER: We've been very indulgent in listening to you.

MRS. BLACK: Yes, they have.

But those are factors, when you look at the layout of the province, that I think we have to consider.

MRS. ART: I can see where some consideration has to be given to the northern part of our province because the areas are so large and, of course, very sparsely populated too.

MRS. BLACK: One thing I was going to ask you. Some jurisdictions divide up their boundaries. They have representation based on population as opposed to representation based on eligible voters.

MRS. ART: What was that again?

MRS. BLACK: They have representation based on population, the total population, as opposed to representation based on eligible voters.

MRS. ART: Okay. I can see population, because you still have the problems with the nonvoters. You know, they still come to

their MLA for help even though they're not eligible voters. So there still is the work involved with representing them.

MRS. BLACK: So you think that should be a factor we should consider then?

MRS. ART: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's been Tom's point.

MR. SIGURDSON: For quite some time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to add anything further, Tom?

MR. SIGURDSON: Well, I have often thought that there's approximately 40 percent of the population that's not considered when we draw boundaries, and those are primarily children. I happen to feel that I represent those who are under 18 as much as I represent those who are over 18.

MRS. ART: Yes. I think you should too.

MR. SIGURDSON: I think it's important, especially important, that children, immigrants, new Canadians - not yet new Canadians but those with landed immigrant status - be accorded some degree of right and representation. I think that's a factor we ought to include in our constituencies.

MRS. ART: Well, actually, I suppose in one of our communities in Calgary-Egmont there are people who are eligible voters, that one area in Fairview. We've seen several apartment buildings there, and this is where the landed immigrants seem to converge. There will be two or three families living in one apartment. I didn't know we had that in our constituency until I helped campaign a few times and found out.

MRS. BLACK: But if you factored that in, then, the numbers could realistically all change around.

MRS. ART: Oh, for sure. Yes. And I'm sure every constituency probably would be the same.

MRS. BLACK: Yeah. And I think particularly up in Calgary-Montrose, Calgary-McCall, Calgary-Forest Lawn, those areas could be heavily affected.

MS BARRETT: Does Calgary-Montrose have any apartment buildings?

MRS. BLACK: Yes.

MRS. ART: It must be, to be so small.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And what about townhouses?

MRS. BLACK: Yeah. But there are a lot of new immigrants in Calgary-Montrose that would not be eligible voters. And the same with Calgary-Millican. Calgary-Millican, again, has a tremendous number of new landed immigrants that would not be eligible voters.

MRS. ART: They would probably have the most actually.

MRS. BLACK: Probably, in Calgary-Millican. Well, that's interesting, I think.

MRS. ART: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Any other questions or comments? Anything else, Eleanor?

MRS. ART: I don't think so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the committee, thank you very much for taking time to come in and share your thoughts with us. As I said, everything that's been said is on a transcript, and we'll make sure the Chief Electoral Officer gets a copy of your concerns relative to the boundaries. But we urge you, once a commission has been struck, to ensure that there is a presentation made on behalf of the constituency at that time. Okay?

MRS. ART: Well, thank you very much.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you.

[The committee recessed from 1:37 p.m. to 1:50 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We were going to have an update on the Victoria trip, first of all, and then discuss the AUMA convention and the delegates who met with the executive of the AUMA and the improvement districts. Unfortunately, Mike isn't here. He, I think, is the only one who met with the improvement districts, the Alberta Hospital Association and the Alberta School Trustees' Association. Then, of course, we have the presentation - Tom, you, Frank, and I are involved in it - on Wednesday with one delegate body.

Why don't we go back to the Victoria trip first? Frank, would you like to lead off?

MR. BRUSEKER: Sure. The meeting occurred on the Friday, and we spent the day with Larry Chalmers, who was the chairman of their committee to look at electoral boundaries. We met with a number of individuals, most of whose names I don't remember too clearly. But we met with the Clerk of the Legislature, Craig. I forget his last name, but he was there. The Surveyor General was there; the Chief Electoral Officer was there. We had a chance to look at the report that was produced, called the Fisher report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And the NDP member for the Beacon Hill area of Victoria.

MR. SIGURDSON: Gordon Hanson.

MR. BRUSEKER: Gordon Hanson, yes.

Judge Fisher was appointed, traveled around the province, and basically came up with a report that recommended changes to the boundaries, which had a couple of effects. First of all, it increased the total number of seats in the House by six, from 69 to 75. It suggested a fairly strict adherence to a provincial mean, and their provincial mean is based on census as opposed to electors. If I remember right, the figure was around 38,000 and something; that was the provincial mean. So all of their electoral boundaries proposed, which will be implemented January of 1990, will adhere fairly strictly to the provincial mean, plus or minus 25 percent: the 25 percent rule.

Plus or minus 25 percent gives them a substantial variation. When you consider an average of 38,000, 25 percent of that is going to be approximately 9,500 plus and minus. You have a variation of some 19,000 in the census, so it allows for quite a variation. The legislation that was proposed suggested that future commissions be guided or stay within the 25 percent plus and minus, but they did in fact have a clause which said that under various certain special circumstances, which were not described or elaborated upon, a commission could in the future go beyond the 25 percent rule. One of the questions I asked was, well, what kinds of circumstances. I think one of the mentions that was made was perhaps to prevent splitting an Indian reserve into two, and it might therefore create some boundary hassle. But with a total variation allowable of some 19,000 people, it seems they will stick to it fairly closely.

I think that pretty well sums it up. The interesting thing that occurred was that out of the 75 constituencies that will be in place as of January 1990, the majority of them can be found located in the southwest corner of the province: the lower mainland, Vancouver, White Rock – the Vancouver metropolitan area, shall we say. So although the concern has been expressed here in Alberta about the shift from a rural to an urban weighting, that concern, I think, was probably taken into account, but Justice McLachlin's recommendations and Judge Fisher's report both suggested representation by population and I believe the proposed boundaries that will come into place really reflect that. So, in fact, now the urban constituencies have the bulk of the representation in the future distribution.

I think that sums it up pretty well, unless I've missed something. Perhaps, Pat or Bob, if I've missed something, you might want to add.

MRS. BLACK: I think Frank has pretty well covered it, except that one of the things I found we were a little shy on is that I really wish we had had Judge Fisher present to explain the basis of this report and what he had found on his tours as to what he may have intended to lead to be special circumstances. It's very vague in the legislation, and I think it's a potential challenge item down the road. I really would suggest that we try and get a meeting with Judge Fisher and ask him if he could come and meet with us – hopefully, come to Edmonton to meet with us.

MR. BRUSEKER: And perhaps Justice McLachlin as well, who addressed that same . . .

MRS. BLACK: I think it would be harder to get her to come . . .

MR. BRUSEKER: Tougher, from the Supreme Court, yes. But just a suggestion.

MRS. BLACK: Yeah, if possible. But I really think it would be important for us to meet with Judge Fisher, because the people we did meet with were not a part of the review process. They were basically the group that received the end results and ratified the end results. I think that's important when we look at some of the areas. As I say, there was a . . . I forget the riding; it was way up in the northern part of the mainland. The present member can access it only because he has his own float plane. He can go from island to island to island, and he's a licensed pilot. Now, you can't make a requirement . . .

MS BARRETT: That's right.

MRS. BLACK: . . . that you have to be a licensed float plane pilot to get elected. It would be very difficult. And those were questions we asked, if consideration for getting to the Gulf Islands was taken into account, and no one seemed to really know. So I think it's really important that we talk to Judge Fisher and see if we can get him to flip out to Calgary or Edmonton for a meeting.

MR. BRUSEKER: In Judge Fisher's report he did mention that there were some issues that needed to be addressed. One of them you've mentioned, Pat. Another one he mentioned was that perhaps within a constituency, members of that constituency – the public at large – perhaps should have a toll-free line to call their MLA, particularly in the rural constituencies. In those areas where it may be difficult for transportation means, perhaps a toll-free line could be addressed. So he was simply, I think, trying to identify some concerns, and they would be identified and hopefully solved within their – we call it Members' Services Committee; they had a different title for their committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Board of internal review.

MR. BRUSEKER: That perhaps their board of internal review should look at the services provided for MLAs and address some of these issues like the telecommunications issue.

MRS. BLACK: And I think just further – one of the things I think we've talked about several times as a recommendation before decisions are made by the commission: that they go back to the public and hear the public. I know when I looked at the map of Nanaimo riding, which I know quite well, they've split it along Hammond Bay Road and Departure Bay Road, which is in the middle of town, and part of it is going to be going down into the Ladysmith riding. I know the people there are going to be screaming, and I think they didn't go back to them and talk to the people within the ridings. I think it's going to cause quite a bit of trouble, and even the way they're extending out east and west, there's a tremendous burden because there isn't a roadway system that goes through east and west. So I think it would be important that our commission go back to the people before they make a final decision on boundaries, because, boy, geography or a road system can mean all the difference between day and night.

MR. BRUSEKER: I think the city of Prince George went into three constituencies, if I remember right. I personally didn't feel very comfortable with that concept.

MRS. BLACK: No. But I don't think they went back to the people, Frank. I don't think the official commission went back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I just supplement? And then we'll take questions either from Tom or Pam.

First of all, on the question of Judge Fisher, Bob Pritchard indicated to me on Friday that he would do his very best to see if we could arrange to get Judge Fisher to come out and meet with the committee while we're either in Edmonton or in Calgary so we would have the benefit of his knowledge and his understandings. It's important, as well, to remember how that process evolved.

Just to build a little bit on what Frank said, when Judge Fisher was first appointed, his sole task was to divide the dual ridings. That was his mandate. He came back to the government and

said: "I can't do that alone. You've got to broaden the mandate." Because one of the things we were curious about was why the Chief Electoral Officer was not part of that commission. When you look at the original mandate, it's pretty straightforward: divide the dual ridings. There are how many dual ridings? Seventeen?

MRS. BLACK: Seventeen dual ridings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. He then asked for an expanded mandate which took him into a full-blown redistribution process, and I think it would be very helpful, as others have said, to sit down and listen to the points he would make.

The only other comment I'd make is that I thought it was valuable meeting on the Thursday evening in a dinner meeting prior to the Friday, so we could review what we intended to do the next day and be prepared for that. That all went very well.

The last comment I'd make is that I've never before been part of a delegation where the organizers have gone to such lengths to ensure that our welcome to the city was as warm and friendly as it actually was. As my wife and I checked into the hotel, and I think the same was true with Stockwell Day and his wife - I'm not sure what time you got there, Frank, or you, Pat - the mayor of the city of Victoria was ready to cut the ribbon to officially open the new Hotel Grand Pacific. It was the official opening. It was not a first anniversary. So we all quickly changed into something more suitable and joined the party downstairs.

MR. PRITCHARD: I tried to convince Mr. Bogle that I had personally set it up for him, but it didn't go over.

MRS. BLACK: There was a major reception in the lobby that took place: red carpets with massive spot lights beaming all over.

MR. PRITCHARD: And anything you wanted to eat and drink.

MRS. BLACK: Frank and I arrived at the same time and thought they knew we were coming.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tom, you had a question or comment?

MR. SIGURDSON: A couple of questions. You said that MLA Chalmers chaired a commission. Did he have a report?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. What happened was that once the court case came down, the McLachlin decision, an all-party committee was struck, and the all-party committee - that was the committee chaired by Chalmers - recommended that they go back and adopt the Fisher recommendations. From there one of their select standing committees became involved with and developed the recommendations for future commissions and future boundary redistribution processes. So although the membership on the special select committee and the standing select committee I think were fairly close, they were two separate committees, as I understood it.

MR. SIGURDSON: Are there reports available from those committees, something we might be able to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. I was going to further suggest that we take the transcripts of the meeting on Friday and have those

built into our record, because in addition to the taped portion of the meeting, we do have copies of the reports which should be compiled with other information we have.

MR. PRITCHARD: I also have some reports in my office that they gave us. Some of them are quite thick, like the history of the electoral boundaries in B.C. Rather than copying them, I thought I'd just set them out in the office, and people can use them as a reference if they're interested in them.

MR. SIGURDSON: Two other points. One, Pat, you mentioned that one chap has his own float plane and pilot's licence, but there's no provision for that member or other members who have large geographical areas to cover? There's no special provision or allowance for them?

MRS. BLACK: No, not at this point. It's something their internal whatever it was . . .

MR. SIGURDSON: Internal board of review.

MRS. BLACK: . . . may be looking at down the road. He can claim it through mileage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As if he were driving a car.

MRS. BLACK: Yeah, but let's face it; it's far more expensive to run an airplane than it is to drive a car. But he claims the same mileage as if he were driving a car.

MR. SIGURDSON: Does he have, as in Alberta, two sets of mileage allowances, one for urban members and one for rural members? Do they have one standard set?

MRS. BLACK: No. It's quite different. We did have an informal discussion on those things, and they were quite interested in what we had done. I think they will be reviewing that.

MR. BRUSEKER: And I believe their mileage allowance, Tom, is substantially poorer than ours in terms of how much you can claim on an annual basis. So I would suspect that the expenses this individual would incur would be far greater than what he could claim back. I could be wrong, but I seem to recall a figure of around \$2,500 or \$3,000 as the total gas allowance for an MLA. Very poor.

MR. SIGURDSON: One final question. Frank had mentioned the point of Prince Rupert being split into three constituencies.

MR. BRUSEKER: Prince George.

MR. SIGURDSON: Prince George? Okay. Do they have an urban/rural constituency makeup, where they take in a part of rural British Columbia and throw it into the urban centres?

MR. BRUSEKER: Yeah. Kelowna city is another one. There is a main north-south street, and Kelowna city has been split in half, basically, into Okanagan west and Okanagan east. As you can imagine, Okanagan west has at its eastern limit half the city of Kelowna and then a very large rural area, and Okanagan east has at its western limit the other half of Kelowna and a large rural component as well.

MR. SIGURDSON: I see. Okay. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But the extreme example was Prince George, which is divided into three. So it's like pieces of the pie with a small wedge in the city fanning out into the countryside.

MRS. BLACK: I think that's why it's important to have Judge Fisher to determine how he drew up those lines.

MR. SIGURDSON: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anything else, Tom?

MR. SIGURDSON: No, that's fine, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pam.

MS BARRETT: He asked most of what I wanted, but it occurs to me to suggest that if we can't get him out at a time when we can get a quorum for meeting, perhaps we could ask Judge Fisher to respond in writing to some questions we could draft. I mean, I think we should try to get the meeting first, but if it ain't going to work out somehow or other, perhaps we could do that.

MRS. BLACK: The only problem with that, Pam, is when you get into these meetings, I think quite often another thought comes from a comment that he has back . . .

MS BARRETT: I recognize that. What I'm suggesting, Pat, is . . .

MRS. BLACK: If we could get him, I think it's important.

MS BARRETT: I didn't say not get him. Read my lips. I suggested that what we do is try to get a meeting with him, and if we can't get a meeting with him, we don't ignore the subject matter, we draft up a letter with a series of questions and send that to him and ask for his response in writing.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah. As a contingency if there is no way we can arrange our meeting.

MS BARRETT: Correct. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Any other questions?
Okay. We can go on then. The Alberta Urban Municipalities Association, the presentation. I don't have the names of which . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: No, I didn't bring the names.

MS BARRETT: Maybe there was no presentation. It was Stock that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, to the executive. Who did the . . . None of us did the presentation?

MR. PRITCHARD: What happened was that we had people at the tables . . .

MS BARRETT: That's right.

MR. PRITCHARD: . . . at the registration times, the two dates. It was Stockwell Day and Mike Cardinal. Unfortunately, neither is here today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's why there's a silence.

MR. BRUSEKER: There you go. Must have gone smoothly.

MR. PRITCHARD: Stockwell and Mike both said it went well. People came over and asked them questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The improvement districts convention out in Jasper.

MR. PRITCHARD: I don't have a lot to report on that. Mike Cardinal went. We set up a special trip for him to get there because there was difficulty over scheduling. He said it went very well and it was well worth going. He got a number of questions, and he was really pleased we spent the money to get the plane so he was able to go up. It was well worth the money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Alberta Hospital Association.

MS BARRETT: That was me and Stock.

MR. PRITCHARD: That's right.

MS BARRETT: We're getting so efficient we had it down to a six-minute presentation, and those people are very well organized and had questions that were right to the point. We were out in 18 minutes flat. It was very efficient, very smooth. They will be presenting to us. They may do a report from their executive in writing and send that along. They will also attempt to have some of their people out at hearings a little bit later down the road. I assume they mean the February hearings. They are particularly concerned with coterminous boundaries; it looks like they desire that. That's the issue that was of greatest concern to them, so we can look forward to, I believe, a written submission and some oral presentations in February.

MR. PRITCHARD: Did we get an invite to their bigger . . .

MS BARRETT: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, remember there wasn't an opportunity. Their agenda had already been fixed.

MS BARRETT: Oh, that's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So we couldn't get on their agenda. Were you thinking of tabling?

MR. PRITCHARD: Oh, that's right. Yes. Sorry, that's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The Alberta School Trustees' Association, the executive.

MR. BRUSEKER: Tom and I did that one together. It worked out very well. We both missed the same plane and managed to arrive at the same time, both late.

MR. SIGURDSON: It was a shock to see each other.

MR. BRUSEKER: We were planning to catch a 1:30 plane, and we discovered that Canadian had cancelled the 1:30 plane.

Again, they were very pleased to have us come there and make our presentation. Tom sort of went through the historical side of things, and then I talked about the plus or minus 25 percent as outlined in the letter.

The topic of coterminous boundaries came up once again, and one of the interesting things that I think came out of that meeting was that they were suggesting perhaps a boundaries committee should be looking not only at provincial MLA boundaries but at boundaries that are in the province. That might include county boundaries and school boards and hospital boards and perhaps some way of streamlining the entire process right across the province, which of course does not fall within our mandate. But I thought it was an interesting concept at any rate, and maybe in the future it could be a consideration.

I think they were quite pleased that we were there. At first they kind of wondered why we were there, but then they realized that yes, there was an impact upon the school trustees. They were pleased we'd taken the time and, I think, are looking forward to our presentation to the entire board next week.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This week.

MR. BRUSEKER: Wednesday, the day after tomorrow. Yeah. Does that sum it up?

MR. SIGURDSON: Yeah, it does.

Just to underscore your point about coterminous boundaries, that did come home. It's something that while it's certainly not in our mandate, with the broad range we have, we might just want to toss out a trial balloon and see if other colleagues in the Legislature want to ever consider looking at trying to develop boundaries that effectively point to one MLA as a provincial representative so that school boards, hospital boards, IDs can know who their contact person is. That may make for a neater arrangement without having so much spillover into other constituencies.

MR. BRUSEKER: One of the reasons they talked about coterminous boundaries – I forget the exact figure, but one of the members of the ASTA mentioned that there are a number of school boards that had been quite recently created, and the reason they're being created is that they have a bit of a tax grab to raise money for a particular project or something and that . . .

MR. SIGURDSON: Yeah.

MR. BRUSEKER: They also talked about the idea that perhaps that's why we should look at – a boundaries committee or a commission, whatever, should look at a variety of boundaries. Again, it falls outside the mandate, but I just . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just an editorial note. It would be much easier to address the question of municipal and school boundaries, because they are coterminous in most cases. Hospital district boundaries, on the other hand, cut across municipal boundaries. There's no correlation at all in the rural areas.

MS BARRETT: That's right. But hospital district boundaries are set by provincial regulation, aren't they?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. But what I'm saying is that the district

boundaries have been carved out and have stayed the same for decades literally, and they don't have regard for municipal boundaries. You know, I'm thinking of the three hospitals that are in my constituency. The Taber hospital, for instance, overlaps into Ray Speaker's constituency and Alan Hyland's. So there are three MLAs who work with a board in the sense that one board member's from Alan's area, two are from Ray's, and I guess five are from mine.

Just to follow up, then, our meeting with the Alberta School Trustees' Association on Wednesday. Tom, you and Frank are joining me. We're to meet there at 9:15, and then the presentation is at 9:30. Apparently they do not have provisions for an overhead, so it's going to be a little more difficult. Robin is going to make sure that . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes, what we're going to do, Mr. Bogle, which will be the best, is put one of those letters on each chair in the centre, because there are several doors going in. So we'll put them on the chairs; there'll be an outline on each chair so they'll have their paper near them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the three of us will have to work out a process on the presentation, and then we'll do the questions and answers.

MR. SIGURDSON: Okay.

MR. BRUSEKER: Perhaps we could just meet there at 9 o'clock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. I think we could do that before Wednesday morning.

MR. SIGURDSON: Perhaps we could have breakfast together.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. A good idea.

MR. SIGURDSON: Just to go over the role we'll have, does the convention start at 9:30? Are we the first on the agenda? Do we know?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah. I understand we're the first on the agenda.

MR. SIGURDSON: Okay.

MS BARRETT: Well, that's pretty good.

MR. SIGURDSON: Otherwise they could flip through their kit and forget about it or lose it, and . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm glad you're distributing it in the room rather than in the kit. Without an overhead, they have to have the letter to make any sense out of it.

MR. PRITCHARD: So they'll either have it in their hand or they'll be sitting on it.

MR. SIGURDSON: I was told there is an overhead in that room but it is sufficient for only about one-third of the audience because of lighting conditions.

MS BARRETT: I had the impression when you and I went to

do . . . Was it municipal districts and counties?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS BARRETT: I had the impression only half the audience could see what we were talking about. The other half might as well have been blind.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes. That was about 700 people.

MS BARRETT: This is double that amount, I know. That's what I was getting at. Well, we learn as we go, right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anything else on delegations? Okay.

The next item on the agenda. I'm proposing that we set aside two hours on Wednesday, February 14, as a wrap-up. You'll recall we're hitting it pretty heavy in February. If you look at the last page of the document, on February 13 we're in St. Paul in the afternoon and in Viking that evening. Now, it's an hour's drive to Edmonton from Viking. What I was suggesting is that we meet from 10 until 12 noon, or mark that in our calendars, so we have a wrap-up business section. We will then not be coming back until the House is in session, which we presume is either the next week or the week after.

So first of all, does that present a problem for anyone on the schedule?

HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Great. We're all agreed on that.

MS BARRETT: Can I see your planner for a minute? I don't have my caucus dates.

MR. SIGURDSON: I don't think I've got them in here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bob, you've got committee report writing. Is there something on that that we should know?

MR. PRITCHARD: No. Basically I just thought you might want to talk about scheduling sometimes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, thank you. It's with the next line. I didn't read on.

One of the things we were going to suggest to our three respective caucuses is that if we can block out time now and get that cleared with our respective Whips, then . . . I'm assuming your caucuses are like the one Pat and I are involved in: once you're there, all kinds of commitments come in and you're in trouble. We could communicate with our caucuses now and say we've got to have time to do the writing on this report, but if we're trying to fit seven schedules together, it just won't work.

MS BARRETT: Impossible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So I was suggesting that we set aside two nights, and I just used Mondays and Thursdays as examples.

MS BARRETT: I already put a note in my calendar. That's how fast I agree.

MR. BRUSEKER: I think that's a good time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay?

MR. SIGURDSON: I agree as well. But, Pam, can you update us on any changes to the Standing Orders that may put us into a four-day week?

MS BARRETT: No, not at this point. I've only had informal discussions, most recently with a couple of deputy government House leaders. I have to book to get that.

MR. SIGURDSON: The only reason I raised that, Mr. Chairman, is that if we do go to a four-day week, I'm sure . . .

MS BARRETT: Well, we would know by Christmas.

MR. SIGURDSON: Yeah, but other members are not going to want to have to stay till Thursday night.

MS BARRETT: No, no. We would make it like Monday and Tuesday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But we could approve this subject to the existing rules, and if the rules are changed, then our committee could come back and adjust.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. And we'll know well in advance. We'll know by Christmas.

MR. BRUSEKER: So what we'd be looking at, then, would be probably not a Thursday evening sitting of the Legislature. Is that what you're looking at, Pam?

MS BARRETT: Yes. That's what I've been working on. It's a several-year project that may come to fruition soon.

MR. BRUSEKER: So you'd be looking at canceling Friday sittings?

MS BARRETT: That's right. So people can spend it in their constituencies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But would we not be sitting Thursday evenings?

MS BARRETT: No. It'd be Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday evenings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I see. All right. If we agree to this, it's subject to the current rules.

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there's a change, then we have to come back and address what we'd do with the Thursday . . .

MS BARRETT: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . either try to compress it into the Tuesday or the Wednesday . . .

MS BARRETT: Or meet after the House concludes on Thursday.

MRS. BLACK: At midnight?

MR. BRUSEKER: No. What she's saying is if the Legislature changes . . .

MRS. BLACK: Yeah. I know what she's saying. I have a problem with Mondays, I have to admit, but I may be able to . . . I have a standing meeting Mondays.

MS BARRETT: Do you?

MRS. BLACK: Yeah.

MS BARRETT: How about Tuesdays? Anybody have a problem with Tuesdays? We usually sit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Tuesday's all right?

MR. BRUSEKER: Tuesday's fine. In a sense maybe Tuesday is better, because Monday is often a bit of a marathon session anyway. With getting to Edmonton and then an evening sitting, I find Mondays can be very long.

MR. PRITCHARD: Okay. I'll make it Tuesdays and Thursdays then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that okay, Pat?

MRS. BLACK: Well, I have one Tuesdays as well. What about Wednesdays?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I think you need, if I may, a day between.

MS BARRETT: Exactly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think if we try to do it two days back-to-back, we're going to be bushed.

[The committee met in camera from 2:22 p.m. to 2:25 p.m.]

MR. PRITCHARD: Just a detail, but do you want those to be dinner meetings?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, just something light. It would have to be, because we're going back in on both the Monday and Thursday evenings.

MR. BRUSEKER: Yeah. Because we wouldn't have any time to get anywhere to get something to eat.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

All right? Is there any other business we want to raise today? I'm going to ask Bob to lead us through tonight and tomorrow, if there's anything further to what's on our written agenda.

MR. BRUSEKER: Just a question. I noticed that we did have Dianne Mirosh written down for 1:15. Is she not going to be able to make it? Have we heard?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes. Unfortunately she was late, and then she was unable to make it due to another emergency commitment that came up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So we may see her tonight or tomorrow.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes. Or a representative.

So basically tonight the public hearings are open. We've had a lot of phone calls, a lot of people interested, so we may have a good turnout.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's advertised, Bob, 7 till 9?

MR. PRITCHARD: It's actually advertised 7 till 10, so you've got plenty of time for people to come in.

Tomorrow morning at 10 a.m. we have Gary Dickson, the president of the Alberta Liberal Party; at 11 o'clock Al Duerr, the mayor of Calgary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. We've got a different schedule than you do, Bob.

MR. BRUSEKER: This is the new and improved schedule that I have.

MR. PRITCHARD: You do? How interesting. Okay.

MR. BRUSEKER: Robin passed out a second schedule, and he said this is the new version and it's correct.

MR. PRITCHARD: Okay. Sorry. Well, 10 p.m. should be 10 a.m., so it's not that.

On Tuesday the 28th at 10 a.m. is Gary Dickson, president of the Alberta Liberal Party; at 11:30 a break to go to the ASTA luncheon. At 2:15 in the afternoon Mayor Al Duerr of Calgary will be tabling a report. At 2:45 a staff member from Jack Major's office will be doing a presentation. Jack Major is unable to do it himself; he has other involvements. At 3:45 is Carol MacDonald, president of the Highwood constituency. At 4 o'clock we can do any other committee business, or if there's somebody we can't fit in from tonight, we can ask them to come at that time. At 4:30 John Bronius, representing Calgary-McCall, wishes to make a presentation. Then we'll break for dinner, and at 7 p.m. back here for the public hearing.

The dinner for this evening is at the Westin at the Terrace restaurant and tomorrow evening is at the Beefeater restaurant, which is across the street from the Westin.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. I have a meeting at 4:30 that will tie me up until probably 5:30, so I'll join you . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: Tonight?

MR. CHAIRMAN: At what time are we going to eat dinner?

MR. PRITCHARD: We're going to go and have supper at the Terrace at 5 o'clock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: At 5. All right. We're all together, are we?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes. It's all together.

MR. BRUSEKER: I will not be joining you for dinner there.

MR. PRITCHARD: Oh, you won't be joining us?

MR. BRUSEKER: No, I'm going to go home.

MR. PRITCHARD: Okay. Frank, no. Anybody else no? There's not too many of us left.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A question about tomorrow: Jack Major. Jack Major is one of the lawyers we have invited to make a presentation. Now, is his law firm represented in that capacity, or are they merely coming to present a brief like others?

MR. PRITCHARD: They'll be paid for this. They'll be the same as Barry Chivers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MRS. BLACK: Aren't we efficient.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anything else?

MR. SIGURDSON: Just one thing. On the way down I heard the weather report, and I want to thank the Calgary members

for arranging this wonderful chinook.

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MRS. BLACK: Actually, this is not unusual weather in Calgary.

MR. SIGURDSON: Can I retract?

MS BARRETT: That will happen later on, but it's minus seven in Edmonton and in Calgary the last report I heard just as I was getting out of my car.

MR. PRITCHARD: Never try and compliment a Calgarian, Tom. It's bad practice.

MRS. BLACK: Calgary is always like this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We're adjourned.

[The committee adjourned at 2:30 p.m.]

