

[Chairman: Mr. Bogle]

[2:21 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we'll now declare the meeting open. If you look first at the agenda page, we've got Medicine Hat *Hansard*, which we'll deal with in a moment, and Review of Scheduled Public Hearings. Bob will lead us through the hearings we have scheduled for the next week and a half. We then have the long-awaited review of our population data information. Remember, that's the idea of going to a total population base rather than an elector base. Then 5 is Discussion - Numbers of People Presenting at Public Hearings, and 6 is any other matters we might wish to deal with.

I'd like to begin by asking you to turn to the November 17, 1989, *Hansard*, and right after that we should deal with the December 12, 1989, *Hansard*. You've each got those?

MS BARRETT: No.

MR. SIGURDSON: I've only got December 12.

MR. BRUSEKER: I've got December 12 here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You just have December 12? All right. I'll just read into the record what was on November 17. This was relative to a presentation being made by Mr. Heron, the former MLA for Stony Plain. Some information was shared with the committee in camera at that time by the Chief Electoral Officer, and the remark to read into the record is on page 205 of the November 17, 1989, *Hansard*:

Mr. Ledgerwood: No. When we go off the record, I'll be pleased to share with you some of the unique factors that the last commission faced and why Stony Plain boundaries are as they are now.

When we were in Medicine Hat on December 12 - you all have a copy of that *Hansard*? All right. There was a presentation made by Mr. Carter.

MR. DAY: What page was that, Bob?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 337.

All right. In the second column, about a third of the way down, Mr. Carter said:

In my submission are two factors that bring into some question the independence, if you wish, of a commission that might look at that. I might add that those questions, particularly the point with respect to where the sitting member lives, should be an irrelevant consideration with respect to drawing the boundaries.

Now, it may be a coincidence that in a submission made by a presenter, a matter is raised that is parallel to a matter shared in confidence, but I want to stress to the committee the importance of trust. If this committee is going to function, and if we have any hope of submitting a unanimous report, then matters which are dealt with in camera must stay in camera and cannot under any circumstances be passed on to others who in turn will make a presentation. That was all I wanted to say relative to the matter.

Okay. Moving on, then, to item 2, Review of Scheduled Public Hearings. Is that mine?

MR. DAY: This is yours actually.

MR. PRITCHARD: I'm going to give everybody, in case they forgot one, another copy.

MS BARRETT: Well, I brought mine in.

MR. PRITCHARD: You've got yours; okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, Bob.

MR. PRITCHARD: Basically, today we're here from 2 to 4 for our meeting this afternoon. We're going to have dinner tonight at Tiffany's and this evening a public hearing in this same room from 7 till 9. We're staying here tonight, except for Stockwell. Tomorrow we'll leave at 9:30 in the morning via the van, for those that want to come in the van, to go to Hanna, have lunch in Hanna, have the public hearing from 1 till 3, and then the van will be going back to the Leg. Annex in Edmonton for anybody that wants to come back.

Stock, were you thinking of coming tomorrow and perhaps coming back with us while we're at . . .

MR. DAY: To Hanna?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes.

MR. DAY: It all depends. I've got meetings in Edmonton tomorrow morning. How soon they end, whether I can get to Hanna or not - I'll have to just leave it at that.

MR. PRITCHARD: Okay. Mike and Pat Black won't be able to join us.

MR. DAY: They will not be in Hanna, you said?

MR. PRITCHARD: No.

MR. BOGLE: Before we leave Hanna, Bob, do we have any backup plans at this point in time if we have a deluge of presentations in Hanna, keeping in mind that that constituency still feels the scars of the last redistribution? In other words, going back to Medicine Hat, we had - what? - 43-odd people and about 16 briefs presented. We extended our time in Medicine Hat by about an hour. We were able to do that because we didn't have any other commitments that evening. Do we have the flexibility to extend our time in Hanna, or are we not able to do that?

MR. PRITCHARD: We have the flexibility as far as the place is concerned, so it's up to people if they . . . You know, we could leave later with the vans, et cetera, et cetera, and *Hansard* is prepared to stay a bit later. Those of you that are traveling on your own, I don't know what your other commitments were.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pam?

MS BARRETT: No. No problem for me. I see that on this agenda it shows 1 o'clock and then 4:30 departure. I assume that the hearings were publicly scheduled from 1 till 3 p.m.? Is that correct, for Hanna?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes.

MS BARRETT: So we've at least got that hour and a half built in for flexibility. Fine with me.

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman to Bob. If I were to phone the

contact person, would they be able to give an indication of how the meeting was going or how long it was going to go? Is that person going to be right in that room or . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: I don't know that, but I can find out and give you a call. If you give me a phone number where I can reach you, I could call you and tell you how it's going so you can come later. Is that what you're thinking?

MR. DAY: Uh huh.

MR. PRITCHARD: Why don't you give me a couple of phone numbers or something? Then I can give you a buzz.

MR. DAY: Okay.

MR. PRITCHARD: That'll be easier.

MR. SIGURDSON: Is there any indication now that we're going to have a lot of folk attending in Hanna?

MR. PRITCHARD: We've had a lot of phone calls. We've had a lot of inquiries from surrounding constituencies that we've referred to Hanna.

MR. SIGURDSON: Okay.

MR. PRITCHARD: I would say the indications are it's probably going to be a large turnout.

MS BARRETT: That'd be true for Cardston and Lethbridge as well?

MR. PRITCHARD: Certainly Lethbridge.

MS BARRETT: Yup. Well, you'll be busy this week, eh?

MR. SIGURDSON: A hot time at the OK corral.

MR. PRITCHARD: If I can move on: Thursday, February 8, to Cardston. We'll pick anybody up at 1:15 at the airport in the van, get to Cardston for the hearing at 2:30 until 4:30, when we'll depart to come back to Lethbridge, to the Lethbridge Lodge. There isn't time built in there for anything extra. We've had some interest in Cardston, but I can't say it's been like Hanna and Lethbridge.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the fact that we're in Pincher Creek, which is a neighbouring constituency, the next day - I assume all the briefs in Cardston will be from that constituency. Probably all the briefs we receive in Pincher Creek will be from the Pincher Creek-Crowsnest constituency, whereas Lethbridge will be drawing from Macleod, possibly some from Little Bow, certainly Taber-Warner, and the two Lethbridge constituencies.

MR. PRITCHARD: Then Thursday evening in the Lethbridge Lodge we'll have the public hearing from 7 till 9, and again we've discussed using a memo where we ask people to be prepared to stay later.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. We'll come to this in a specific way later, I guess, when we talk under item 5 about how we might deal with that.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah. On Friday, February 9, we'll have a breakfast meeting in the morning at 8:30. We're having a couple of speakers in. David Alton and Peter McCormack are going to come and give us a political science perspective on electoral boundaries. When we have the breakfast meeting, we can also discuss what's happened at the previous two hearings. Then we'll leave for Pincher Creek, have the public hearing in the afternoon from 1 till 3, and make a variety of arrangements to get back to wherever people are going, by van or flying, or some are driving. I'm assuming with a lot of these that you've seen the schedules before and made arrangements or we've made the arrangements for you or whatever you requested or whatever was required.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Bob, I'd like to point out that you've only allowed 45 minutes to drive from Lethbridge to Pincher Creek. It's about 100 kilometres. I think you'll have to extend that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I agree.

MR. PRITCHARD: What was that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: How much time you've allowed from the morning meeting in Lethbridge for us to get to Pincher Creek . . .

MS BARRETT: Well, on the other hand . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . for the 1 o'clock meeting.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. If the check-out time is 10:30, presumably people will be hopping into vehicles right about then and just taking off directly, so that should be a factor.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah. With some of these, as soon as we get everybody together, we'll leave.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, as long as we're in Pincher Creek in time to, you know, start the meeting on time.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah. But that's a good point, Pat, and we'll adjust that.

On Monday, February 12, Slave Lake and Fort McMurray by government aircraft. If anybody wants a map where the airport is - I think it was Pat Ledgerwood who asked for a map - that's where we'll meet. A couple of planes are going. The public hearing will be 2 to 4. The hotel is picking us up and bringing us back to the plane.

MR. BRUSEKER: Okay. On that particular day I have booked to be on the 10:30 flight from Calgary to Edmonton, which will get to Edmonton about 11:10. The next earliest flight prior to that is 9 o'clock, and I don't feel like sitting around for an hour and a half. Does that give us enough time? I'll just be on the other side of the airport, so I'm wondering if there's any possibility of just getting picked up or . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: Oh, yeah. You're on King.

MR. BRUSEKER: I'm on King Air, which is to leave at 11:15.

MR. PRITCHARD: Okay.

MR. BRUSEKER: I'm guessing, although I don't know, maybe Pat Black might be interested in doing the same kind of thing as well. I don't know whether she's planning on being with us this day or not.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah. We'll pick you up at the other terminal, because it is just a five-minute drive around.

MR. BRUSEKER: So do you want me to wait at the main terminal where Canadian Airlines will set me down, or do you want me to get a cab and come around to the other side? What's the most convenient?

MR. PRITCHARD: I think probably if you wait, we'll pick you up.

MR. BRUSEKER: Okay.

MR. PRITCHARD: Because we'll be there with a vehicle.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're sure you'll have no trouble doing that.

MR. PRITCHARD: Well, it'll be a little bit . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Wouldn't it be better, Bob, if he took a cab around to the government hangar? I'm just thinking if you run into any snags at the main terminal with a private plane picking people up. It can probably be done, but . . .

MR. BRUSEKER: How about if you check, and can you let me know on Thursday when we're in Lethbridge?

MR. PRITCHARD: Maybe if we do it now, it's better. Maybe we'll do that, if you don't mind getting a cab.

MR. BRUSEKER: I'll just take a cab. Okay. Just so long as you're aware that I will be there as soon as I can.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah. And then we'll wait for you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bob, you'll check with Pat Black as well, and if the two can do it . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: I will.

MR. BRUSEKER: Yeah. That would be the best.

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, also to Bob. With all our communication back and forth there, Bob, we probably got some things crossed over, but I will not be on that flight.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes, I know. That was later. Thanks for mentioning it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MS BARRETT: You're not going with them?

MR. DAY: Not Monday. I'll be with you Tuesday.

MR. PRITCHARD: Anything else with that trip?  
Okay. Then in the evening to Fort McMurray, public hearings

from 7 till 9, and back by the government plane again. If we're a bit late, the government plane will wait, et cetera. On Tuesday the 13th, St. Paul and Viking. In the morning we'll leave the Leg. Annex at 10:30. We'll have lunch in St. Paul, a public hearing from 2 till 4. We leave by van to go to Viking, a 7 till 9 public hearing in the evening, and then drive back to Edmonton.

Are there any questions with any of that? Pam's laughing.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. I just saw the notation for 3:30 p.m. on Wednesday, February 14.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah.

MS BARRETT: No editorial comment there, eh?

MR. PRITCHARD: Somebody had to stick that in.

MS BARRETT: Well, good.

MR. PRITCHARD: Wednesday, on February 14, Donnelly. Government aircraft leave 9:30 and 10:30 in two planes to Donnelly. The public hearing is from 12 noon till 2 o'clock. There is time set aside for a wrap-up meeting, but it may be an extension of the public hearing. There have been a lot of calls and a lot of interest in that hearing.

AN HON. MEMBER: In Donnelly?

MR. PRITCHARD: In Donnelly. Particularly from neighbouring constituencies.

MR. BRUSEKER: I don't believe I'm going to be able to make that particular day.

MR. PRITCHARD: On the 14th?

MR. BRUSEKER: On the 14th. That's our caucus day.

MR. PRITCHARD: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. As it now stands, that will wrap up . . . No. Pardon me.

MR. PRITCHARD: One more. Edmonton on February 26, in the Carillon Room from 10 a.m. till 12 noon.

MR. BRUSEKER: And that is just a public hearing, is it? Or is it a committee meeting?

MR. PRITCHARD: It's a public hearing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We had asked to save the Tuesday evening for a committee meeting, didn't we?

MR. PRITCHARD: Save the Tuesday evening for our committee meeting. I've sent a memo around. I didn't bring copies, but basically the possible extension on the Lethbridge hearing: to hold 7 till 9 on Tuesday, February 27, in the Carillon Room. And also the schedule of 5:30 till 7:30 on Mondays and Thursdays starting March 7, unless the Leg. sits after March 1, which it now is, March 8. So we asked that the Mondays and Thursdays prior to March 8 be held in their entirety to start report

writing.

MR. BRUSEKER: Starting the first of March?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah.

MR. BRUSEKER: Okay. I don't believe I'm going to be able to make either the 26th or the 27th. The 27th is the leader's dinner in Calgary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, excuse me. Holding those two evenings was on the premise that we'd be in the session. We've got more flexibility as we're not in session.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah. They're simply held. But you're saying you can't make it on the 26th.

MR. BRUSEKER: No, I won't be there for the Carillon Room on the 26th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Anything else on the scheduled meetings to date?

MR. DAY: Thursday, March 8.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. DAY: I wonder if that could be difficult in light of the fact that people may have constituents up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. I'm assuming we're not going to be meeting the night. Let's assume our first of the evening meetings would be the following Monday, so that's - what? - the 12th.

MS BARRETT: I have an extremely important engagement to attend, unfortunately.

MR. DAY: I'll be here and I can speak for Pam.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Wrap it up then, eh? It'll be that week.

MR. DAY: So the Monday evening of March 12?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. BRUSEKER: We won't have any committee meeting prior to that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm still uneasy about wrapping up our hearings. We may have a meeting prior to that, Frank, if there's the need and we have enough members who can attend. But in terms of the schedule, Monday and Thursday evenings, those dates were set on a basis that we'd be sitting. So if we start on the 12th and our first meeting might be a relatively short meeting, we might be trying to earmark dates after that point.

MS BARRETT: It might be better to do that now, Bob, don't you think?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, let's hold it. We've got a couple of other times between now and . . . I'd like all the members to be here when we do that.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. A good point.

MR. PRITCHARD: That might be something you want to do at the end in Donnelly if there's half an hour, 20 minutes, or something. There's only the one hearing after that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Anything else on agenda item 2? All right. We're ready, then, to go on to Review of Population Data/Slides.

MR. PRITCHARD: Do you want to go through the whole slide show so everybody remembers it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. SIGURDSON: Even just to see the slides.

MR. DAY: Can we have a 90-second break?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure.

Just a second. When you say the whole slide show, you mean the population data, not the ones we've been reviewing at every . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah, not the enumeration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's what I thought you meant. Okay. Robert.

MR. PRITCHARD: What we did was use the same formulae - plus/minus 25, minus 35 percent, and minus 50 percent - and looked at population figures. So, based on the enumeration figures, there were 1,550,867 names divided by 83, which gave us our range of 14,014 to 23,356. When based on population figures, there were 2,365,825 names divided by 83, which gave us a range with a plus/minus 25 of 28,504 to 35,630, giving us an average per electoral division of 21,378. So based on those figures, we redid the maps and the charts.

MR. BRUSEKER: Well, just before you leave that, just a quick question. I notice that the census is '86. What year was the enumeration? Was that '88? There's two years' difference between these sets of figures?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah. The enumeration was '88.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Actually, the figures are updated from the 1988 enumeration to include the swear-ins and revisions at the 1989 general election.

MR. PRITCHARD: That's right too. There was an update.

MR. DAY: Could we have copies of that just for our own use?

MR. PRITCHARD: I can give you copies, sure. I don't have them right now.

This is using the same chart that we used with the enumeration list. Bob, I gave you that sheet with the different . . . With the over plus 25 on the eligible voters, there were 19 constituen-

cies. Looking at the population, it brings it down to 18 that are over plus 25. Under minus 25 there were 24 constituencies with eligible voters. With the population figures, there are 22 that fall under.

There are also some shifts around in the group of ranking. For example, Pincher Creek-Crowsnest comes to the bottom and Edmonton-Mill Woods goes to the top, which is different from the enumeration lists.

MR. DAY: Bob, sorry. Could we just leave that for a second?

MR. PRITCHARD: Sure.

MR. DAY: Okay. Thanks.

MR. PRITCHARD: This is the map. I'll show you this map and then show you the map from the enumeration lists. This is based on population. You'll notice there's a couple of big . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, but before you leave that, Bob, for the first time we've got two rural constituencies that are above the line.

MS BARRETT: That show green, yeah.

MR. PRITCHARD: On this one you've got two little dribs. You've got St. Albert and Medicine Hat that are plus 25.

This is the minus 35. Should I show you as a comparison that when it moves, this moves a up a little bit into the central region? Also, on a comparison basis, minus 35: with eligible voters, there were 16 constituencies; based on population figures, there are 12 constituencies that fall under.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So there's a net gain of four, or four that slip out of that negative category.

MR. PRITCHARD: You'll notice on this one with our eligible voters list that there's a concentration down here that changes. The most dramatic is the minus 50.

A very good slide show.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, it's Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

MR. PRITCHARD: Anyhow, I'm going to show you the one from the population lists. There's one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whereas we had five before.

MR. PRITCHARD: As you recall from this one, plus 35 . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. That's the best news part.

MR. BRUSEKER: Can you put up the list?

MR. PRITCHARD: Sure.

MR. BRUSEKER: The very first one you had.

MR. PRITCHARD: The population list?

MR. BRUSEKER: The population.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So there are several urban ridings or

metropolitan urban ridings that slip out of the yellow/green category into the . . .

Have you got the two city maps, Bob, on total population, Calgary and Edmonton?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah. These are the two city . . .

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Bob, I noticed on the bottom of that chart that it doesn't show the 1986 census figures. It shows the update of the Alberta Bureau of Stats for August 1989.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which one?

MR. PRITCHARD: Sorry, Pat?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Do I read on the bottom that it says that's . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: The Alberta Bureau of Statistics report, August 1989.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: So are we mixing apples and oranges, so you can't . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: No. It's the 1986 census data, but it's from the most current report, the 1989 report. It's 1986 data. Based on population, the city of Calgary - find the city of Calgary on there.

MR. BRUSEKER: So what would we lose? We'd lose Calgary-Foothills and Calgary-West?

MR. PRITCHARD: That is the picture with . . . Actually, for Calgary it's identical, right?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. PRITCHARD: No, it's not: Calgary-Foothills.

MR. BRUSEKER: Calgary-Foothills, Calgary-West, Calgary-Millican, Calgary-Buffalo.

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. SIGURDSON: Are you trying to become an optometrist?

MR. DAY: You can cover her right eye now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I hope the tape is running to catch all this. I want to play it back to Bob at some future time.

MR. PRITCHARD: It'd be mostly the sound of shuffling paper.

This is the city of Edmonton: the city of Edmonton based on enumeration; the city of Edmonton based on population.

MR. BRUSEKER: Looks like we added one.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah. Two: Edmonton-Parkallen and Edmonton-Avonmore. No?

MS BARRETT: No. And Edmonton-Calder.

MR. SIGURDSON: And Calder. Calder drops.

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. PRITCHARD: Are you ready for bifocals now, Stockwell?

MR. DAY: Yeah, you got it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay?

MR. PRITCHARD: A little sloppy, but anyhow it changes it slightly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pat, any comments you wanted to make at this point in the process?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Well, as you know, the 1986 census figures were available shortly after the federal commission sat, but we were restricted to the 1981 census figures. The next time there will be a census will be 1991.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So are you saying that the most recent revision of federal ridings used 1981 statistics?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: That is correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the federal government is considerably behind the figures we're using.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: The federal government started in 1871 and revised the boundaries every 10 years.

MS BARRETT: Are they going to keep it on a 10-year basis?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: A 10-year basis.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whereas we do it every second election.

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. PRITCHARD: Is that because of what you were saying, where they had to be in place for a year before they could . . .

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Well, yes. One of the other factors is that once the order has been passed, new boundaries don't come into effect for one year, for election purposes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, it's interesting when you look at what the population base does to the electoral map. And it was Tom, I believe, who first recommended we take a look at suggesting that in light of the fact that urban families are slightly larger than rural families, there might be some benefit . . .

MS BARRETT: The other way around.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What did I say?

MR. SIGURDSON: Rural families are slightly larger.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Pardon me. We have a logic that rural families are slightly larger than urban families, and something bears true. If we look at Cypress-Redcliff, for instance, which was one of the lowest before, it has now pulled up to the upper half of the constituencies still in yellow.

MS BARRETT: Of the people at the hearings that we've asked where they stand on this issue, has anybody bothered to sort of keep a tally and get a feel about . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: Well, that's all available in *Hansard*. We have the discs from *Hansard*, so if there's any topic that you can think of that came up, if you can have some key words . . .

MS BARRETT: So we can do a key word check. Good.

MR. PRITCHARD: . . . the computer will flip through it, and we can get those sections all printed out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you remember, we've been asking that question: wherever there's any expression made on the subject.

MR. PRITCHARD: Even if you're great at it, the wording doesn't have to be exact. If you just know the topic, we can seek it out in the computer and . . .

MR. SIGURDSON: I've been keeping track loosely, and I think that just ever so slightly the majority are in favour of having the entire population. But it's just a slim majority of those who were asked.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Well, the advantage, of course, is that you're including Indian bands, Hutterite colonies, and those people who don't vote or don't get their names on the list of electors.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, as you know, we wanted to hold a hearing on the Blood Reserve at Stand Off and Bob's been unsuccessful in even arranging a meeting. So we're going to shift down to Cardston for the meeting. By using the total population, we eliminate that anomaly. And it is a serious anomaly when you can't count 1,800 electors because they did not wish to be enumerated.

MS BARRETT: Or electors in this instance. But they're still public; they're still citizens.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

Okay. Any other comments on the population base? Of course, we're not making any decisions at this point, but we shall. I think we should feel free to share with presenters or others the results we have. Are you agreeable that when we show background information, we show them what the total population means as well?

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR. BRUSEKER: I like the idea. I'm wondering if it might not become a little overwhelming.

MR. DAY: I'm wondering if it would be overkill too.

MR. BRUSEKER: I think that rather than showing the full two sets of slides, perhaps we could mention what it is that has been found out by doing that investigation. Otherwise, that could be a real boondoggle. I mean, we're fairly conversant with the information and so on, and I think for someone just coming in new it would be . . .

MS BARRETT: That might be right, but I just assumed that the people who are going to bother to present have also, first of all, read the information sheet we've sent out; secondly, most of the people who have come out to present have also come with an opinion on the subject. Whenever they're asked, many of them offer an opinion on that subject. I think it's a good idea to show the information. Let's assume that people want as much as they can have. If we're proved wrong, then stop showing it, but I would really suggest that we show it.

MR. PRITCHARD: To make it a little simpler, maybe you could just show the calculation and show the map of Alberta and the minus 35 and minus 50. The city maps might be because they're hard to compare, and some of the lists might be hard to compare, because people start trying to find out where their constituency moved to.

MS BARRETT: But it's useful for them to know that.

MR. PRITCHARD: Well, it is useful.

MS BARRETT: I mean, that map that shows the quadrants: the green at the top left and the pink at the bottom right, I think that's very useful. Let them look at their own riding and see where it compares on the basis of electors versus population as a whole. You might not need to use the city-by-city overlays, for instance, and you could certainly organize it in such a way as to demonstrate: okay, here we show you how many pink ridings or green ridings we've got if we base it on voters; and the next one, this is how many pink and green we've got if we base it on population as a whole. There are ways to, you know, tie it together.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah, rather than showing them on the end.

MR. DAY: Yeah, I think in retrospect, then, that is clear. I'm thinking on presentation here. If it's explained clearly and carefully, I think people could probably grasp it.

MR. BRUSEKER: Is there a possibility of getting another overhead projector and another screen and showing comparable slides simultaneously?

MR. DAY: I think that would be a boondoggle.

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. PRITCHARD: Well, that's a good idea. I'm sure we can get another projector.

MR. BRUSEKER: Then you could look at both of them at the same time, and you could see what the difference actually is as opposed to flipping back and forth.

MR. DAY: Would that mean hiring more staff?

MR. PRITCHARD: Three dimensional. Right, I could . . .

MS BARRETT: Oh, oh. Mr. Restraint wants to talk again. Yeah, I can see it now. Stockwell's got the floor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This isn't Members' Services. Well, why don't we reassess it after we've tried it tonight?

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's see how it works. I think each of us should be trying to read those who are here in terms of facial expressions and ensure we're not losing people.

MS BARRETT: Fine with me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And Bob will have the slides organized a little better than he did today.

MR. PRITCHARD: Not much.

MR. DAY: He'd have to improve on perfection.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Our theme song is *The Impossible Dream*. All right. Anything else on population?

MS BARRETT: Thank you. I mean, thanks for getting it done. I think it's useful.

MR. PRITCHARD: I'll also get hard copies to everybody.

MS BARRETT: Yea!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moving on then; item 4. Pat has agreed to give us an overview of the federal boundaries commission: work which was done and some of the background.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think it would be easier if everyone just turned their chairs around. And maybe, Bob, if you and Tom would come a little closer so that you can see the maps . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we're okay so far.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: The federal commission operates through a seven-step procedure. The first step is the allocation of seats. This has changed through the period since 1867, when the BNA Act came into force, and at that time Quebec was given 65 seats. You divided the population of Quebec by 65, and that established your median or quotient. Then you applied that to each of the jurisdictions to come up with the total number of seats.

The only change to that between 1867 and 1915 – in 1915 they added a senatorial clause so that no jurisdiction had fewer members in the House than they had in the Senate. Then the next change was in 1946. At that time there were 255 seats in the House, but the population swings were becoming very evident, so they had a clause at that time that was called the 15 percent clause. That meant that no jurisdiction could reduce the number of Members of Parliament by more than 15 percent at any redistribution. It was a rather complicated formula.

The next change was in 1974. At that time they established the provinces in three basic categories – the large, the medium, and the small – with a little different rules. That only applied for one redistribution. Then after the 1981 census they had redistribution, and I think you may recall that they were going at it with about 312 seats. It was scheduled that by the year 2001, if the population continued, there would be 369 seats in the House of Commons, so they got together and decided that they would come up with a new formula. They've come up with a new formula, and I have a lot of detail on that on another flip

chart. This is when they went from 282 seats to 295 seats.

Prior to 1964 they didn't have commissions; 1964 was when they got into commissions. They found that the government generally used the factors they wanted to get the boundaries they wanted. They felt there was a lot of gerrymandering, so they wanted to get the politicians out of drawing boundaries. This is when they came up with commissions, in 1964. The commissions now are a three-member commission. The chairman is appointed by the Chief Justice of the jurisdiction. There are two other commission members, and they are appointed by the Speaker of the House of Commons. In the case of our commission, Justice Sinclair, who was a former Chief Justice, was our chairperson. I was a member, and Frank Dyck, who was a retired RCMP staff sergeant and mayor of Wetaskiwin at the time. So he had a good feel for Alberta in that he'd spent most of his RCMP career traveling throughout the province.

Commissions establish their boundaries and publish them. They can't hold any public hearings until a minimum of 60 days after they publish the boundaries. After the public hearings they then do their necessary revisions, and they complete a report which they send to Ottawa. The report is tabled in the House of Commons. Any MP, as long as he has the support of nine of his colleagues – it takes 10 Members of Parliament – can then recommend changes to the commission's proposals. That comes back to the commission. They examine each one and send their comments back. The commission has the final authority; the politicians do not. Once the commission has examined them, made their decisions, and sent them back, then there's a representation order which is passed in the House. The new boundaries, for election purposes, do not become effective until one year after that representation order.

MS BARRETT: Is that like an order in council, or is that like a Bill that's not allowed debate?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Yeah. It's called a representation order.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, but what it is? What's it like, I mean, in parliamentary terms?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I don't know. I would have to . . .

MS BARRETT: It goes through the House of Commons as opposed to His Honour the Honourable . . . It goes through the House?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I don't know just the technicalities on that.

MS BARRETT: Okay.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: In the case of the commission that I was on, we used the 1981 census figures. So they took the members of the House at the time: 282. The Northwest Territories has two seats always; Yukon has one seat always. They took away those three seats, and left 279. They took the population of Canada at that time – it was 24,274,287 – divided it by the 279, and the magic number was 87,005. They took the population of Alberta at that time, which was 2,237,724, and divided it by the 87,005. It ended up at 25 plus. Because it was over 25 and a half, we received 26 seats. Our magic number was 86,066. This is the population figure. So the 86,006 – plus 25

percent, the top range we were working with was 107,583 – minus 25 percent: 64,550. So those are the parameters that we have to operate within.

One of the problems we had initially was that the Kirby commission had been established in 1982, after the 1981 census. At that time using the formula, Alberta was to gain 6 seats. We were going to go from 21 to 27 seats. The Kirby commission allocated two seats to Calgary, two to Edmonton – they incorporated Sherwood Park as part of Edmonton to get the numbers up – and two new rural. Our commission went from 21 seats to 26 seats, an increase of five seats. So we basically looked at three options: two for Edmonton, two for Calgary, one rural; two for Calgary, one for Edmonton, and two rural; or the option that we selected, one more for Edmonton, one more for Calgary, and three more rural, in that we put increased emphasis on some of the problems that we've heard at our briefings regarding the distance and the difficulty of serving the rural electorate. So we ended up: Calgary got six seats, Edmonton six, and the remainder with 14.

So the average in Calgary is 98,801, which is about 15 percent over our magic 86,066; Edmonton at 90,000, which was plus 5 percent; the rural at 78,780, which was 8 percent below the median. So if you take the top to the bottom, you're looking at a 23 percent spread.

Any questions on the numbers?

Okay. The commission was formed in May. We published our proposals in August. The way we published them, we had inserts in all of the weekly and daily newspapers in Alberta, so that we distributed almost a million copies of our proposal. And what it was was a detail showing the parameters that the commission operated under, a map showing the province of Alberta, a map showing Edmonton, and a map showing Calgary, with all of the numbers. We couldn't hold any public hearings until 60 days after our information was published.

We held public hearings in October and November. We held public hearings in each of the 14 rural electoral divisions and a couple in Edmonton and a couple in Calgary: excellent reports from the public at large, the constituency associations, the Members of Parliament. We received over 50 really good submissions at the public hearings. We made several revisions to the initial proposals which we sent down to Ottawa in December, and were ready for publishing in January of 1987. There were a number of MPs who objected to our boundaries. We accepted all of the criticisms, despite the fact that very few of them followed the rules in that they had 30 days to object formally and it required the support of 10 Members of Parliament. Most of them didn't do that. As a matter of fact, some of them came to the privileges and elections committee with verbal complaints. We acknowledged each one of them, and made decisions on them. We had everything reviewed and back to Ottawa in May. The representation order was published in July '87. The new boundaries came into effect in July 1988.

I have maps of the 1971 census figures and the 1981 map as we proposed it. We were looking at Pembina at over 138,000, Yellowhead at over 115,000, Red Deer at over 116,000, and Bow River at over 109,000. So we had four that were beyond the highest limit we could have with numbers. So what we did was make a new electoral division basically centred north of Calgary at Airdrie; we also eliminated Pembina and created three electoral divisions in the Edmonton area. If you look down at the rural map, you can see that Peace River was the only electoral district that we didn't change. One of the problems with the Peace River area is the communications, in that if we



cut off south of Grande Prairie and made it part of Yellowhead, then there was no communication north/south. The communications in this area are east/west. If we took from Athabasca and went too far eastward, then we made it very difficult to meet the needs of the electorate with one MP with such a large area. One of the problems we ended up – I think you're familiar with McLennan, basically the centre of the area of the French-Canadian and the Catholic group; they're located up in this area. So if we went east, then we had to go a long ways east in order to incorporate this community of interest, and it would have skewed our numbers significantly. So this is a problem that the next commission will have to face. The 1991 census figures will be used for the next commission.

Going down into this area, what we did was create a new riding at Elk Island, a new St. Albert, and a new Beaver River. Down in this area we created a new Wild Rose and Macleod basically out of the old Red Deer and Bow River. Because of the population changes down here, you can see that the domino effect is quite apparent. We had to change Medicine Hat, and we had to change Lethbridge, moving up into Macleod. Some of this criticism we had, for example, was we should have maybe taken this area and moved it up into Wild Rose. Well, there are about 5,000 people in that area, so that automatically takes Macleod below the limit. Gordon Taylor objected basically in three areas. He objected to the name Wild Rose, despite the fact that he attended the public hearing and agreed at that time that Wild Rose was an appropriate name and then wrote us a letter saying how pleased he was that we had selected Wild Rose. However, when he went to the elections and privileges committee, he wanted to change it back to the former name. He also wasn't happy with the fact that Crowfoot contained both Camrose and Drumheller, but we had to do that because of the numbers game. So he wanted to take Drumheller and communities around Drumheller and put back into the old riding. It would have made Crowfoot below the limits.

I think in all cases but one when the members came back with objections, we didn't agree with their rationale. The only one we agreed with was Harvie Andre in Calgary Centre, where we moved a couple of thousand. Even then there wasn't unanimous agreement in that where we had 102,000 and 98,000 we took one up to 104,000-plus and then took the other one down to 95,000-plus. So that's basically the rural. Any questions on the rural?

On the cities – very difficult because I didn't have any of the old maps. It's just one of the those things. Once we were finished with the commission, unfortunately I threw away the maps. With the scale here I can't really show you what it was like. I think it's significant to say that anytime you change five ridings and make six, it just impacts on all of the ridings. So when we went from 21 ridings to 26 ridings, a 25 percent change, it impacted on all the ridings.

Going back to the comparison on the timing between the federal commission and our last provincial commission, the '83-84 commission was established by order in council on December 14, 1983. The commission had their first meeting in January. We published the interim report on July 10, had public hearings in August, and the final report was published on October 15.

Are there no questions, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions of Pat? Yes, Tom.

MR. SIGURDSON: In Macleod constituency you've got 66,000, and I don't know what constituency it is in Calgary where you go to 102,000. Has there been any indication of a challenge?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: No, because it was within the plus or minus 25 percent. You may remember we could go to 107,500 or 64,500, so they're both within that plus or minus 25 percent.

MR. SIGURDSON: Okay, thanks. That makes for about a 40 percent, 45 percent variance between those two.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Well, plus or minus 25 percent makes it . . .

MR. SIGURDSON: Indeed, yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tom, you may recall that one of the questions we put to the lawyers we had out in Calgary was whether or not the two seats in the Northwest Territories and the one in Yukon would withstand a challenge, and I think we've gotten mixed signals from people on that. Some say yes; some say no.

Do you have any comment on that, Pat?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: No. We haven't discussed that at any of our meetings. It think it's like that grandfather clause or the senatorial clause or the 15 percent clause. I think they've just been accepted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Anyone else of Pat re his presentation?

Thanks very much for a comprehensive overview. The work you've done as Chief Electoral Officer here is strengthened by working on the federal commission, and your input in our own commission certainly will benefit from that.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll go on, then, to item 5: Discussion – Numbers of People Presenting . . . Really, it's presenting briefs at our public hearings. I'd ask Bob to circulate the little excerpt from the *Lethbridge Herald*. Believe it or not, weekly newspapers are very profitable entities, I'm told. The *Lethbridge Herald* is now attempting to get into the weekly newspaper business, and this is their very first attempt.

Those of you who were in Medicine Hat will recall that one of the 16 briefs we received – it was a brief from the town of Bow Island – suggested that we leave the boundaries as they are. It went on to say, however, that if you can't do that, here are some suggestions, and among other things they suggested dividing Taber-Warner in half. The *Town & Country* reprinted the map and presented an article, and unfortunately I believe there's a lot of misunderstanding in the southwest part of the province; I think a number of people believe this is what we are proposing.

Bob, you might want to comment on calls that you've had. I know in my pre-session meetings around the constituency and discussions I've had with several neighbouring MLAs, there seems to be a lot of interest and people coming to the hearing, particularly in Lethbridge.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes. And it is, just as you say, around that very issue: that Taber-Warner's going to be split, ridings are going to be lumped together, they're going to lose their MLAs, and that it's already done, that the committee has already said this is going to happen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, we've already addressed the question of possibly extending our time line in Lethbridge from 9 p.m. But I want to pose a question to you. What do we do if we're absolutely swamped that evening and we cannot physically accommodate all those who are coming forward? One early thought I had was dividing our committee into two parts. But I don't know how we could handle *Hansard* by doing that, and we must have *Hansard* present.

Are there any thoughts that any of you have on what we can do if we're absolutely inundated – and I'm using Lethbridge as an example; it could happen anyplace – if we cannot physically accommodate all those who are in? Tom.

MR. SIGURDSON: Well, I would suggest that what we do is stick to the mandate the committee was given and not hear any proposals that deal with boundary changes. So if people are going to get specific and say that, you know, you take the boundary along the highway and divide it down the middle of the highway, we say: "Sorry. We can't hear that. That's properly the responsibility of the commission."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. We can certainly do that, and I think we can do that diplomatically. But where we're going to have difficulty is that if a brief talks about boundaries in general and then goes on to mention a specific boundary, you can't reject the whole brief.

MS BARRETT: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We could, I guess, give some guiding comments at the beginning of the meeting about the kinds of things we're looking at.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Set the parameters.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Set the parameters and . . .

MR. SIGURDSON: Just be careful and cognizant of it, and if they start to wander, you'll have to try and hold them back as diplomatically as you can.

MR. DAY: Just to address a concern that may come up if we take that approach: we have set a precedent. You know, we've made it clear it's not our mandate, but in other meetings people have come forward and said, "And I'd like to talk about this boundary change." The chairman has always made it clear that that's not our mandate but go ahead, say it, and we'll make sure the commission gets it. So we have set that precedent.

MR. SIGURDSON: We can certainly invite them to give us the written submission, and we will ensure that the commission will receive anything we get in writing and that there will be the opportunity for the commission to hear them at a later date.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I think that will meet their requirement in that they want somebody in authority to be aware of what their wishes are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So in our opening we should possibly be emphasizing a little stronger the role of our committee in that if there are specific boundary alterations or recommendations being presented, if they would leave those we will ensure, as we have in the past, that they are forwarded on to the commission

once it is struck.

MR. SIGURDSON: Perhaps what we could also do is say that we erred when we were in Medicine Hat and allowed this to come forward; we shouldn't have had this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we don't want to be defensive. I think again that it isn't the brief as much as the way it's been represented in the media that's at fault. Because the brief clearly stated, "We'd like you to leave things alone." Then the brief went on, as a number of others did, and said, "However, if you must make changes, here are some things we think you should look at."

MS BARRETT: Well, I have a couple of additional suggestions. One is that if we walk into any meeting and we see a big crowd, if possible before we start the meeting, decide whether or not we can extend ourselves by half an hour or an hour. That's one thing.

The other thing we could do if it is necessary is to suggest to people who have written briefs that they hand those out immediately when they arrive. That way we can have a look at them. They don't have to spend the time going through them and reading them out. You know, we could just say, "Okay, give us the highlights orally and we'll ask you questions" and I think we might be able to save a bit of time there too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I've got one sensitivity about rural people travelling some distance to come in . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: I was going to mention that, because we've had phone calls from people who have written submissions but they don't want to send them in in a written form; they want to come and present them somewhere. Also, a lot of people are not clear about this committee, that it's dealing with legislation on boundaries, and many people, when you try and explain that to them, will argue that one affects the other, that in fact it's the same issue. Because if the rules are such that it's going to affect their boundaries, that's what they're talking about.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. No, I understand that. I'm not saying don't present; I'm not saying just hand the stuff in in writing and we'll look at it. What I am saying is that a lot of people walk in and keep their written submissions in their briefcases until it's time for them to come to the microphone, and then they read them out. In fact, if they've got written submissions, we could ask them at the door: "If you have anything in writing, we'd be pleased to take that and distribute it amongst the members of the committee now." That way we can glance at it, let them know that they don't have to read it out but can choose to highlight certain sections orally, and proceed to a discussion based on that rather than, you know, going through the whole process of reading a seven-page paper.

MR. DAY: Well, yeah, I think we just need to be clear if we're taking that approach. Someone who's got a written submission has probably – and I'm saying "probably" – put more time into preparing it than someone who's just going to come and address it verbally. Of course, they both are of equal importance, but I wouldn't want somebody out there to get the feeling that because they've taken the time to write and prepare it and probably have it typed – and maybe they want to see it in *Hansard* or have it recorded that they presented it themselves.

I just don't want them thinking that because they've gone to that work, they're not going to get to present it.

MS BARRETT: Fair enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recall that when we were in Medicine Hat, when we realized there were a lot of people in the room – it was by far the largest group we'd had out to that point in time – we went through 16 briefs in just under three hours. One of the things that happened is that people disciplined themselves and we as a committee disciplined ourselves. We weren't asking as many questions, and they were going through their briefs a little more promptly than hearings where we had two and three people presenting briefs and very casual round table discussion.

MR. SIGURDSON: Well, I don't see any problem with extending the hours in Lethbridge. We're due to end at 9 o'clock, and in that everybody's going to be staying overnight, an extra hour or an hour and a half shouldn't be too much of a problem. I would worry more about Pincher Creek.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. That's tight.

MR. SIGURDSON: Because that is tight for those people who are going to be flying back or having to catch a plane out of Lethbridge.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, my general query is that whether it's at Lethbridge or Pincher Creek or Hanna, we have to put our minds to what if we have 80 people out, 40 of whom want to present briefs. Even by being disciplined ourselves and those being disciplined, we're not going to get through that many briefs in the session. I ask you to think about how we'd handle that. Up to this point in time we've said, "If we can't accommodate you, if there's some problem that's justifiable, we'll come back or we'll do something." Donnelly is the living proof. We've rescheduled at least two hearings in Edmonton, I believe, that catch people who weren't ready. We now, I understand, have a request from the Calgary board of education for an opportunity. I think we need to be thinking about how we draw to a conclusion and at the same time not in any way leave anyone with the feeling that we're not prepared to listen to them.

MR. SIGURDSON: Well, using your scenario, if we do have 80 people show up and do have 40 of those that want to do presentations, maybe what we're going to have to do is sort of go back to your original suggestion and divide in two, but not that day. Maybe Stock and I and Frank would have to come down and sit in Hanna for another day, and then maybe you and Pam and Mike or Pat would have to go down to Pincher Creek. But limit it, then, I would suggest, to only those people who are . . . [interjection] Yeah, and then we can commit to having to come down another day, but breaking the committee.

MS BARRETT: Well, I concur with Tom. We've got a sitting coming up and we're to report during the sitting. I just think we have to be clear with people that we want to hear from them but also have certain time constraints; let's be realistic. I'm sure they understand that this is one job of a gazillion that we do.

MR. DAY: I think Tom's point would probably accommodate the time constraint we're under, because more than anything I

don't want and, because this is a democratic process, I don't think any of us want anybody in the province saying: "I came; you didn't listen. I know you were busy people, but you left."

MR. SIGURDSON: Absolutely.

MS BARRETT: No, no. No one's suggesting that, Stock. I agree.

MR. DAY: No. That's why I agree with what the two of you are saying. I think we can accommodate it. If it means splitting up, we split up, but we've got to let them know we're going to accommodate them.

MR. SIGURDSON: Yeah.

MR. BRUSEKER: But I think, if possible, the easiest thing to do is just stay an extra hour or so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed.

MS BARRETT: When possible, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It worked for us so well in Medicine Hat, and we're lucky here this evening. We're fortunate tomorrow in Hanna, I hope.

MR. SIGURDSON: Maybe what we should do, as soon as we see the crowd, is find out how many people are going to want to make a presentation.

MR. PRITCHARD: I think that's what you did in Medicine Hat.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bob does that now.

AN HON. MEMBER: As soon as they come in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He gets a good feel for it.

MS BARRETT: He gets a list going.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So we may want to have a quick caucus before we begin.

MS BARRETT: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because if we know that we can't accommodate everyone, rather than wait three hours and then indicate, gee, those of you on the last half of the list will have to come back, it would be better to let them know right away.

MS BARRETT: I agree. We'll be able to tell at the beginning of each meeting pretty well.

MR. BRUSEKER: The other possibility would be to, you know, give a time limit, to say "Okay, 10 minutes per brief," for example. Then you could get through quite a number, which requires us as a committee to be more disciplined.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's easier for us to do that to ourselves, but how do we turn around now, after having given so much flexibility in places like Calgary and Grande Prairie, and do that

without - I'd hate to have anybody come back and say, "You didn't apply the same rules."

MR. BRUSEKER: Well, maybe if we just kept that as an informal guideline for ourselves and kind of kept track.

MS BARRETT: Remember, this whole subjects generates interest as it goes along. We hung around meeting rooms and, you know, there were very few people who came along. We stretched out the discussions and still ended up twiddling our thumbs waiting for 9 o'clock to come because nobody else was there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The other possibility, building on what you said relative to possibly splitting into two subcommittees and coming back if need be . . . For instance, in Hanna tomorrow if we find that we've got quite a few people, first of all we decide that we can't handle everyone by the time we're in Hanna, and secondly, out of the 50 briefs we're anticipating, 10 or 12 are from a community. We might decide then to go back to that community - not back to Hanna but back to the neighbouring community or wherever it is where there seems to be that interest generated.

MS BARRETT: Well, I have one more question. Let's ask Doug and Viv. Is it possible to use the equipment we've got in such a way that, you know, on one side of the room you've got one set of hearings going on and on another side you've got another, or no?

MRS. LOOSEMORE: I don't think so. We do have additional recording equipment. Our problem right now is staff, because session is coming up and all our available staff is working on transcribing the committee and we're training new people for session. But we do have additional recording equipment.

MR. SIGURDSON: But not here?

MRS. LOOSEMORE: But not here.

MR. SIGURDSON: Not here, so we couldn't do it this time.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Speaking of extra equipment, we might do ourselves a service by having a portable photocopier, so that if somebody's coming in with a sheet of paper, we can then photocopy that and have each committee member have that particular brief.

MR. PRITCHARD: That's a good idea, Pat, but usually we've been in a place where we can go down the hall, like here, and borrow a photocopier, so we've been able to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there another hand up over here?

MS BARRETT: I think we've come to a consensus.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The other thing is that if we split into two parts, we may not be in the same community. We would be in different places.

MS BARRETT: I know. No, I understand. Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. I'm not trying to create problems

but trying to look ahead anticipating what might happen. So that's good. I'm glad we've got a consensus on how to approach it: to basically assess it at the beginning of each meeting and make a decision whether we think we can get through or not. We'll be a little tighter on the guidelines at the beginning of a meeting as to the mandate of our committee and our purpose; try to keep the meeting a little tighter. As I said, members of the committee disciplined themselves very well in Medicine Hat in allowing more briefs to be presented in the time available. But we sure don't want to be cutting anyone off or leave the perception with anyone that we're not there to listen.

MS BARRETT: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Item 6, Other. Any committee members?

MR. SIGURDSON: Yeah. When Pat was making his presentation, I was wondering if this committee would want to hear from a Member of Parliament representing one of those large, spread out constituencies to hear about some of the traveling difficulties that they have, how they service their communities, what kind of difficulties they have. Certainly we wouldn't have to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think Norm Weiss is planning to come to the meeting in Fort McMurray. Is he not?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes, he is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And he represents one of the largest, if not the largest, constituencies.

MR. SIGURDSON: But, again, Norm Weiss has most of his constituents contained within the city of Fort McMurray.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Two-thirds within Fort McMurray.

MR. SIGURDSON: I was just thinking that if we had maybe the Member for Crowfoot or the Member for Red Deer, they might be able to tell us some of the problems they've got in representing . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we're going to hear from Shirley McClellan tomorrow in Hanna, and she has, at least in terms of a provincial riding and the number of communities, one of the largest, in terms of it being an organized riding, a settled riding. Could we reassess it after that? I don't know if there's a need to go to a federal member if we've got a provincial one who can give us the same kind of input. Glen Clegg did it to a degree when we were in Grande Prairie, but let's wait and hear from Shirley McClellan tomorrow, because that's a unique riding with so many small towns and villages and highway systems that don't cause easy crisscross.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I have a map of Calgary showing the 1981 census figures, so if anyone is interested in comparing how the commission works using population figures vis-à-vis electors, I'd be very pleased to show them just the mechanics of that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, that might be helpful. Sure. That's good. Thank you.

Anything else under Other? Bob, from an administrative

point of view.

MR. PRITCHARD: I just have three pieces of paper that I'm going to hand out.

MS BARRETT: More paper. I've been waiting for this, Bob.

MR. PRITCHARD: Everybody loves a bit of paper.

MS BARRETT: Oh, yeah.

MR. PRITCHARD: Just bill everything to your hotel room, not pay as we advised you in the past; that wasn't accurate. There's an overall schedule, and there's a hard copy on the enumeration figures.

MS BARRETT: Oh, grand.

MR. PRITCHARD: See, you're happy to get the paper.

MS BARRETT: Oh, yeah.  
So we meet again at 5:30?

MR. CHAIRMAN: At 5:30. Where? In the lobby?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah.

MS BARRETT: Have we adjourned?

[The committee adjourned at 3:41 p.m.]

