

[Chairman: Mr. Bogle]

[7:04 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd like to declare the Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries meeting being held here in St. Albert officially open and welcome those of you who have chosen to join us this evening.

I'm going to introduce the panel members. We will then have a brief overview by Patrick Ledgerwood, the Chief Electoral Officer, of the British Columbia court case, which is the real reason that our committee was struck. That will be followed by a slide presentation which Frank Bruseker will lead us through to share with you some of the population figures in the province, some of the issues that we're dealing with. We'll then proceed with the briefs. It's our intention – and I think at this point in time we have three or four briefs to be presented this evening – to call probably the first two forward. We'll go through the first brief, panel members will then be given an opportunity to ask questions, and then if there are additional questions or comments that any of you have in the audience, you'll be invited to participate.

We want you to be as relaxed as you can and not be intimidated by these microphones. The microphones are here so that *Hansard* may record the proceedings. In that way there is a written record of all the hearings, and if you wish, you are able to obtain the proceedings for tonight's meeting or all the meetings, if you so desire.

I'm going to introduce the panel members at this time. On my immediate left, Pam Barrett. Pam is the New Democratic Member of the Legislative Assembly for Edmonton-Highlands. She's also the House leader for the New Democratic caucus. This is her second term as a member of the Assembly.

Seated next to Pam is Pat Ledgerwood. Pat is the Chief Electoral Officer for the province of Alberta. He is an honorary member of our committee. He's come on board at the request of all of us and at the invitation of the three leaders of the three political parties represented in the Assembly. Pat has extensive background and experience in the electoral boundaries process both at the provincial and federal levels.

The other committee members seated at the table are Frank Bruseker on my immediate right. Frank is a Liberal member for Calgary-North West, a first-time member of the Assembly, and certainly getting a chance through this committee to see rural Alberta. Next to Frank is Tom Sigurdson. Tom is a two-time member – not a two-timer but a two-time member. This is his second term, and he represents the constituency of Edmonton-Belmont. He's a New Democratic member of the Assembly. He worked as Grant Notley's executive assistant when Mr. Notley served as the member for Spirit River-Fairview. Also, you'll recall that the late Grant Notley served on a previous Electoral Boundaries Commission, so he does have some experience in the process in that sense. And Pat Black. Pat is a Conservative member of the Assembly for Calgary-Foothills. This is her first term, and we're delighted to have Pat with us this evening. She was unable to be with us this morning when we were up in Westlock, due to an illness in the family, but we're delighted that you're back with us tonight. My name is Bob Bogle. I'm a Conservative member of the Assembly, and I represent the constituency of Taber-Warner.

Other individuals I'd like to introduce this evening are Bob Pritchard, who's at the table. Bob is the senior administrator for the electoral boundaries committee. Ted Edwards, at the back of the room, works with Bob. When things go well, Bob takes the credit, and when they don't go well, everybody jumps on Ted. For those who weren't with us earlier, I mentioned that

Ted and his wife are proud parents of a new baby son, their first. So he's just now coming back to work after celebrating that momentous occasion. We also have three members of *Hansard* with us this evening: Gary Garrison and two of his support staff, Paula and Doug. Again, they make the records of these particular meetings possible.

I mentioned earlier that during the presentations and during the evening we'd like people to feel comfortable and relaxed. If there's a brief that you have which deals with the drawing of boundaries, that, as you may be aware, is not something our committee is dealing with. That is something the commission will deal with once the commission is struck. The purpose of our committee is to make recommendations back to the Legislative Assembly on what the general parameters should be. The arrangements we've made in other communities are that if you do have a particular recommendation on a boundary, we will receive it, we will ensure through Mr. Ledgerwood, who will be a member of the commission when it is struck, that consideration will be given to your concern, and we'll follow up in that particular way. As well, if you wish to highlight your brief or go through key points, don't feel compelled to read the entire brief. If it is quite detailed, we will take it and ensure that it is read into *Hansard* and will become part of our record.

Obviously, we can't keep track of all the points made over a number of months, keeping in mind this is the 31st meeting we've had, so we're relying on the ability of our computers. We are taking the key points made in the various briefs, so that when we want to ascertain how many briefs focused in on a particular point, that information is readily available. So we'll be able to take all of the key material and break it down, categorize it, and that'll help us a lot in terms of our own work when we're trying to come to some conclusion in this process.

I'm going to pause at that point and turn to Pat Ledgerwood and ask him to give us the overview of why we're here in terms of the British Columbia court case, and that will be followed by Frank Bruseker and the slide presentation. Pat.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ladies and gentlemen, the commission is normally struck after every second general election. With a general election in 1986 and a general election in 1989 the commission would have normally been sitting at this point in that it would normally be struck at the first session after the general election of 1989. However, there was a situation in British Columbia which developed that could impact on our boundaries. The situation was that they had 69 seats and the population ranged from just over 5,500 to over 68,000 in a riding. So the government struck a commission. It was headed by a Justice Fisher. The commission was appointed in April 1987 and completed its report in December of 1988.

They made three basic points. They wanted to eliminate their dual-member ridings, which really doesn't impact on us. They increased the number of MLAs from 69 to 75, which doesn't impact on us. But what he did was look at the Charter and also in other jurisdictions, and wanted to provide equal weight to each elector. This is something you'll hear a lot about: the plus or minus 25 percent rule. So what he did was take the province of British Columbia, divided it by 75, came to an average, and said that all electoral divisions should be within that plus or minus 25 percent of the average.

The British Columbia government accepted this report but didn't do much about it, so a group headed by a Professor Dixon challenged it in the court, and the case was heard before the Chief Justice of the B.C. Supreme Court, Madam Chief Justice McLachlin. She basically agreed with the Fisher commission.

The point that we're interested in was that she accepted the average of plus or minus 25 percent. There was no appeal to this particular decision; also, the government didn't do anything. So Professor Dixon again went to court. The case was heard before a Justice Meredith, and what the court ruled at that time was that they could not do anything to interfere with the current boundaries in British Columbia and that the court was not a government and they were not going to legislate. The B.C. government accepted this and established a commission in 1989, which went through and basically accepted the Fisher Commission boundaries with minor adjustments. Those boundaries became law in British Columbia in January of this year, so that the next election in British Columbia will be fought on the 75 electoral division boundaries with an average of plus or minus 25 percent of the population. As a result of this decision, this committee was formed to look at basically the composition of a commission and the redistribution rules.

As you know, this is the 32nd hearing, and there will be seven more public hearings. I think maybe Bob will explain later on just the fact that the committee will report to the Legislature this fall, and a commission will be struck following the tabling of this committee's recommendations.

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks very much. Any questions of Pat on the overview? Okay.

Frank, would you like to lead us through the slides, please?

MR. F. BRUSEKER: At the front door you probably picked up a package like this, which has a letter at the front and also has some maps further in. What we want to do is go through a series of transparencies on the overhead which show you basically the same information, but then we also have some additional information that is not contained in the package.

The first transparency you see before you is simply a list of the 83 constituencies in the province. The number directly to the right of the name of the constituency is the number of eligible voters based on the list we used at the last general election in 1989. The second list is the same list. However, now, instead of being in alphabetical order, it is shown in numerical order, from the largest constituency of Edmonton-Whitemud to the smallest constituency of Cardston. Cardston is a bit unusual in that there are the Blood Indians on the reservation there that chose not to be enumerated, so the total of 8,100 there is actually a little lower than it should be. There are some 1,800 members of that reservation that chose not to be enumerated, so those should probably be added to the total.

If you took all those numbers and summed them, you would get a total of approximately one and a half million electors, and if you divided that by the total number of electoral divisions we currently have in the province, which is 83, you'd get an average figure of about 18,600 electors or voters per constituency. If you apply the plus or minus 25 percent variation that is being used in the province of British Columbia, you would get an upper end of 23,000 as being the upper maximum allowable, and the lower end would be 14,000, which would be the lower that would be allowed.

If we then colour the list that you saw before, the constituencies highlighted with green are those constituencies which are more than 25 percent above the average of 18,600, and the ones that are coloured in pink are more than 25 percent below the average; in other words, less than 14,000. If we show that on a map of the province of Alberta, you can see that there are two small green dots there. One is for Medicine Hat, which is one

constituency, and the other one is this constituency, St. Albert. But you'll also notice there's a tremendous amount of pink there, and all those pink rural constituencies are those which are less than 14,000 electors per constituency.

All of the constituencies which exceed the 23,000 upper maximum are urban constituencies. This is the city of Calgary. You can see it has a number of green-coloured constituencies. The next transparency is for the city of Edmonton, which again has a number of constituencies highlighted in green, indicating again over the 23,000 upper end.

This is the city of Lethbridge, currently divided into two constituencies, Lethbridge-West and Lethbridge-East. It is unshaded at this time, indicating that currently those two constituencies fall within the range of 23,000 down to 14,000.

This map is the city of Medicine Hat. The lines that you see on there are actually polling stations, but all of this is one constituency. Again, being one of the larger constituencies, it is exceeding currently the 25 percent guideline.

The city of Red Deer in the last redistribution was too large to be one constituency but not quite large enough to be two constituencies. That's why we have two different colours of lines here. The brown line is actually the city of Red Deer city limits; the black line that is further out is the current electoral divisions. What happened in the city of Red Deer when it was divided in two, into Red Deer-North and Red Deer-South, was they added to each of those constituencies a little bit of the rural countryside, the acreages that are around that part, to bring the total population up so that those now are of sufficient size to warrant two constituencies as opposed to one.

This is the city of St. Albert. The lines indicate different polling stations currently. Again, one of the larger constituencies in the province.

When we looked at the transparencies, we saw that some of the constituencies were in fact quite small. The purple colour you see here indicates that these are more than 35 percent below the provincial average; in other words, 12,000 electors or less per constituency.

This one in yellow you'll see right down at the bottom of the province. There are five constituencies coloured in yellow, meaning that they are more than 50 percent away from the average; in other words, less than 10,000 electors per constituency.

This is a list of the additional hearings we have scheduled. We will be wrapping up the hearings process by the end of next week, next Friday. Our committee will then take a break for a week, and then we are going to sit down and try and write that report.

The coloured dots that you see on this map here show the locations of where we have held hearings or will be holding hearings in the next week, and you can see there are quite a number of locations around the province.

This transparency simply is a combination of the last two that you saw. It shows you where we have gone or will be going, and it shows you those constituencies which potentially will see the greatest amount of change because they are so far away from the provincial average in terms of their size.

Very early on in the hearings process the question that was put forward to our committee was: what about using total population figures? So we decided we would look at that. It's not in the package which you have before you right now. We have the same series of slides you've just seen, but now using total population. Now, the difference here, of course, is that it would include, first of all, those people who are less than 18 years of age and are not eligible to vote. It also would include

landed immigrants and non-Canadians who nonetheless are constituents we have to represent if they run into difficulty and need government service in some way. It also would eliminate the concern I mentioned earlier about the Blood Indian Reserve in Cardston, for example, that chose not to be enumerated. If you use the total population, it includes everyone. Applying the same kind of calculation we did earlier, the plus or minus 25 percent, we end up with an upper end of 35,000 total population per constituency; that would be the plus 25 percent. The minus 25 percent would give us a lower end of 21,000. The provincial average, using population now, would be 28,000, as opposed to 18,000 with electors.

So this next transparency shows you the difference. Again the green ones being greater than 25 percent above and the ones highlighted in pink more than 25 percent below, the difference here is that we have one fewer that is highlighted in green and two fewer that are highlighted in pink, with the result that we have more in that central region. In other words, the extremes are not quite as extreme, and you'll see that a little more clearly as we go through the slides.

This is again the map of Alberta and again the pink indicates those that are below the minus 25 percent. But notice now in this particular one that we have two constituencies highlighted in green. The constituency of Grande Prairie on the western border and, on the northeast corner, the constituency of Fort McMurray are now over the plus 25 percent, and in fact in that regard are too large in terms of their population.

This again is the city of Calgary. Again you see some highlighted in green. The difference between this map and the previous one that I showed you: the previous one had nine constituencies highlighted in green; this particular map has only seven constituencies highlighted in green.

The next one is the city of Edmonton. This one has seven constituencies highlighted in green; the previous one had eight. One thing I want to point out with both the cities of Edmonton and Calgary is that if you look at it, it is the periphery or outer edges of the city where growth is occurring. That is where we see the high population areas. That's of course why St. Albert, being a city that is undergoing rapid growth, is one of those constituencies that is currently exceeding the provincial average guideline.

Again the purple colour indicates those constituencies that are more than 35 percent below the provincial average. The interesting thing with this map is that there are 12 constituencies coloured in purple. On the previous one I showed you, using the enumeration figures, there are 16 constituencies coloured in purple. So again not quite as much variation.

The next one is really quite dramatic. There is only one constituency, that of Pincher Creek-Crowsnest in the very southeast corner of the province, which is more than 50 percent away from the average. On the previous one I showed you, using enumerated electors, we had five constituencies. So there's quite a change there.

This is the last transparency, showing you where we've gone. We have traveled to the other three western provinces to find out what has occurred there and what will be occurring over their next elections. We have had a total of 29 hearings up until - well, actually 31 today - in a total of 21 different locations. We had several hearings in both Edmonton and Calgary because of the population there and the number of constituencies. Because of the demand that we had, we had two hearings in Red Deer and two in Hanna. You can see that the total number of people attending is probably over the 700 mark as of today. Total submissions - I can't quite read the number, but again

that's got to be pretty close to 290, I think, by now, and another 115 written submissions. So we are getting up there with lots of input from lots of people.

That's the last transparency. Are there any questions or anything that I went over too quickly that people didn't understand?

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks very much. Just before I ask Bob to call up the first two presenters: in picking up on Pat's comment, as you know, the committee did request an extension in its mandate. The committee was actually created a year ago yesterday. We didn't believe we would still be working one year later. We did ask for an extension in our mandate to accommodate the additional 10 communities or constituencies where hearings had been requested. Once we complete the hearing process, which is scheduled for the end of next week, we will begin work in September on drawing up our report. Assuming the report is developed sometime in September or September and October, we have the ability, by the amendment to our motion in the Assembly, to release the report, to make it public immediately. That pleases all members of the committee, because it will give individuals and groups and organizations an opportunity for input prior to the Legislature actually coming back and deliberating on the report itself. We hope that the Legislature would then enact the necessary legislation and create the Electoral Boundaries Commission so that the commission would be struck and ready to begin its work very early in the new calendar year. One of the concerns a number of committee members and others have expressed is that if the commission is not struck and we don't get on with our job, then there could be some question as to whether or not this process would be completed by the time of the next election. We believe that in the current time frame that certainly can and will be achieved.

So, Bob, let's call up the first couple of presenters, please.

MR. PRITCHARD: Can we have the first two? Anita Ratchinsky and Leo Bruseker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Mayor, it's good to see you back. You did present a brief on behalf of St. Albert when we were in Edmonton, and of course that was prior to any decision having been made to come out to St. Albert. I do believe you have some supplementary information, and we welcome you.

MRS. RATCHINSKY: I do. I welcome you to our city, and thank you for the opportunity for anyone within this constituency's boundaries that may not have been able to get to you otherwise. I appreciate it. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I did make a submission on behalf of council, and I again bring some supplementary information.

Just to highlight: my previous submission alluded to the fact that we seem to be in a position where we may be in line for an electoral boundary change, depending on your findings, and in that instance our particular request was to have two urban constituencies, to take that into consideration in your deliberations. The additional information that we've put together you probably can get from another source, but I thought it would be timely, since you're in our city, that we would do it in this manner. Council did as well, and the resolutions have indicated that I should come forward and supply the additional.

Since my last presentation to you, we have just done a census. Our population increase was 3.35 percent, which was a little bit higher than normal. That brings our total population to 40,707.

The quadrant breakdown and electors – we had another occasion whereby we needed to break out the over-18s in our city for a different project that we were doing. By electors the quadrants broke down: to the southeast, 12,949; the southwest, 6,146; the northeast, 850; the northwest, 7,961, giving us a total voting population of 27,906. The lower numbers in the northeast and the northwest are the areas in our city that are not grown out to the boundaries and will continue to expand in that area. In my other submission we indicated that in further consideration those would be the areas that would bring in the country estates that border on those boundaries, and I just leave that with you. I guess the information would further strengthen our argument for an additional urban riding to be created in our city, and knowing that the work of your committee is ongoing, we ask that some significant time elapse before the decisions are made. I also recognize that your particular group is not making that decision; however, your recommendations will bring a bearing to the decision-makers, so I appreciate your time.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Questions by panel members first.

Yes, Frank.

MR. F. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Madam Mayor. I'm sorry I didn't hear your first presentation, so maybe my question is redundant. But I'm going to ask it anyway. My question is simply this: currently we have 42 urban and 41 rural constituencies, which is more or less 50-50, yet the urban to rural population currently in the province is more like 60-40. I wonder if you'd care to comment on that discrepancy between those two ratios?

MRS. RATCHINSKY: If I recall, I think someone asked me that question last time, as a matter of fact. I certainly am not in favour of additional expenditures within the province through additional salaries created unnecessarily by Members of the Legislative Assembly, but in all the reading I have done it appears that there are some discrepancies in the distribution, and I guess that's what you're trying to work out. I don't know if it requires more MLAs or just a different breakdown. That's what you're deliberating about. I certainly am not in favour of creating an additional expense where it's unnecessary.

MR. F. BRUSEKER: So you're saying keep it at 83. I guess my question is: if we keep it at 83 so we don't have the additional expense, would you then advocate shifting some of the constituencies to address those differences in the ratios?

MRS. RATCHINSKY: Are you talking about my personal opinion?

MR. F. BRUSEKER: I'm talking about your personal opinion, not necessarily that of the council, but . . .

MRS. RATCHINSKY: Well, I'm not exactly sure how to respond, because I feel that not only do I not want to see the expense, I also want to see fair. I know that a lot of the rural municipalities have concerns on the distances that their MLAs have to travel and maybe the lack of understanding in some areas if they get combined with an urban area and all of those things taken into consideration. So I guess I'm just going to stay on the fence on that one.

MR. F. BRUSEKER: All right. Thanks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

One question I might ask, and I do so in that St. Albert and Medicine Hat are in a similar position. If we're looking at either the electors list or the total population, you have more electors or people than you should have for a riding but not enough for two. So then, you know, you have to address the question: do you go to the kind of scenario that the boundaries commission used in Red Deer during the last redistribution where you create two ridings which are primarily urban but do have a rural component? Or in the case of Medicine Hat, one brief suggested that there should be one purely urban riding and then parts of the city might be added to two rural ridings that are both low in population. In that case it was Cypress-Redcliff and Bow Valley. But in that case you'd keep one urban riding of Medicine Hat and have two portions of the city that would become parts of rural ridings. Have you given any thought or do you have any thoughts on that kind of scenario?

MRS. RATCHINSKY: The position we took, and this again is a position of council, was that by not splitting our city using Highway 2 but going across the other way, you would then have your heavily populated area as one riding which would be strictly urban. That would then leave the northeast and northwest which would then take in possibly some rural area, but there's not that much substantial rural area there. What there is in that area is a lot of country estate people who have a lot of the same concerns an urban area has, and it would make sense even for a representative for that particular constituency if you chose to split it that way. That's how we rationalized it becoming to urban areas, because we will build out that way. We were on the city of Edmonton boundary the other way, so it doesn't make sense to look at it any other way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

We'll pause for just a moment and introduce the Hon. Dick Fowler, the provincial Solicitor General and of course your MLA, who was instrumental in getting the committee to St. Albert as one of our communities. Welcome to the hearing.

MR. FOWLER: Thank you, Chairman Bob.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now I'll throw it open to those of you in the public. Are there any questions or comments you'd like to add or make?

Yes, sir. Pardon me. Could you begin by introducing yourselves for *Hansard*.

MR. CRAIG: Darryl Craig. I live in St. Albert. What were the revised numbers you took as far as the updated electors on that survey you just did? Was it about 28,000?

MRS. RATCHINSKY: Total electorate population?

MR. CRAIG: Right.

MRS. RATCHINSKY: Yeah. Twenty-seven nine – 28,000.

MR. CRAIG: And at the rate St. Albert is growing, I think that would probably be close to even 29,000 by the time there is another election, which would put us into the bottom end of the scale as far as the 14 minimum type of thing. I just wanted to point that out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure. Good point.
Anyone else?

MR. FOWLER: One question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir.

MR. FOWLER: You indicate that there are 27,900 voters now?

MRS. RATCHINSKY: Yes. At our last count.

MR. FOWLER: But that's on your count as a city, isn't it? That's not electors in a provincial election necessarily.

MRS. RATCHINSKY: Not from the electors' list. No. The count we have is a . . .

MR. FOWLER: Population count of the city.

MRS. RATCHINSKY: But pulling out the over 18s.

MR. FOWLER: But what about pulling out the noncitizens who can't vote?

MRS. RATCHINSKY: We just pulled out the over 18s.

MR. FOWLER: Because in our last election of '88-89 we showed on the electoral list 24,000 and some, didn't we? So I don't think it's fair to assume that we've had a 2,000 or 3,000 increase in St. Albert in that period of time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One of the things we went over earlier in the presentation, Dick, was a result of a recommendation at one of the first hearings, where a presenter said: have you considered going to total population rather than elector lists? We've heard that recommendation in other centres, and we've actually done the number crunching. One of the advantages in using the total number list is pointed out right here. You're not then trying to decide whether we're talking about those under 18 or those over 18 who are not citizens of your country or who have chosen not to be enumerated for one reason or another. We saw in the case of Cardston where it jumped from being at the very bottom of the list to the top third of those still underneath the safe category – but a very significant jump in its position by using the total population figure.

Any other questions or comments? All right, we'll move on then. Leo.

MR. L. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm here today as a long-time, 18-year resident of St. Albert to express my views on the nature of the political map for the province. My interest in these matters has been stimulated by my brother Frank's involvement with your committee and my close association with a colleague, Len Bracko, an alderman for the city of St. Albert. Len was part of the team that made the presentation to your committee on February 26. After much thought, I would like to make the following comments about the boundaries.

Probably like most Albertans I was not aware of the wide discrepancies in the number of registered voters among the 83 constituencies. I naively assumed that while the numbers would not necessarily be identical, they would be very close. Little did I realize that 1.52 and, in one instance, three St. Albert voters count as much as one voter in other constituencies. You, of course, already know this, but you need to hear that I as a

resident of the city of St. Albert find this appalling and grossly unfair.

My immediate reaction is to embrace the concept of representation by population. In reading some of the thoughts of various persons at your meeting on February 26, I was persuaded that some leeway must be given. The plus or minus 25 percent variance from the provincial average, as suggested by Chief Justice McLachlin of the B.C. court, would amply provide this leeway in my opinion. My strong feeling – be that as it may – is that this is probably too high and the variance should be somewhere between 10 and 20 percent. I'm cognizant of the impact this would have on rural constituencies. However, anything over 25 percent in my opinion would be too great.

I'm aware that if the present number of constituencies is maintained at 83, this will result in a dramatic shift of seats from rural to urban. I support this shift. While the problem could be solved by adding to the number of constituencies, I believe the present arrangement already leaves Albertans well represented, and the additional seats would simply be an added tax burden. Besides, Mr. Chairman, I've been in the Legislative Assembly. Where would you put them? No, the solution must be found within the present parameters.

Some of the arguments I've read in *Hansard* suggest that the rural MLAs work harder and have a responsibility to more hospital boards, school boards, and other organizations than do urban MLAs. Distance is also of great concern to residents of rural ridings. None of these arguments remember that it is often individual Albertans who wish to contact their MLAs, and the greater the number of voters the more difficult this becomes.

Just going away from my text, Mr. Chairman, I'm the principal of an elementary school in the city of St. Albert, and I know that every time I give more students to a teacher, I greatly increase the workload of that teacher. Each one of those students requires the attention of that teacher, demands become at some point intolerable, and splits have to be made. I think we have that situation in several constituencies in this province, and I believe the city of St. Albert is one of those constituencies.

The desire of rural residents to have smaller constituencies – that is, number of voters – and the need to reduce, in my belief, the number of voters in urban constituencies would be sufficiently addressed using the plus or minus 25 percent variance.

This brings me to the unique St. Albert situation. I have read the arguments, and I've heard them again here today, of Anita Ratchinsky and Len Bracko. St. Albert is an unusual city, Mr. Chairman. While it is adjacent to Edmonton and most of its residents work in Edmonton, it is distinct and not part of what we in St. Albert call "that city to the south." Just the same, residents of St. Albert are not part of the surrounding rural area. For these reasons, I strongly support the arguments made by the city of St. Albert for two urban MLAs. This city has experienced tremendous growth in the 18 years I've lived here. When I came here in 1972 it had 10,000 people, and it now is over 40,000 in population and continues to grow in all areas, in all quadrants of the city. In my mind, the best thing for St. Albert residents would be two distinctly urban ridings. This would allow for continued growth for several years into the future before the boundaries would need to be redrawn.

I thank you for your attention, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Leo.
Questions? Pam.

MS BARRETT: Thank you. I might have some information that will put you at a disadvantage when I ask the following

question. I just asked the Chief Electoral Officer to give me figures on the average population per riding. That's population according to the most current update based on the 1986 census, and the estimation is on average 29,504 in Alberta. Your mayor has provided information to indicate that the city of St. Albert currently has a total population, if I'm not mistaken, of 40,707. If you subtract 25 percent from the first figure, 29,504, you would come to the floor level on the 25 percent rule of 22,128. So two urbans wouldn't quite cut it. Does that change your opinion at all, or do you have an amending idea here?

MR. L. BRUSEKER: No. I know that after every two elections there is another Electoral Boundaries Commission that's set. I think St. Albert is in a unique position in terms of its growth. If you're going to add some areas around, then I would suggest that you go for some rural areas. But, in my opinion, I think the best advantage to the citizens of the city of St. Albert is two urban ridings.

MS BARRETT: Okay. But you understand that if you stick to that argument, you yourself will not make your 25 percent rule. I'm going to assume that that 25 percent rule is of such great principal importance to you that you're going to find another recommendation. Is there one that you would have? If you really wanted two, are you so determined that you cannot have a blend of what your mayor was referring to as acreages and . . .

MR. L. BRUSEKER: No, no.

MS BARRETT: Okay, good. Thank you. I understand.

MR. L. BRUSEKER: No, I'm just saying that what would be the best advantage for the citizens would be two urban ridings. I don't think it would be an awful thing if it was combined with some rural areas. I do feel, however, that it would not be in the best interests of either citizens of the city of Edmonton or citizens of the city of St. Albert to combine portions of those two cities into one constituency.

MS BARRETT: Thank you. You couldn't be more clear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. And just for clarification, while some have advocated combined urban/rural ridings, I don't believe – and correct me if I'm wrong, panel members – that any of the briefs have suggested that that include the metropolitan centres of Calgary or Edmonton. I think the view was that you may find a situation around Grande Prairie or Lethbridge or Red Deer or St. Albert or Medicine Hat where it would be applicable, but I don't think anyone advocated that for the two metropolitan centres.

Other questions?

MR. F. BRUSEKER: Just one quick question; I've got to ask.

MS BARRETT: Oh, yeah. Setup. Puffball.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. F. BRUSEKER: I know I've read some of the other arguments about determining the size of constituencies that talk about geographic area, the number of hospital boards, et cetera, et cetera. In determining or making a recommendation to the Legislature, what weight do you think those things should have in determining the size of constituencies in the future?

MR. L. BRUSEKER: I think distance has to be a factor. I'm a member of a Boy Scout organization, northern Alberta Boy Scouts, and we take in a geographic distance north of Highway 16 to the B.C. border and Saskatchewan and away up to the Northwest Territories, and it's an incredible geographic region. Then there's another region called Edmonton region. There's a real difference in the mind-set about people who drive in the Edmonton region and who drive in the northern Alberta region for Scouts Canada. So I think I would place the highest regard on the distance that has to be traveled. I would be very careful in that regard.

MS BARRETT: You're talking about within the riding or . . .

MR. L. BRUSEKER: Sorry. Yes, within the riding, not from the Legislature to the riding.

MS BARRETT: Gotcha.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anyone else? In the audience?
Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. L. BRUSEKER: Thank you.

MR. PRITCHARD: We have two people to give us our next presentation: Dennis Pommen and Sandy Lipka.

MS BARRETT: Oh boy. Heavy reading. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's easy to read.

MS BARRETT: Oh, sure. A little light bedtime reading, eh?

MS LIPKA: Actually, it really won't take you very long.

MS BARRETT: No?

MS LIPKA: No.

MS BARRETT: Okay.

MS LIPKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. While Dennis is handing out the briefs, I would like to introduce myself. I'm Sandy Lipka. I'm a councillor in the county of Strathcona representing an urban division. Dennis is our general manager of the county, and between the two of us and a lot of help from staff, we put together a brief for tonight in the past few days. We apologize for not being able to address the committee at any other date, but unfortunately we are a very busy municipality. We, too, are experiencing a large amount of growth.

A couple of clarifications. Number one is that we have given you the brief. I have no problem at all if you read along with me. I would hope you would let me get through it once. Dennis will be here to answer questions on the numbers and the charts we are presenting in the brief. We just thought it would be easier if you had them so you could pose your questions or whatever while we're doing them. So if you'll permit me, we'll get started.

The executive summary recognizes four things that we felt have to be addressed in the boundary changes or the boundary divisions that have to be made by your committee. Number one is to recognize the importance of the distinctive characteristics of urban, 'rurban', and rural population communities in Alberta.

Number two is that geography and demography are equally important in determining the distribution of constituencies and their boundaries. We agree with the adopt plus or minus 25 percent condition on the average population division size for all three categories: to recognize the dispersed population, normal increases/decreases over time, and population movements made between boundary reviews. The fourth one is equitable treatment for urban, 'rurban,' and rural divisions, ensuring fair representation for all.

Strathcona county recognizes the significant challenge of this committee to structure the electoral divisions to permit appropriate representation of all Albertans through the electoral process. It is with this understanding that Strathcona county has also had to address its own representation within the county to recognize urban and rural blends. To this end, the result has been to identify Strathcona as a 'rurban' municipality incorporating the unique representation requirements within the geographic area.

Understanding the importance of fair representation – a voice for rural, 'rurban,' and urban communities in the province of Alberta – Strathcona county reviewed its electoral boundaries in 1989 and emerged with two rural, three 'rurban,' and five urban divisions. From our own experience, we knew how much more difficult it would be to serve the needs of a population base located in a geographically large rural area compared to a similar population base located in an urban area. Consequently, we set larger geographic electoral boundaries with smaller rural populations and smaller geographic electoral boundaries with larger urban populations, and these are included in your brief on schedule B.

We also recognized the importance of the distinctive characteristics of urban, 'rurban,' and rural population communities. The population is not homogeneous. There are different philosophies and needs and all are important to ensure the survival of those communities and ultimately the municipality as a whole. We see a parallel between Strathcona county and the province of Alberta in this regard. Geography and demography are both equally important in determining the distribution of constituencies and their boundaries. Schedule A, which is also attached in your brief, shows the model used by Strathcona county and how the distribution of population and divisions for the province of Alberta can be effectively related to that model, taking into consideration both geography and demography. Division in 'rurban' and urban areas could give an average population of 27,000 to 35,000 respectively. The rural population divisions could be 19,000, taking into account the large geographic areas to be represented.

Strathcona county recommends that the commission consider adopting a plus or minus 25 percent condition on the average population division size which would recognize the dispersed population levels in relation to sparse geographic areas. At the same time, this allows for the increase and decrease in the populations of divisions during the time between boundary reviews. The plus or minus 25 percent condition would pertain to urban, 'rurban,' and rural divisions and would only be applied within their own population groupings. At this point we would like to clarify that we are using total population figures. Unfortunately, we did not have access to the eligible voters lists for the province in the short time span that we were using. So with the table that is listed next on page 3, the application of the plus or minus 25 percent condition could give the following variances using total population. In an urban riding you could have a low of 26,000 to a high of 44,000, which would give you an average of 35,000 population per riding. In a 'rurban'

constituency your low would be 20,000 to 34,000 on the high end, with an average of 27,000. In the rural ridings you would have a low of 14,000 and a high of 24,000, for an average of 19,000.

To further demonstrate the success of this model, we provide the Strathcona boards and committees listings that indicate the 'rurban' concept of representation. We point out that the council consciously delegates the boards' and commissions' representatives from the three components: 'rurban,' urban, and rural. We would ask you to refer to the attached schedule C listing, again in your brief, but just before you get to that, we would highlight the following. For an example, on our Agricultural Services Board, since we do have a large rural component within our municipality, we have two urban members, two 'rurban' members, and two rural members. On the Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Planning Commission we have been recognized as needing one urban and one rural. With our Development Appeal Board, again we go with two urban, two 'rurban,' and one rural.

The argument of one vote for every Albertan in order to guarantee rights under the Charter is, in our opinion, too black and white. To accept such an argument would delegate the balance of power to the urban centres, leaving the rural communities without the voice of fair representation. A decision by the commission to consider geography as well as demography in determining the distribution of constituencies and the determination of their boundaries will ensure that all parts of Alberta are being treated equitably. This does not mean they're being treated the same but, rather, appropriately and fairly recognizing the needs, aspirations, and circumstances of each area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Sandy.

Questions from panel members? Pam.

MS BARRETT: What's 'rurban'?

MS LIPKA: I think 'rurban' is something you've been alluding to ever since we walked into the room tonight, and that is a blend of urban and country residential. In Strathcona county – I don't know how familiar you are with us – Sherwood Park being our large urban area, we are surrounded basically by country residential, people who love the idea of being in the country but only maintain about a three-acre parcel. Then we have distinct rural designations, which is where we have our actual active farmers.

MS BARRETT: So that would satisfy the county in terms of definition. I mean, when you're changing legislation, you can't be loose about stuff like this. It ain't easy to be clear even about what's rural and what's urban, so in adding a new one, you've got to be really clear. You would say that 'rurban' necessarily means the area immediately surrounding an urban area which has a predominance of small acreages, not farms, say, of a quarter section or more. Something like that?

MS LIPKA: Correct. Exactly like that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pat.

MRS. BLACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I understand it, you've put this in place already, have you?

MS LIPKA: We've had it in place since the last municipal election, yes.

MRS. BLACK: How did you determine to do this? Was this a request from the people, or did you go out and talk to the people?

MS LIPKA: We did do a fair amount of talking with the people actually. It was Alberta Municipal Affairs that said we had to realign our boundaries. We had a distinct difference in population. For example, I am the representative of division 6. Your map of the urban area will show you that I still have the highest population, and while I'm classified as an urban councillor, I actually service both urban and an area which is more industrial. It is not 'rurban' because there are no farms, no acreages in that particular riding.

When we had a council of eight, we were four and four and wanted to keep equality on council so that both parts of our municipality felt equally represented. We went to the people and asked them individually, not through any referendums or surveys, how they would feel if there were one more urban because of our population being so much larger. We received a resounding "No way." We then sat down again with Municipal Affairs, who looked at the way our numbers are spread out, at the residential growth we are having, where we are experiencing it, the country residential which is also growing – and I have to credit Mr. Archie Grover with the word 'rurban' – and we decided to go for it. We increased from eight councillors to 10, and the people are very happy with it so far and we are very happy with it.

MRS. BLACK: One other philosophical question, if I might, Mr. Chairman. You come from a unique situation where you have had urban and rural, and we've had hearings that have been predominantly urban or rural. Can you tell me what the distinction is between the type of representation that is required by an urban population as opposed to that of a rural population?

MS LIPKA: Okay. Actually, I have two examples, both within my own division, being the division I had prior to our changes. We had a residential street, which was a very small street housing 97 homes, being used as a shortcut route with 8,000 cars per day. That was something that no rural councillor was going to have to tackle. We did tackle it. I did tackle it. We now have speed humps on that street. I also have low-income rental housing – the only development within all of Strathcona county – in my division, and we are looking at the possible purchase by the developer so we will no longer even have that, and that is something else a rural would not have to contend with.

A 'rurban' councillor would have to contend probably with commercial development, sewer and water services, road services, and at the same time pest control or weed control through agricultural services. Then our rural councillors are concerned more with pesticide control, road conditions again, the new rural assessment for taxes – that type of issue – water control, beavers. We are very much distinct, the three divisions.

MRS. BLACK: And could one MLA serve all three effectively?

MR. POMMEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess I'd just like to add that as a point, that where it comes together is the aspect of the three components. For example, if we use the area of planning, the aspect of planning means that everybody has to look at it in a global context, so if you looked at it from one MLA, yes, that person does have to look at all three areas. In the case of Strathcona, with the three types or components, each

area has to think about planning as a whole. They can't just look at their particular division, because if you're dealing with the preservation of agricultural land, that's a certain concern for rural but also has to be a concern from an urban perspective as well. So that's where it ties together again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The advantage, Pat, is that the member, Peter Elzinga, is meeting with one council, and the council in essence is dealing with the three distinct groups.

MS LIPKA: But, in fairness, we're dealing with three MLAs within our county boundaries too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good point.

Okay. Anyone else? In the audience? Okay. Thank you very much.

MS LIPKA: Thanks very much.

MR. PRITCHARD: Our final presenter this evening is Richard Plain. Come up, Richard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If anyone would like a cup of coffee or glass of juice, please help yourself.

Welcome, Richard.

DR. PLAIN: Mr. Chairman, members of the panel, in February we had the opportunity of addressing the group – and I think most members were there – on this subject. So what I wish to do this evening is to reiterate three of our principle points, and one additional point has come as a result of deliberations we've held very recently, in the month of August. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, it focuses very much on this population issue. So that's a new addition to the submission.

In our early representation we noted, as others have done, that the existing system in our opinion has failed to adequately serve Albertans. This range as it stands is unacceptable, based on electorates between 14,000 and 31,000. There's no fairness. So everyone's recognized that, and of course your task is how to change it. We argued or suggested that it was important, given the growth patterns of this province – sometimes a period of recession, slow growth; other periods of dynamic population explosion – that we have something other than eight years. In fact, we suggest after each election an adjustment, small alignments. It goes on a marginal basis, and there isn't this dramatic shifting and tearing apart: someone's out 50 percent, 40 percent, 80 percent. No, let's deal with 5s, 10s, 20s, and the job should be hopefully not as onerous – hopefully.

The 25 percent variation. We indicated to the panel we wished them the best of luck in establishing that after listening to Albertans, because that's a judgment you indeed have to come up with, as to what is the best, aside from what the judiciary or legal ruling may have decided. But we note the following: that with a 25 percent variation, if we're using the electorate as the basis, you start out in the best of circumstances. If you take the highest and you take the lowest, you start out with a 67 percent differential, and then it could get worse. So you start out with a 67, two-thirds, split. Many people feel that's unfair just to begin with, that it's too large. You shouldn't have a 67 percent differential under reform or other basis. We don't have the wisdom of Solomon; all we can say is that we feel that with review after each election, this would stop these extreme variations from occurring. Therefore, if you're going with a 25 or adjustments around there, in the 20s or whatever, things

would be markedly better and improved, and certainly we'd avoid the present situation.

Our new representation is based on the proposition that the total population, not just the electors, should be used to establish the boundaries of the constituency. An MLA must attempt to meet the needs of all the people in his or her constituency. For example, over 25 percent of our provincial budget goes on education alone. If we add in all the other needs, if we were relating them to those that were 18 years and under and the rest and sorted it out, are we 50-50? There are billions of dollars, thousands and tens of thousands of people that all need the attention of their MLAs and their representation. They're all part and parcel of them. That should be the base. That's more representative of your workload and your needs than the size. So we recommend, then, that it's total population that should be used in establishing the new boundaries.

As Mr. Chairman and others of the panel have pointed out, it was interesting to note that communities such as Cardston and Cypress-Redcliff, which are far below the minimum based on the electors – the minimum of electors is roughly 14,000 under the 25 percent rule – are relatively close to minimum, though, if the boundaries are based on total population, again with a 25 percent variation. So we think that if, because by accident of geography or the local economy, the region is one where it can't sustain an adult population in part – that it grows and then the people move into other parts because of the urban economy in the other directions – those needs are there, the workload is there, and the population in those cases is the better indication of the type of basis that should be used for adjusting boundaries.

Penny, do you have any other comments or points? Is that a fair assessment of where we stand on this?

MRS. REEVES: I think Dick has given you a very accurate interpretation of what our board felt. I really don't feel that I have anything to add to what he said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.
Questions or comments? Yes, Pat.

MRS. BLACK: I'm just going to ask a question. I appreciate your presentation very much. You seem very, very concerned over the 25 percent variance as being a little too high as a general rule. You're from the Conservative association. Would you then have any objection – I was just looking at the map of the province – if, say, there was a reworking of municipal legislation that allowed some of St. Albert to shift into Edmonton and some of it to go out into rural? Would that bother you?

DR. PLAIN: Could I share a bit of history with you? And it's not going back to Father Lacombe; I could tell you about that. But we'll start in more contemporary Alberta, in the 20th century. How about just before the last period, in the '70s? The town of St. Albert included the towns of Bon Accord and Gibbons and the other side and almost out to the Fort and out to Vimy and out to Calahoo and the park. This has been our trading and any other related area. Our MLAs that were representative, from Keith Everitt, who was a Social Credit, to Myrna Fyfe, a Progressive Conservative, and to Bryan Strong in the NDP, who had an urban riding – basically it worked, I believe. There were more and greater demands on our members with that mix, but it worked and worked well.

I guess that partly reflects my background. I'm a fourth generation Albertan. My brother is farming. I was raised on a

farm, in urban and other areas. I really am quite disturbed from time to time about this massive difference between these urban and rural people. You know, if you took the urban side and counted that all up, 85 percent of Alberta is urban, because you count towns and villages on the other side. But then if we say, well, what is rural, what is urban . . . I can't understand it. We were rural, you know, and had 19,000 or 20,000 and had all our neighbours and the rest in there, and it worked. Then we became a city and we had 25,000 or some other size, and then these couldn't be matched in because, you see, those were rural folks that think differently; you can't relate to them. I believe that's overstated. I believe that in the main it's not as well founded as some would suggest, and perhaps they've not had the opportunity to have the experience. In some ways, though it's demanding for those that have had to go through it, you really got a cross section of Alberta if you could stand the workload. I mean, because you had the province, you had agricultural and urban and the other parts.

So we in our position stated that we believe certain recognition has got to be taken of the boundaries as they relate to the municipal side, but the most important factor is that it shouldn't interfere with obtaining a closer relationship between the population of a region and its representation within the Legislature. You've got a number of options here, whether it's a purely urban St. Albert seat or another one that's extended, whether it's additional portions, if that's what you wish. There are a number of combinations. I just say that historically we have been through the whole situation, and from a personal point of view I just really find it pretty difficult to believe that I in the city can't understand my brothers and my fathers and the other people too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Richard.
Any other questions?

MS BARRETT: I have a comment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

MS BARRETT: I'd just like to thank you for getting back on that computer and giving us even more information. You do the best computer printouts. Thank you.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Richard, I have a technical question. If you're basing the population on the 1986 census – there'll not be another census done until 1991. For example, St. Albert has just completed a census; Edmonton has; Calgary has. In the major urban centres, for example, we know that since 1986 Calgary has gone up by 42,000; we know that Edmonton has gone up by 31,000. How do you build that into this population base? We also know that the rural areas have been depopulating in that period. We don't have any current data for the rural areas. The only areas where we have really factual, up-to-date information are the cities.

DR. PLAIN: When you enumerate, if you're using population, you're doing the total count. Okay? That would be enumerating the population, so the census, in effect, is what you'd be doing. The other one would be to look at the growth from a combination of sources. Check out your municipal statistics. If somebody didn't file their municipal statistics for certain reasons, well, that's another reason. But I think between our medicare – for example, the estimates that are used in intercensal years are from Alberta medicare, and ABS uses that in connection

with Stats Canada. So I think we can come up with some pretty good estimates from two or three sources: the municipalities, the Alberta health care, and any of our other projections. I think we can come pretty close. If you say "legally," it has got to be the federal census, but I don't believe the federal census is better. I do not believe it is better than our other estimates demographically.

MR. PRITCHARD: Well, as you know if you've been following their estimates, their demographics have not been very accurate. The next time we're going to get an accurate count is in the summer of 1991. That information will not be available till the summer of 1992, a little late for this particular commission.

DR. PLAIN: But I think all you can do is to take your growth projections on the past in the areas and the sides on your counts that you've got, your municipal and the other areas, and make the best guesstimate. I think that's a task, but the best guesstimate - we do it all the time. We have to forecast, we have to push ahead, and that's all that one can do.

MR. PRITCHARD: So the question: do you think we could use the 1986 census data in the areas where that is the latest information, but if we have later information from cities, we use that information?

DR. PLAIN: I think you need to look at the three combinations: one from the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission counts and changes on a regional basis, the one on the municipal side, and one on a projection from the Stats Canada combination, and then make the best guesstimate on it.

MR. PRITCHARD: One of the technical problems, of course, is that a regional estimate is not very good when you're drawing a boundary line and you need to know exactly where people are located.

DR. PLAIN: I know, although the Alberta health care might not be bad.

MR. PRITCHARD: They'll give you regional, but regional is no good.

DR. PLAIN: Well, you've got place of residence and the location. I don't know how tough on that side, but it'd be pretty consistent. It's about 3 percent higher on the census counts between Alberta health care and Stats Canada in the numbers issued, as I'm sure you well know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Any other questions from the panel? Yes, Dick.

MR. FOWLER: I'm going to take you back, Dr. Plain, to the position you appeared to be making, that if St. Albert, from what I was hearing, were broken in half and rural added to both halves, it would then become an urban/rural constituency. I gathered it was your belief that irrespective of where the member was elected from, he or she could equally represent both halves, the rural half and the urban half. If that's what I'm hearing, I would feel the examples you used about Myrna Fyfe and Bryan Strong may be based on the fact that those people were elected from the city of St. Albert as St. Albert residents, where the bulk of the population was, and could represent the other side.

You also speak from a personal viewpoint of being off the farm yourself but totally urbanized, having been involved in the university most of your life, and as a true urbanite tell us, and I think it's true, that you still have a good feel for the rural side. I certainly believe that, and I think it's true. But what about the situation where St. Albert is divided in two with rural added on both sides, and the member from both sides is in fact a rural member who doesn't have the background that you have or somebody else has, has been on a dairy farm all their life, has never dealt with the complexities of urban government, of a rapidly progressing city like St. Albert with all its problems? Do you believe St. Albert could be adequately represented in that case?

DR. PLAIN: Yeah, personally, I wasn't just suggesting that there should be rural added to both. For example, St. Albert could very nicely have an urban seat and then a seat that was urban with a rural addition to it, so it could be in that sense a pure urban. I have not expressed a preference to say that, you know, in some sense they both had to be. I just said that in our historical experience, before becoming a city proper, though we were the largest town and really were a city for a number of years although under the town label, it worked. All these combinations worked, but the loads on the MLAs were markedly heavier, and that's the other point that's very important. For anyone that knows Myrna Fyfe or takes an opportunity to talk with her, when you in effect have two constituencies, it's a difficult load.

MR. FOWLER: Then let me just wind up with one more question, Dr. Plain. What I'm hearing now or what you're suggesting - or let me suggest to you, and you react to it however you want. But surely a city with the 45,000 that you guess the population will be at the next election - would you not feel it is entitled to one urban seat out of that? If it doesn't include everybody . . .

DR. PLAIN: Yeah. I've not been advocating that you have to have rural in every component of two seats in St. Albert. I mean, there could be a totally urban and then an urban/rural combination, or you could have both. I'm just saying that in our experience historically both worked, with a lot more difficulty for the member, but they both worked and worked well in that context. But the options are there, and I can't answer what would be better in somebody's opinion: to have one urban and a rural/urban or a bit of both. Give them a choice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions or comments from the floor?

Thank you very much, Penny and Richard.

Are there any comments that any member would now like to make before we conclude? Okay. Starting with you then, Dick, as our host MLA, are there any comments you'd like to make, sir?

MR. FOWLER: Well, firstly, I would like to thank you, Mr. Bogle, for ceding to the request of St. Albert people and others and my own urging that you to come to St. Albert. We were missed in the first round, and we are deeply appreciative of you appearing now. I would like to thank all the people that have made presentations in the previous hearings, that went to the city, took the time to go into Edmonton to make those presentations, which is a little more inconvenient than doing it at home. I would like to thank also the people that have come today to re-present or make new presentations to the committee. You

have an extremely difficult job. I know that all the presenters are more than sophisticated enough to appreciate the difficulty of your job that must be done, and I know that the committee – I appreciate them being here.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Pat.

MRS. BLACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to thank the people for their hospitality and for their presentations, and as we've said so often, as is always the case, we've learned something new again today and a new terminology called 'rurban'. It seems every time we have a hearing, we learn at least one new thing. I'd like to thank you for having us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Tom.

MR. SIGURDSON: Just briefly to underscore what the two previous people have said, I thank you for coming out and making your presentation. We've got a difficult job before us. The Charter of Rights is going to be a guiding beacon in all of this, and the representations that you've made this evening are certainly different than the representations we heard this afternoon in a community not too very far away. Somehow we're going to try and balance that. It's not going to be an easy task, but it's one that all of us look forward to.

Thank you again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Frank.

MR. F. BRUSEKER: Yeah. Just thanks for coming out this evening. We appreciate the thought and the effort that's gone into the presentations. It's interesting, as Tom said, to listen to the variety of positions that have been put forward in the course of this afternoon's and this evening's hearings. As I've said before, and I'll say it again, we'll do the best to please every-

body, but I'm sure we're not going to make everybody exactly happy. I just hope you're satisfied with whatever comes out of all this.

Thanks for coming out.

MS BARRETT: Ditto as to all of the above.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I'd like to particularly endorse the remarks of the professional presentations made and the research that was done by the presenters – first class.

Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, again I thank all of you for coming out this evening. To you, Madam Mayor, for coming and supplementing your earlier brief with some additional information on the city's population, I thank you. Sandy and Dennis, we know how busy you are. We tried to accommodate you on, I think, two previous occasions, and that wasn't possible. Now you've traveled over here, and we do appreciate it. Again, as was earlier mentioned by Pat and others, thanks for the new input that you've given us. To Richard and Penny, again you've had time to think since your last presentation on some of the concepts, and you're now coming out and endorsing the total population rather than an elector list, and we appreciate that input. Just to underscore . . . Oh, I forgot Leo, and I shouldn't have, because I was really impressed, Leo, with your comments on distance. We hear that in the rural areas quite regularly. It's really refreshing for myself as a rural member to hear an urban individual who has some experience, in your case through the Boy Scout movement, in distances and what that means and that there should be some consideration given to distance. It's not just a matter of rep by pop alone.

So thank you to all the presenters for your briefs. I think Pat said it very well when he commented on how professionally they've been done. So thanks for coming out and sharing your ideas with us.

[The committee adjourned at 8:28 p.m.]

