

[Chairman: Mr. Bogle]

[1:09 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we'll officially declare the meeting open. Bob has a number of handouts at the beginning, and once he's finished distributing them, we'll go through them and discuss them briefly.

MR. BRUSEKER: Just like the first day of school, eh?

MR. PRITCHARD: And with you, it's exactly like the first day of school.

What I handed you is just an outline of in camera sittings: the rules. They asked that I pass those out from upstairs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is one matter that I think we should discuss when all members are present. It is the process we wish to follow. You recall on a previous occasion I raised the question whether we wanted all of our proceedings recorded, whether we wanted some meetings in camera, whether we wanted some meetings held in camera and not recorded but rather minutes kept. Keep those options in mind for the meeting scheduled on the 25th of the month in Calgary.

MR. PRITCHARD: This is a memo regarding our scheduling for the future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You'll recall while we were in Wainwright we had agreed to a schedule of meetings for the months of September and October, and that was, of course, subject to compliance of the two members who were not with us in Wainwright. As well, I did have communication, Tom, from yourself and from Pam prior to the Wainwright meeting just asking us when I anticipated the final report would be finished and when appropriate legislation would be drawn. This letter to all of the committee members is intended to address those matters. Bob advises me that we do require approximately two weeks once we've completed our final draft so that the report may be printed and prepared for distribution. We will need in excess of 1,000 copies. First, one for each Member of the Legislative Assembly and several additional copies for the library and the Speaker's office. We'll need additional copies for the press gallery and, of course, we made commitments during the public hearings that all those who attended would be given copies. I think we have an attendance in excess of 800 at the hearings themselves.

So if we need all of the meetings we've agreed to - that's running through until October 24 - and there are another two weeks required, then obviously the report would be ready in the month of November.

There are two other scenarios. One is that we'll complete our work more quickly. In that event the report would be made public more quickly. If on the other hand we need additional time past the 24th for our meetings, then the report would be backed up. But as we know, we are committed to a fall sitting of the Legislature, and it would then be the responsibility of the Government House Leader - I believe customary practice is consultation with the House leaders from the other two parties - to bring in appropriate legislation to enact the changes necessary to the ground rules and also for the establishment of the commission.

Questions or comments on that?

MR. BRUSEKER: Do you have any idea when we're going back in? Has there been any discussion, Pam?

MS BARRETT: Uh uh; no indication. I think it's very clear that . . . I mean, if we're planning to be sitting as late as October 24, it's going to be a week or two after that already. So the sooner we get done, the sooner the House sits.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed. Then I think we'll have a sense once the committee is rolling as to how much time we will indeed require. All right?

Bob, the next agenda.

MR. PRITCHARD: The next item I've got to hand out is minutes from our small meeting that we held after . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. Tom, did you have a question before we leave that?

MR. SIGURDSON: Sorry, Mr. Chairman. Just with respect to the September 26 date. I thought we had two times booked for the 26th, the evening as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We did. You'll recall that was subject to checking with Pam and Stock. We find that there is a commitment in Calgary that both Stock and now Pat are involved in. Pat wasn't aware of that on the Friday either when we were in Wainwright, were you?

MRS. BLACK: No, but I phoned Bob back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. But you are now. Okay. That's the reason we're not able to meet in the evening of the 26th while we're in Calgary.

MR. SIGURDSON: So that's the only change, then, to what we agreed to in Wainwright, Bob?

MR. PRITCHARD: That was the only one.

MR. SIGURDSON: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One other "subject to." We have not been able to speak with Stockwell Day directly. Bob has talked to his secretary, and the dates we've agreed to are marked in his book. He had no conflicts in his book. I would do my very, very best to dissuade him from any other commitment he might have. We've worked around the cabinet planning session. Hopefully there are no other conflicts. Okay? Any other questions before we move on?

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Chairman, on October 10th . . . I guess I've misprinted my book or something. Why are we taking from noon until 7 p.m. off on the 10th? Oh, for cabinet.

MR. PRITCHARD: Wednesday - I believe it was for Frank, so Frank could go back to Edmonton.

MRS. BLACK: That's your caucus?

MR. BRUSEKER: It's caucus on that day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Last call: any other questions or comments?

All right, Robert.

MR. PRITCHARD: Good. What I'm handing out now are the minutes from our Wainwright meeting following the Wainwright public hearing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You will recall that at the meeting in Wainwright we did not have *Hansard* recording the meeting.

MR. PRITCHARD: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Therefore, we do have a copy of the minutes of the meeting.

Any questions or comments? All right.

MR. SIGURDSON: In between October 12 and 22: would that be sufficient time for us to get back to our caucuses? I'm just wondering about the period of time we need in order to discuss the matter with our caucuses.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Actually, it was my understanding that we'd be doing it earlier.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, that's what I thought too. Between September 28 and October 9.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR. SIGURDSON: I stand corrected.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay?

HON. MEMBERS: Uh huh.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next agenda item, Robert.

MR. PRITCHARD: The next one: I thought I'd like to ask about the meetings on September 25, 26, and 28. If we could just go around the table quickly and if you could tell me who wants a room for the night. I'm assuming that - of course, Pat and Frank, no. And you're driving down, are you, Tom?

MR. SIGURDSON: I'll be driving down, I assume.

MR. PRITCHARD: So you'll want a room. And you'll be staying over through until Friday?

MR. SIGURDSON: Yes.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. Me too.

MR. CARDINAL: I suspect I will too.

MS BARRETT: Or we could all crash at Frank's house.

MR. CARDINAL: Good idea.

MR. PRITCHARD: Maybe he'll have his new house up by then.

MR. BRUSEKER: We should have the subfloor in place by that time. I don't know how much it would leak.

MR. PRITCHARD: It would be a good test.

I just wanted to mention two other additions on October 10 and 11, and that's that we'll have our scheduled dinner from 5:30 to 7 on the 10th, and on the 11th from 5 till 6.

MR. BRUSEKER: On the 10th and 11th, you say?

MR. PRITCHARD: October 10 and 11.

What I'm going to hand out now - we have two systems for collecting data by a computer. One is all the *Hansard* data that's gone in from the public hearings and from our meetings, and also a little separate system we've developed that we've just called the electoral boundaries reference tracking system.

The *Hansard* system is a system *Hansard* uses all the time, so we've actually just borrowed it. It means that we can scan through. For example, if somebody wants to know where the word "urban" was used and how it was used, we can scan through it and it will pick out the *Hansards* it was in. It still means that we have to go to those *Hansards* and draw them out and read to see what was said, but at least it's a quick way of finding items; we have that system. We have those disks on the computer here so we can use it here. So it will be quick and handy.

The second little system we built was for all the mail-in submissions that we've received. We've received about 200 to date, although in that 200 are included all the requests for public hearings as well, because often in those letters people made a comment that could be taken as a submission. So this system has broken it down. We've selected out about 12 or 14 areas that I thought might be of interest, and these lists break them down. They basically tell you how many people talked about difficulty in getting to see their MLA or that they wanted population figures used or that they wanted enumeration figures used or that they didn't want the boundaries changed: those sorts of things. So there are a few printouts. Actually, in some ways they look more massive than the 200 letters.

This first one I'll give to you basically tells the names.

MS BARRETT: Thank you.

MR. PRITCHARD: This is something for you just to take a look through and consider. Basically, a reference number is just a number we assign. It gives the name of the person that sent the submission in, and then the Xs indicate the areas where there were concerns.

They were condensed on this sheet. There's a little bit better expansion on the title, so you'll know it. Basically, it will tell you the ones that asked about the composition of the commission where people discuss the number of electoral divisions; where they had issues about urban population issues, the rural population issues, the use of enumeration figures, the use of population figures; where constituents had difficulty seeing their members; where the people wanted no change; where they had comments regarding rural/urban ratio. Some of them talked about organizations the MLA deals with. Some of them talked about percentage factors, such as plus/minus 25 or other percentages they may have come up with; where people addressed one person, one vote. Sometimes people talked about frequency redistribution, formula considerations, special considerations, and urban and rural mix, such as Red Deer; where the MLA had access or difficulty of access to government offices; and of course, as I've mentioned, requests for additional public hearings.

MR. BRUSEKER: Is there any note anywhere that explains what "other" refers to? For example, Alfred Schalm there has a couple of Xs.

MR. PRITCHARD: No. "Other" is one where if we want to know that, we have to go back and look it up, because there were dozens of different things. Each one was probably different.

MR. BRUSEKER: All right.

MR. PRITCHARD: On the last page at the end it's broken down. There are 203 of them broken down into the number of submissions in each area and the percentage of the submissions on those particular topics.

These are sort of three variations we've run off. There are other ways we can collect data. So what I'd like to do partly this afternoon, just sometime during the afternoon, is: if you'd give me ideas of what you want researched, some things you want drawn out of this system – you know, I don't expect you to read this stuff and figure it out – then we'll go back and draw it out of either the *Hansard* material or the written submission material.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When we get to that point, are you going to use the board over here, Bob?

MR. PRITCHARD: Sure. Then I can write these . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it's important that we not worry about what information is already available. Let's get all of the various points out that we've got, and then Bob can spend time correlating what information is readily available from the machine now and what he has to dig deeper for.

MR. PRITCHARD: This is only to give you a sample of what we can do.

MR. BRUSEKER: This package we have before us right now: these are all the oral presentations?

MR. PRITCHARD: No. Those are the written submissions we received by mail. They're separate from the written presentations that were received at public hearings.

MR. BRUSEKER: But some of the names that are in here are people who also made . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: Could be, yes. Quite often they made a submission and came to a hearing, and it came twice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What's happened in a number of cases, I think, is that we've got individuals who submitted a written brief prior to our first deadline on the assumption that there would not be an opportunity to make a verbal presentation. Then some of them came back and met when we had the additional hearings.

MR. PRITCHARD: There were also some, Bob, I think, that went out of their way to make sure they wrote in, came to a hearing and gave a presentation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And we had some people who came to two and three.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah.

This again is just for your information. This is a breakdown of the people that submitted and who they represented, if they represented a group. This last one is the name of the individual, and it's printed out what their main topics were in their written submissions.

MS BARRETT: Now, this was all taken from written submissions again, eh?

MR. PRITCHARD: Written by mail. Right.

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. So the 203 written briefs are capsulized here.

MR. PRITCHARD: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if we want to read into the record the name and the main points.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes, it might be a good idea to have that on the record, because the submissions that have come in by mail are not anywhere on formal record with *Hansard*. I can read in the name of the person that made a submission and the highlights from their submission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, Bob.

MR. PRITCHARD: Okay.

The first one – actually this was the first one we received – was anonymous. They were in favour of one person, one vote; they suggested a plus or minus 5 percent variation; and they suggested a rural assistant to an MLA.

The second one was . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. If there are any comments or questions any member has while Bob's going through these, we'll just pause for a moment.

MS BARRETT: Well, I have a comment right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

MS BARRETT: You want to read all of these?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's 203.

MS BARRETT: That's amazing. You folks have scanners, don't you, in *Hansard*? Somebody does.

MR. PRITCHARD: They don't have this kind of scanner, because this has never gone into their record. The written submissions only came into the office here.

MS BARRETT: The only way we can get this into the record is to read it?

MR. PRITCHARD: As far as I'm aware.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The advantage in reading it isn't to get it into the record. It's just to ensure that the written briefs that came in – and Bob has got them broken down so that they're in

major points. We're not listening to every word; we just went through one and it took a minute and a half.

MS BARRETT: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's to ensure we know the points made by those who wrote in. If the committee would rather waive it, we'll waive it. What's your pleasure?

MRS. BLACK: Well, I think it has to be recorded, and if that's the only means, then I think we should go ahead and get it over with, get them read into the record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But I didn't see it for that reason.

MRS. BLACK: No, but I think it's important that they are in the record. And if the only means is to read them in, then we should do it.

MR. CARDINAL: I think it should be read in. I don't know what's written in, so as a member of this committee I'd like to know what's written in and generally just a rough outline of what the people say. It's part of our hearing process. It won't take very long.

MR. SIGURDSON: It's much quicker to read it, and I was just wondering if you've got that on computer. Surely that can be just transcribed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll let Bob go through one page, and let's see how long it takes. I sense one of the concerns is the amount of time it might take.

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we do the first page?

MS BARRETT: Sure.

MR. PRITCHARD: I'll read up to nine.

Alan Warnock, Airdrie: should consider geographic size as well as the number of municipalities; second point, should have urban divisions and a nearly similar number of rural divisions.

Garth Werschler, Alder Flats: one, believes in Triple E Senate to safeguard rural people; two, retain current or equal rural/urban ratio; three, reference to federal east having unfair majority.

Jim and Gladys Campbell from Alix: one, no change; two, no mathematical approach.

Mayor Enid Neufeld, Alliance: one, no change; two, loss of rural representation.

Joan Sherman, Athabasca: one, 25 percent variance okay if supported by local circumstances; amalgamate Little Bow, Cypress-Redcliff, Cardston, Chinook, and Pincher Creek-Crowsnest; three, add at least four seats to be divided between Edmonton and Calgary; four, no change for Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

Reeve Robert A. Wilkinson, Athabasca: one, economy based primarily on rural Alberta - strong voice required; two, council supports decentralization of services; three, no change for Athabasca-Lac La Biche.

Adolf Bablitz from Barrhead: requests a public hearing in the Barrhead area.

Wes Romanchuk of Barrhead: requests a public hearing in Barrhead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Let's just stop a minute.

MRS. BLACK: One minute.

MS BARRETT: Okay.

MR. PRITCHARD: Sid Gurevitch, Barrhead: request that a public hearing be scheduled in Barrhead.

Wes Romanchuk, Barrhead: length of hearings may not allow all to be heard; two, schedule a public hearing in Barrhead.

I. Hildebrandt, Bashaw: one, no change; two, increased size makes MLA/constituent communication hard.

Mayor John Gust of Bashaw: schedule a public hearing in Stettler.

Annie W. Zahelka of Bentley: the proposal is no change.

Virgil White, Bentley: proposal - no change for Lacombe.

Gayleen Wine, Bentley: proposal - no change for Lacombe.

Muriel White of Bentley: submission - no change for Lacombe.

Mr. and Mrs. P.A. Lavery, Bentley: one, no change in Lacombe; two, population around Bentley will increase in the next five years.

Mr. and Mrs. Harry Siebenga, Bentley: proposal - no change for Lacombe.

Marg Martin from Bentley: do not increase the size of Lacombe - MLA less effective.

Mary Holmes from Bentley: no change.

Harold Peterson, Bentley: no change; rural population declining.

Rea Peterson, Bentley: no change; rural population declining.

Florence Peterson, Bentley: no change for Lacombe.

Mr. and Mrs. Dan Wecker, Bentley: no change for Lacombe.

Max and Agnes Moore, Bentley: no change in Lacombe.

Mayor Fred Kinley, Berwyn, several points: one, rural MLA distances and travel time; two, rural MLA deals with large number of boards and towns, et cetera; three, rural Alberta is resource base; four, large ridings make it hard for MLA to monitor environment; five, declining rural population.

Joyce Sydnies, Berwyn: no change.

R.E. (Bob) Walter, Berwyn: rep by population tempered with distance and accessibility; second point, costs rural residents time and money to access central government.

J.M. Pimm of Berwyn, three points: rural MLA travel and workload; two, numerous boards and elected officials; three, request public hearing in Dunvegan.

Esther Rogers, Black Diamond: one, strongly opposed to change that reduces the number of constituencies; two, increase in geographic size would reduce MLA efficiency.

J. Wayne Terriff, Blairmore, four points: do not reduce rural rep - increase urban if necessary; provincial economic diversification; rural population declining; rural Alberta needs more representation, not less.

Kathleen I. Kerr, Blairmore: rep by pop favours urban centres; rural MLA deals with several elected boards; rural MLA travel time already taxing.

Glenda Bobbie, Bon Accord: do not reduce rural representation.

Jean Umbach, Bonanza: request to reschedule public hearings in Spirit River or Rycroft.

Marguerite Johnson, Bowden: redistribution by population could lead to large rural constituencies; secondly, large con-

stituencies too diverse and difficult for one MLA; three, maintain current practice, possibly with urban additions.

D.N. James of Brooks: requests a public hearing in Brooks.

Monte Solberg, Brooks, three points: rural Alberta is basis of Alberta's economy; Alberta needs a Triple E Senate, reference to the federal government; request for a public hearing in Brooks.

J.R. Thomas of Calgary: reduce constituencies to 70, fewer rural MLAs.

M. Elaine Warholm of Calgary: Calgary-Shaw boundary – recommended changes.

R. Gary Dickson, Calgary, three points: 25 percent tolerance should be the maximum permitted; rural riding should have 50 percent of population in urban centre; commission composition.

Ron and Judy Plett from Calgary: do not add more urban seats or any seats; secondly, move government services and encourage industry to move to rural; three, reference to Triple E Senate, federal – let's not set a double standard.

Al Duerr of Calgary, two points: detailed scenario on effects of a 10 percent factor; detailed scenario on effects of a 20 percent factor.

Peter Bulkowski, Calgary: one person, one vote; second point, 90 percent of ridings plus or minus 5 percent of mean, with minus 5 percent gain, or minus 10 percent; rules for rep over reasonable periods of time.

Gordon Shrake, Calgary: no change.

Reeve Al Bishop of Camrose, two points: significant rural rep must be maintained; rural MLAs have large geographic areas to cover.

Wendy Sowerby, Carbon, three points: 25 percent system implemented if current system can't be kept; two, do not add more urban representation; three, one man, one vote unacceptable.

Ralph L. Price, Cardston: proposes no change.

Susan M. Smith from Cardston, three points: use population figures, not enumeration; reference to Charter of Rights and Freedoms; small urban centres should not dictate for the entire body.

Jessie L.S. McKay of Cardston, three points: do not use 25 percent factor as Cardston would disappear; MLA not effective due to size, organization, or number of constituents; effect on an MLA's family.

Jessie Campbell of Castor: proposes no change.

Michael Yakielashek of Castor, two proposals: if change is based on population very large constituencies would result; two, requests a public hearing be held in Stettler.

Lloyd Brattly from Castor, two suggestions: schedule a public hearing in Stettler, Chinook, or Wainwright; secondly, hearings should be held in all constituencies to be affected.

Anola Laing of Claresholm, two points: consider the county or municipal boundaries; and two, move the eastern border of Macleod to the MD border.

Louis L. Damphouse of Claresholm: his point was concerned with possible erosion of rural representation.

Mayor Joyce Raiwet of Clyde advised that the village of Clyde wishes to remain in Westlock-Sturgeon.

Laurie Wilgosh of Cowley had five points: one, no change; two, reference to federal and southern Ontario domination; three, rural depopulation; four, rural MLA has greater duties – more boards, larger area – and five, if area is increased, salaries must be raised as well.

Wayne M. Ryder of Crossfield said, "Do not increase the total number of constituencies."

Henry Rondeau of Drayton Valley, three points: council supports submission by county of Leduc No. 188; two, concerned about potential shift of power to urban; and three, supports request for a public hearing in Leduc.

William Scott of Eckville: no rep by population – agrees with current equilibrium between rural and urban; and secondly, rural Alberta is important.

Marilyn Pawsey of Edgerton wrote with five points: equal rural/urban ratio; average less 25 percent will eliminate rural constituencies; consider cost, size, and declining rural population; must consider the number of MDs and Cs and special areas; and a different formula for a large, sparsely populated region.

Sandra Weidner of Edmonton, three points: consider reviewing education boundaries at the same time; consider representation and communication; and the committee should consist of blue-ribbon apolitical MBRs.

Deborah Miller of Edmonton, two points: one person, one vote; and secondly, rules for deviation exception.

Tom Eger of Edmonton, two points: changes are disruptive; and two, future review should include growth decline.

Nick Taylor of Edmonton referenced Triple E Senate.

Jack Hubler of Edmonton, two points: present system completely unfair; each constituency should have equal population.

R. Jespersen of Edmonton: point one, present rural/urban ratio remain the same; two, do not increase the number of electoral divisions; three, rural MLA has greater workload and travel; and four, importance of rural economy.

Clifford W. Downey, Edmonton: one, should be at least one rural seat for every urban seat; two, apply 25 percent to rural/urban separately.

Halvar Jonson, Edmonton: one, Ponoka-Rimbey has five Indian bands and enumeration is hard; two, would be within the range if numbers were accurate.

Ivan Strang, Edson: no change in West Yellowhead.

Mrs. G. W. Renouf, Elnora: one, no change if rural constituencies to be increased in size; two, rural widely diversified and have trouble getting attention; three, similar problem in the county system.

Patricia Matthews, Elnora: no change.

Gordon Turner, Empress: keep in Bow Valley constituency area south of Red Deer River.

Doug Johnson, Endiang: request for a public hearing in Stettler.

Lorraine Fraser, Exshaw: do not reduce the number of rural MLAs.

Mr. Dave Allison, Fairview: large rural ridings lack fair representation due to size; secondly, rural MLA deals with large number of councils, schools, et cetera.

Lyle B. McKen, Fairview: one, maintain even rural/urban balance; two, rural representation must not be reduced; three, consider geography, demography, economy, plus number of miles of roads – rep by pop seriously flawed when it comes to rural Alberta.

Larry Chorney, Fairview: one, maintain a balance of 41 rural and 42 urban; two, consider geographic, economic, and demographic circumstances; three, rural voice must be heard; four, MLA travel.

Peter K. Schierbeck, Fairview: one, if geographic size is increased, MLA access to constituency is hard; two, rural Alberta needs a strong voice – high prices and limited medical; three, a balance of area and population must be used; four, split should not be political.

Roland Turcotte, Falher: one, rep by pop does not account for unique rural economy and geography; two, rural voice very important; three, can't support proposed changes as voice would decrease.

Lewis H. Hughes, Fallis: one, plus or minus 25 percent a tool but some plus or minus seems logical; two, hard for rural MLAs to be effective if geographic size is too big; three, hard to continue decentralizing government if too much rural representation.

Myrna Fankhanel, Ferintosh: her point was not in favour of change if rural representation is to be reduced.

Marion Oberg Riise, Forestburg: one, if proportional changes made, huge rural constituencies would result; two, rural MLA has many more councils, boards, et cetera; three, the status quo should be maintained.

Terry Lyon, Fort Macleod: one, support current ratio of 42 urban and 41 rural; two, rep by pop would result in same imbalance as federal; three, consider MLA travel time; four, unfair by Charter of Rights - i.e., unequal representation; five, rural/urban mix too diverse for proper representation.

Lane McLaren, Fort Macleod: support existing and rural MLA distribution.

Bruce Moltzan, Fox Creek, three points: difficult to meet with constituents due to vast area; keep present system - no change; lack of fairness if based on population.

Allen Dietz, Galahad, five points: one, leave rural constituency boundaries as they are; two, split urban seats which have number problems; three, rural MLA workloads heavier than urban for reasons cited; four, rural Albertans have great interest in industry for reasons cited; five, must stimulate rural growth and development - hard if big.

Laverne Sorgaard, Grande Prairie: request for public hearing in Grande Prairie and other Peace centres.

Connie Vavrek, Grande Prairie, two points: no increase in rural constituency size, MLA time demands; and secondly, do not put Sexsmith RCSSD No. 51 in an urban riding.

The next submission was by Dwight Logan, Grande Prairie: one, agree with plus/minus 25 percent factor; two, reduce Grande Prairie to urban/rural added to others; three, if predominantly urban meets criteria, should be solely urban.

Ron Pfau, Grande Prairie: schedule another public hearing in Grande Prairie.

Kelly D. Daniels of Grande Prairie: one, not enough time to prepare a brief; two, when is outside submission deadline?

A. Langstraat, Grassy Lake, four points: consider population, distance from Edmonton, and size; secondly, number of municipalities within; three, shift in population from rural to urban; and four, municipalities are highly dependent on MLA for services.

Thomas W. Baldwin of Grimshaw wrote two points: rural have greater time and distance factors; and secondly, provincial and municipal communication must be considered.

Jenny Alcock of Grimshaw said distances an MLA travels must be considered.

I'll skip the next one - for some reason the points were left off - the presentation by Eugene Kush.

Next, Rhonda Paul of Hay Lakes said no change for Camrose.

Allan E. Strauss from Heisler, two points: change Camrose boundary to include all of Heisler; and secondly, against any decision to reduce rural ridings, thus voice.

Mayor R.E. Walter of High Level, five points: one, constituency size and rural MLA travel; two, MLA responsibilities - for example, number of elected reps dealt with; three, rural/urban issues much different; four, rural MLA access to the

central government offices not good; and five, urban people represented well, even with high population.

Chief J.A. Sewepagaham, High Level, wrote to say: create far north constituency, Wood Buffalo, north of the 24th and 25th baseline.

Omar Broughton of High River wrote and said: does not want industry located in rural Alberta.

Manley Flynn from High River, three points: no change, especially to Highwood; two, rural MLA deals with more councils and schools; and three, difficult to see MLA.

Harry Riva Cambrin of High River wrote: point one, strongly opposed to establishing boundaries solely by population; two, made reference to the federal and western alienation and Senate reform; three, a system dominated by urban would lose rural voice; and four, present system not perfect but acceptable.

Martha Andrews of High River wrote: point one, base boundaries on importance of work within, not population; two, rural Alberta has many councils and boards to deal with; three, consider geographic size plus distance from capital; four, rural Alberta needs more representation, not less.

Eldon Couey of High River wrote: one, rural MLAs travel vast areas; two, many boards to deal with; three, distance electorate must travel to get to government services; and four, do not increase size of rural constituencies or eliminate any.

F. Kary of Hines Creek: submission to consider travel and climatic conditions.

Ross Risvold of Hinton suggested no change to West Yellowhead.

Alice Killam of Hinton, four points: do not create the same imbalances we have federally; two, consider MLA travel to government offices and within constituencies; three, a public hearing in west-central Alberta; and four, reference Senate reform.

Christine B. MacKay of Holden submitted four items: one, present system only fair and equitable method; two, contact is difficult due to sheer size of rural ridings; three, rural MLA has more municipal government and community groups; and four, increased size would lead to greater service inequities.

Myrtle Pentelchuk of Hussar, three points: no change if rural representation to be decreased; rural Alberta has greater land area and natural resources and agriculture; and thirdly, distance considerations.

Robert Filkohazy of Hussar-Strathmore: schedule a public hearing in Hussar or Strathmore.

Patricia Newman of Innisfail, four points: large areas hard for MLA to physically cover; enlarging areas leads to greater diversity of industries; three, present boundaries are fair - reference federal and Senate; four, process should be democratic and political, not judicial.

Alex Rose, Lacombe, wrote with five points: consider large geographic size of Lacombe; consider number of elected bodies, school boards, clubs, and organizations; consider the distance to Edmonton; consider the constituency office ineffective, lots of home calls; and consider the greater demand on rural MLAs to attend social functions.

Steve Andrais of Lamont, two points: rural population decreasing and extension of boundaries make representation difficult for MLA.

David C. Petroski of Lamont asked that a public hearing be scheduled in Redwater-Andrew.

Steve Andrais of Lamont, four points: rural MLAs represent many diverse interests; large constituencies dilute representation; if population used, make highly populated constituencies smaller; town council is opposed to increasing electoral boundaries.

Fred R. Pewarchuk of Lamont: rural Albertans need a strong voice in government.

R.A. Woznura of Lamont requested that a public hearing be held in the county of Lamont.

Larry R. Majeski of Leduc, two points: continuation of equitable rural/urban split; and consider rural demographic, economic, and geographic aspects.

Ray Boulton of Leduc, two points: concern about population used over rural/urban split as main factor; second, schedule a public hearing within the county of Leduc.

C.D. Stewart of Lethbridge: one, equal number of rural and urban; two, consider travel distance and time; three, rural population decreasing.

Brian Anderson of Lethbridge: one, retain number of MLAs in rural Alberta; two, rural representation given by area rather than population; three, consider geographic, demographic, number of local boards, distance from Edmonton. Decentralize more of civil service to rural communities was the fourth point.

M. Jean Johnstone of Lethbridge: agree with plus or minus 25, about 28,685 average.

Sylvia Campbell of Lethbridge wrote four points: number of electoral divisions be reduced to 78; two, give MLAs with large areas larger allowances; three, increase the number of urban ridings and reduce the rural; four, abolish Lethbridge-East and Lethbridge-West and create north and south; five, if (d) rejected, transfer polling divisions 28, 29, 37, 38, and 39 from Lethbridge-West to Lethbridge-East.

Bruce Bovencamp of Loughheed said no change.

Rodney H. Bly of Magrath had four or five points: one, rep by pop not always fair – reference to federal; two, population shift from rural to urban; three, maintain present rural/urban ratio; four, rural/urban mix bad due to different philosophies; and five, districts will be created too large to represent well.

Stuart B. Norton of Magrath wrote two points: one, geographical size and complexity of rural constituencies greater; and two, consider distances from the capital, demands on the MLA and family.

Mayor Dave Schaffler of Manning: one, consider constituency distances and area, MLA access; two, rural MLA deals with many more boards and committees; three, boundaries should enhance communication between municipal and provincial governments.

Terry Michaelis, Milk River: rural voice must not be lost; larger riding would lessen MLA efficiency; consider location of riding, number of elected bodies, and economics.

George S. Snow of Milk River wrote to say that it's easier to represent 50,000 urban than 25,000 rural.

Lavern Clark of Millet wrote: support submission by Wetaskiwin Chamber of Commerce No. 184.

Adrian van Nieuwkerk of Mirror wrote: no change in Lacombe; MLA travel, personal knowledge of constituents; and rural Alberta struggling.

Bob Greig of Mirror wrote: rural MLA deals with greater number of councils and boards; physical size of rural constituencies much larger than urban; accessibility of MLA to Edmonton; resource distribution should not be decided by urban; maintain current rural/urban ratio.

Reeve Frank Schoenberger, Morinville: one, present legislation, Electoral Boundaries Commission Act, is fair; consider population variance within the rural and urban rather than provincial. Reasons: geographic, economic, demographic, and political responsibilities cited.

Frank Schoenberger from Morinville: rural Alberta at risk of losing equal representation; request public hearing in Redwater-Andrew and Westlock-Sturgeon.

Sharon Unrau of Nampa: one, consider municipality, ID, and county boundaries; two, constituency size concerns; three, economic, social, and traditional shopping areas – similar boundaries.

M.B. (Zak) Ezekowitz, Nisku: one, support county of Leduc No. 25; two, maintain equitable rural/urban split.

Mayor Henry Lindstedt, Nobleford: if 25 percent rule adhered to, many quality MLAs will be lost; rural MLA workload already at the point of overload; plus or minus 25 percent should be used for rural and urban separately.

Sandi Kennedy, Okotoks: one, no increase in urban ridings – rural reasonably maintained; two, Alberta has too many MLAs; three, rural MLA role is much more demanding than urban.

Ed McNeill, Onoway: in favour of equitable realignment based on one man, one vote; realignment should not be done to keep government in power; geographic size of constituency not the issue.

Michael Procter, Peace River, three points: geographic size of Peace River and MLA time concerns; two, rural MLA has many more boards, councils; three, consider giving rural constituencies a 50 percent variance like Saskatchewan.

Donald Scott, Penhold, four points: rural MLA duties are more time consuming and diversified; two, many boards to deal with; three, reference to the federal Senate and the imbalance of power; four, no change.

R. L. Casson, Picture Butte: one, no change if rural seats decreased; two, rural electoral divisions represent a wide variety of interests; three, difficulties in communication between rural MLAs and constituencies.

Ray Grinich, Picture Butte: one, no change if size will be increased or some eliminated; two, rural constituency size and travel distance; three, economy based on rural, therefore need strong rep.

Gordon Zobell, Raymond: one, no change for Cardston; two, consider distance from capital; three, agriculture and spin-off industries.

Ruth Nalder, Raymond: one, rep by pop doesn't recognize unique rural geographic, demographic, economic factors; travel time of rural MLA should not be increased; number of organizations within a constituency a major factor; do not support larger rural constituencies.

Pat Henry, Red Deer, writes three points: number of electoral divisions remain the same; two, present rural/urban distribution is fair; and three, consider geographic, not demographic, factors for rural.

David J. Baugh, Red Deer, writes two points: McLachlin's ruling regarding Fisher report weak for Alberta; two, Charter of Rights does not mention constituency size.

Bill Duncan, Redcliffe, two points: no change in Cypress-Redcliff; two, possible consolidation with existing Medicine Hat constituency.

Keith Miller of Redwater says retain equal rural/urban representation.

Pat Wise of Rockyford, three points: no change; rep by pop would undercut rural Alberta's representation; rep by pop ignores rural Alberta's unique demographic, economic, and geographic factors.

Tom Nahiriak of Round Hill has three points: no change; rural MLAs have more trouble meeting with groups; would soon require Triple E Senate.

Robert H. Woken of Rycroft: one, reduce size of Dunvegan; two, consider both constituency size and shape; three, do not even consider a sub-MLA; four, one rural to three or four urban not excessive; and five, request public hearing in Rycroft or Spirit River.

Gerald Beach, Rycroft: one, many points generally saying that proposed changes are not good for rural Alberta; commission should be made up of equal urban/rural representation of general public and MLAs; consider projected growth, grant diffusion; this committee is perhaps not needed at this time.

Arnold R. Koberstein, Sangudo: one, maintain current rural/urban ratio; two, increase in size would make rural MLA more inaccessible; three, entire population, not electors, should be used; and four, rural/urban mix.

Arnold R. Koberstein, Sangudo: request public hearing in Lac Ste. Anne.

G.A.J. Feeny of Sexsmith says no change.

Iris S. Evans of Sherwood Park requests a meeting with the committee.

Karen Spiess of Sherwood Park: put area north of Highway 16, polling substation 70, to Clover Bar.

Elmer M. Oshann of Smoky Lake: request a public hearing for Redwater-Andrew in Smoky Lake.

Veronica Andruchiw of Spirit River, four points: maintain existing urban/rural ratio; two, reference to Manitoba, plus or minus 10 percent not working well; three, reference to federal, with over 50 percent of Canada's population in Ontario; four, if constituency size increased, MLA can't adequately represent.

Helene Caryk of Spirit River, three points: reference to federal being lopsided between east and west; two, geographic size already a problem for rural MLAs; three, rural MLAs deal with many more boards.

Willie Janssen of Spirit River writes asking for a public hearing in Peace River.

Alfred Schalm of St. Albert: one, decrease the number of electoral divisions; two, rural ridings overrepresented compared to urban; three, MLA expense account based on geographic size and distance from Edmonton.

S.E. Mercier, St. Albert: one, constituency area component along with rep by pop; two, increase in number of MLAs all right; three, time and distance consideration.

David E. Bromley of St. Albert requests that more hearings be held in the Edmonton area.

Anita Ratchinsky of St. Albert: a request for more hearings in the greater Edmonton area.

Larry Langager of St. Paul: one, consider rural interests, diversity, limited resources; two, use population rather than enumeration; three, split rural and urban, then use 25 percent factor; four, if no split, then use 35 percent for rural ridings; five, consider projected growth.

Robert Bouchard of St. Paul: one, retain St. Paul in its present or expanded form; two, St. Paul should remain in the hub of the altered division; three, rep by pop in certain situations is not always logical; Indian reservations are generally supportive of current boundaries; five, align new boundaries within existing IDs and MDs and Cs.

John Berns of Stavely, three points: present distribution of 42 urban and 41 rural is sufficient; two, proposed changes give urban constituencies too much control; three, enlarged area can make MLA travel impossible.

Heather Baird of Stettler requests a public hearing in Stettler.

Wayne Alton of Stettler, three points: one, the 25 percent factor does not necessarily have to be in rural Alberta; two, consider travel expense, population trends, long-distance

communication; three, create five or six new urban ridings, check, then realign.

Dugall Wood of Stettler requests a public hearing in Stettler.

William S. Kirtley, Stettler, three points: rep by pop must be tempered with distances MLAs cover; rep by pop won't work alone; areas too large do not have adequate representation.

Allen Dietz of Stettler: not enough time at public hearings to present briefs; schedule a public hearing in Stettler.

Colleen Jackson, Stettler, requests a public hearing in Stettler.

Bob Stewart of Stettler, four points: keep Stettler in the heart of the Stettler constituency; two, allow rural MLAs larger expense accounts, faxes, and free phones; balance of rural/urban seats; four, larger percentage factor for rural.

Noreen Woolsey of Stettler: one, consider rural MLA travel time to see constituents; two, consider the number of school boards, councils, et cetera; three, consider the unpredictable weather and road conditions.

Peter Woloshyn of Stony Plain: one, do not agree with basing changes on population; two, continue with current system of equitable rural/urban; three, request for a public hearing in urban centre within the county.

J. Montgomery from Strathmore, three points: one, keep current balance rural/urban; two, wealth is rural; three, rural size concerns.

Merlin Litchfield from Taber: one, concerned about rural voice if changes made; two, mix rural with urban using proposed "pie" concept.

Irene Anderson from Taber: one, incompatibility of Taber with Medicine Hat district; two, support presentation by sugar beet growers, No. 147; three, also support views of Ralph Jespersen, Unifarm, No. 52.

Ray Shwetz of Thorhild wrote: no change for Redwater-Andrew.

Barbara Senio of Thorsby wrote: no change, especially to Drayton Valley.

Steve Shybunka of Two Hills, three points: one, Two Hills and area prefer to be annexed to Vermilion-Viking; second and third choices are Lloydminster and St. Paul respectively; three, reasons cited for above in letter.

Gary Popowich of Two Hills: point one, retain rural/urban ratio or significantly increase rural seats; two, agriculture an important part of Alberta's economy; three, Alberta economy based on resource development and extraction - need voice.

Ted Blowers of Valleyview: one, rep by pop would have detrimental effect on rural Alberta; two, MLA now has a hard time serving constituents due to size; three, rural Alberta's unique geography and demographic and economic disparity; four, maintain status quo for rural representation in Legislature.

Doug B. Topinka, Valleyview: one, maintain status quo as to number of rural and urban seats; two, use total population, not electors, for comparison; three, do not increase total number of seats.

Sandy Tetachuk, Vulcan: one, maintain current rural/urban ratio; two, plus or minus 25 percent for both rural and urban; three, consider rural distance and workload.

Marion Wolitski, Wabasca: one, concerned with large urban ridings; two, 41 rural/42 urban is fair; three, split into urban/rural then apply 25 percent rule - numbers cited.

Norman Coleman, Wainwright: one, do not add more seats as government spending would increase; two, must not jeopardize distinct concerns of the rural municipalities; three, must not allow urban to overpower rural - reference to federal Senate; four, maintain current rural/urban ratio; five, keep boundaries as they are if no fair alternative.

Shirley Danylyshen, Waskatenau, requests a public hearing for Redwater-Andrew and Waskatenau.

R.H. Riddett, Wetaskiwin: follow existing municipal boundaries.

Hazel Boulton, Wetaskiwin: part of Ponoka-Rimbey and wish to return to Wetaskiwin-Leduc.

Ron Noel, Wetaskiwin: one, boundaries should run east to west, probably on county boundaries; two, include village of Ma-Me-O in Wetaskiwin; three, use total population, not voter population; four, consider distances, different levels of government grants; and five, requests a public hearing in Wetaskiwin.

Frank Courtney of Wetaskiwin requests a public hearing in Wetaskiwin.

Mary Ann Mullin, Wetaskiwin: one, boundaries should run east to west on county boundaries; two, include Ma-Me-O in Wetaskiwin; three, use total population, not voter population, to determine boundaries; four, consider distances and different levels of government grants; five, requests a public hearing in Wetaskiwin.

Werner Messerschmidt of Whitecourt requests a public hearing in Whitecourt.

R. Goettel, Whitecourt: reference federal Triple E Senate, do not set a double standard; more school boards, et cetera, for rural MLAs; number of rural and urban constituencies remain the same.

George Minailo of Willingdon says no change for Redwater-Andrew.

George Minailo of Willingdon, second submission, requests a public hearing for Redwater-Andrew; extend Redwater-Andrew boundary east of Willingdon.

Total number: 203 written submissions by mail.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Questions or comments?

MS BARRETT: I take it you'll give a copy of that to *Hansard* so they can get names and all that.

MR. PRITCHARD: Of this?

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. PRITCHARD: Oh, yes. Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have any other general items, Bob?

MR. PRITCHARD: The only thing I wanted to report – unofficially because we have to go through and check when couples attended, man and wife and that sort of thing – there were 876 people who attended our public hearings. There were 337 people who gave presentations, and we had 203 people that sent in written submissions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other questions before we move on to identifying the kinds of questions we want answers to in terms of the briefs presented?

What I thought we might do is divide it into two categories, firstly dealing with the briefs presented and the information we want gleaned out. A second category might include things that were or were not contained in any of the briefs but other factors that we'd like some research done on.

Mike?

MR. CARDINAL: Sorry; I had a question on this, what Bob read into *Hansard*. The letters that are sent in are available to members if we request them?

MR. PRITCHARD: Definitely.

MR. CARDINAL: Okay. Thanks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anyone else? Are we ready to go? Okay, Robert?

MR. PRITCHARD: All right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is everyone comfortable and clear on what we want to do now?

MS BARRETT: Well, I understand what you want to do, but I'm not sure . . . What you're suggesting is that we can have pulled from computer records or from *Hansard*, you know, the number of submissions that dealt with X, Y, or Z concepts. How vital is that to the decision-making process, given that most of us were able to attend a fair amount of the public hearings, presumably have memories that work, continue, I assume, to be literate, and appreciate the general thrust of what we heard and from where? I don't want to waste valuable resources or, more importantly, time if it's not really necessary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A fair observation. We had 337 briefs presented; we had 202 written briefs given. There's similarity between a number of them. We have discussed on previous occasions – in fact, I was under the impression that our computer would be able to do for us what we are now asking Bob to pull from it, so that while we are deliberating, if a member wants to know how many briefs dealt with distance from the capital as a factor, we should have that precise figure.

MS BARRETT: So you're not saying that the number of times any reference was made will be the decision-making factor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Our table is the decision-making team.

MS BARRETT: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But in terms of background information, if I'm trying to persuade you at this table or you're trying to persuade me of a particular point and you want to go back to the number of times that point was made, I have the precise figure. We have a week break between now and our next meeting. This will ensure that Bob has something to do during that period of time.

MS BARRETT: We don't meet tomorrow?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I meant we have the next week when we're not meeting. We are meeting tomorrow morning.

MR. SIGURDSON: We've got two weeks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have two weeks? All the better for Robert. Robert's away on holiday for one of those weeks.

MR. PRITCHARD: With any luck I'll have something else to read, and when I come back, there's going to be . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: He wants to take some work with him, I'm sure.

Anyone want to kick it off?

MR. BRUSEKER: I have one question. On the very last page, where you summarize things, there were 31 submissions that made reference to rural/urban ratios. Were those people all saying to maintain it, or did they just make some reference to it?

MR. PRITCHARD: No. That's where if you ask a question, we have to go back and figure out what they said. On that particular question it probably is yes or no. In some of the other areas they could be coming from three or four different perspectives. If there's something in there you want to zero in on, we'll have to draw those out, look at them, and do a more detailed analysis, physically take them out and read them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anything else, Frank?

MR. BRUSEKER: No; go ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tom.

MR. SIGURDSON: On your points heading here, I don't see any reference to the Charter of Rights. Would that be the person/vote issue?

MR. PRITCHARD: There isn't a heading "Charter of Rights." These were some headings that we picked out. There could be other questions that come up, and if you want us to go back through them and look if somebody specifically addressed the Charter of Rights, we can do that.

MR. SIGURDSON: Well, the ones that I wouldn't mind having just for my reference are the presentation in Lethbridge by the two professors from the University of Lethbridge, all of the legal counsel that appeared before us in Calgary and Edmonton, including the lawyer from your constituency, and - where was Mark practising law again? Mark used to be a researcher with . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, in St. Albert.

MR. PRITCHARD: All our legal opinions; I think we have five or six, or now we have 10 or 12, actually.

MR. SIGURDSON: There's also the professor from the University of Alberta. Johnston?

MS BARRETT: Paul Johnston.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Bob, I'm assuming on the chart you've given us that where there's no change, we maintain the 83 ridings in the province. That's clear enough; we know that's what's meant?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because that was a very consistent, reoccurring recommendation: don't add seats.

MR. PRITCHARD: No change; that's it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. There were some people who suggested that we maintain the number of rural ridings, but if there needed to be additional ridings, that they be added to the urban areas. So we'll find out how many were in that category. Pat.

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Chairman, this summary, if I understand it, is for the written submissions only?

MR. PRITCHARD: That's right: written, by mail only.

MRS. BLACK: Would it be possible to summarize the oral presentations in a similar fashion?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes, we can do it by going through *Hansards*, where the chairman summarized it again. Also, we're doing a set of minutes where we're taking each presentation and making a summary of what people said. I'll have those within a week.

MRS. BLACK: Because this only represents 203 submissions, and we had 337 or something . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: Exactly; 337 presentations.

MRS. BLACK: . . . oral presentations, and I think it would be advantageous to have both. The other question is: when we went to the various hearings, we found - and we said this consistently - that there was something new, and I'm wondering if that's involved in the "other"? Can you do a printout of the "other," or just a listing?

MR. PRITCHARD: No, but I can make a list of everything. I'll just look at those others, pick out the factors that were the "other," and put them on a sheet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What we're really doing is helping Bob to expand the list of points so that when he goes back and looks at both the written and oral presentations, he's gleaned more information.

MRS. BLACK: Yeah.

MR. PRITCHARD: So we'll have a summary of the presentations. It'll be about a two-liner on each. Plus we have the summaries that the chairman gave at the end, and then also we'll review the "other."

MR. BRUSEKER: Those summaries of presentations might need to be more than two lines; like here you have some that are one and some that are four or five. Perhaps what we need to do is make a list of all of the comments that have been made and then beside each statement put a total of the number of times that that concept was referred to. For example, you've talked here that we had - if I'm reading the right column, I think it's 52 people that said no change in the written submissions. I'm wondering if instead of just listing some as you've done here, we shouldn't list all of them, including all of the "other."

MRS. BLACK: Well, that's what I'm asking for. I'd like a breakdown of what the "other" is.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah. From that we'll go through and we'll actually pick out what those "other" things are.

MRS. BLACK: Yes, because there's a hundred "other" comments.

MR. PRITCHARD: Their "other" comments: we'll list all those comments. In the *Hansards* for the minutes where we're going through each presentation, it's . . . By two lines, I don't mean it's in point form; it's like two or three written sentences summing up what the person has said. But without sort of rewriting the whole thing that everybody said or sitting down and reading the *Hansards*, it's hard to get every little nuance or point.

MR. BRUSEKER: No, just sitting at the hearings was sufficient.

MR. PRITCHARD: I think you'll find the summary will catch the highlights from each person's presentation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Pam.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. My shopping list consists of a request to make sure that we're not seeing duplicate information. If you have, for example, 10, 20, 30 percent of the written submissions that were also read out at the hearings, I'd like to know the exact numbers so that I'm not seeing duplicates. See, some of these people . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: Some of these were written submissions, and then they brought the same things to the hearings.

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What Pam is asking is that you delete – I presume you mean delete the written . . .

MS BARRETT: I want the net result, not a combined.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah; fair enough.

MR. PRITCHARD: So I'll go through and delete any from the written lists that were actually present at the hearings.

MS BARRETT: Yeah; please. Thanks.

MRS. BLACK: Could we also do a grouping by group? Could we go, like, the chambers that presented . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Municipalities.

MRS. BLACK: How many chambers presented, and how many, say, school districts or hospital districts? Go on a grouping basis?

MR. BRUSEKER: To what end?

MRS. BLACK: Well, just to see if there was, like, a common theme within the chambers throughout the province or if there was a common theme that was expressed within the school districts or hospital districts, that kind of a correlation.

MR. PRITCHARD: Do you want that for the presentations and the written submissions?

MRS. BLACK: Well, I would think . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bob, for purposes of gathering the information, we've got to be consistent. Shouldn't we be combining the two? Once you separate out, re Pam's request where we've got duplication, so we've got a total list of 400 and whatever, then the answers to the questions we're now asking should be from the combined, net list.

MS BARRETT: Is this all possible to do within two weeks?

MR. PRITCHARD: I think so, so far.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're not going to postpone the next meeting if it isn't done.

MS BARRETT: Good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That was a concern.

MR. PRITCHARD: We'll break it out into councils or groups, school boards.

MRS. BLACK: As close as you can. There will be some that you won't be able to slot.

MR. PRITCHARD: Or individuals.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bob, I don't recognize in your list of points here, unless I'm missing it, a Triple E Senate reference, which a number of people have made.

MR. PRITCHARD: It's in "other."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Would you break it out, please?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah.

MRS. BLACK: We're going to break all of "other" out, are we not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: And also the number of municipalities.

MR. SIGURDSON: There's a hundred other points. Can you break them all out?

MRS. BLACK: Well, that's where the unique thing comes into play. Right? The commonality is in here, and the uniqueness comes from there.

MR. BRUSEKER: I'd be interested in knowing, too, how many people made reference to extra services or whatever you want to call it for MLAs like toll-free lines, fax machines, larger constituency budgets, assistants for MLAs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So they could better represent the constituents.

MR. BRUSEKER: Exactly. People that made reference to constituency budgets.

MR. PRITCHARD: Do you want me to include assistants as well as machinery and communications?

MR. BRUSEKER: Yeah. All those things that make the job easier or quicker or whatever.

MS BARRETT: High tech, people, airplanes: things like that.

MR. BRUSEKER: A Telecopier for each rural MLA.

MR. SIGURDSON: What about frequency of redistribution? Have you got that somewhere?

MR. PRITCHARD: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's a good point.

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. BRUSEKER: It's on here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Frequency?

MR. BRUSEKER: It's on here.

MS BARRETT: Where?

MR. BRUSEKER: He's got it already.

MS BARRETT: Yup. Redistribution frequency, right; three-quarters of the way down.

MRS. BLACK: Is this the committee composition or is that the commission?

MR. PRITCHARD: Commission composition.

MRS. BLACK: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You've got it on . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah. At the beginning.

MRS. BLACK: Where do you see frequency? Oh, here. Redistribution frequency: nobody.

MR. PRITCHARD: I'll look at that through the presentations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bob, I know you've been doing some work on comparisons with other provinces, both directly and through Pat Ledgerwood.

MR. PRITCHARD: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We should have those figures at hand too. This comes to mind; example: frequency of redistribution, makeup of the commission.

MR. CARDINAL: There's another one, Bob, that came up a number of times: it's using two different variances for urban and rural. Now, I don't know how many times it came up, but a number of times. Some even gave specific numbers.

MRS. BLACK: And a formula.

MR. CARDINAL: Formulas, yeah.

MR. BRUSEKER: Well, he's got formulas in here too.

MRS. BLACK: Where?

MR. BRUSEKER: Formula considerations; it's right after frequency of redistribution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we need to break that out. I think that could be broken down further.

MRS. BLACK: It needs to be broken down.

MR. PRITCHARD: What was that again?

MR. CARDINAL: It was a variance for urban and a variance for rural.

MR. PRITCHARD: Oh, yeah; sort of one for . . .

MR. CARDINAL: A number of people suggested that there be some consideration as to 25 percent and 35 for rural. In fact, you read one out . . .

MRS. BLACK: Can you define special consideration?

MR. BRUSEKER: I think what he was talking about there was the number of people who said, "Representation by population is fine, but not for us, because we're special."

MR. PRITCHARD: "We want special consideration because of size or climate" was mentioned by somebody, and roads.

MR. SIGURDSON: A symphony orchestra.

MR. PRITCHARD: A symphony orchestra: things that didn't fall under these other categories, whether it was only because of distances. There were a few special things mentioned.

MRS. BLACK: Maybe we should have a breakdown. Could you break it out for us?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah. There's what, 29 or . . .

MRS. BLACK: There's quite a number. There's 29.

MR. PRITCHARD: My glasses don't work very well.

MRS. BLACK: Special - what's this one? What's that? Oh, the number of organizations he deals with.

MR. BRUSEKER: We had 14 presentations, according to the written-in submissions, that talked about the number of electoral divisions. I wonder if we could just break out how many people said increase and how many said decrease. I'd like to know what the general consensus was there, because all this talks about is just the number.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They range from a high - I think it was the Liberal Party of Alberta that had about a 20-seat increase.

MR. BRUSEKER: Oh, that was Jan Reimer.

MRS. BLACK: No, it was the guy in Calgary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It was in Calgary.

MR. BRUSEKER: Gary Dickson: was he the highest?

MRS. BLACK: Yeah; Gary Dickson. That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ranging down to a low of what? Fifty?

MR. BRUSEKER: I think it varied from 59 to 102, but I'd like to know how many people said go up and how many people said go down.

This use of population figures and use of enumeration figures: these are people that said use enumeration, and that gives us a total there, and use population . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes, that one's broken down.

MRS. BLACK: What was that rural population issue? Was that the loss of . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes. Voice: where they said anything about rural voice or services drying up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The one thing that you can't really pull – we'll have to rely on our memory – is that . . . You'll recall that when we were at the meeting in Brooks and we posed the question to those present as to how would they feel about taking a corner of Medicine Hat, there was almost unanimous agreement that that wasn't a bad idea. It wasn't contained in anybody's written brief. They were there basically saying to leave Bow Valley as is, but when they were presented with something that came out of a brief in Medicine Hat, there was general acceptance of the concept. I guess, as I said, the only reason I raise that is that it's not the kind of thing you can pull out; we'll have to rely on our own memories of what happened.

Back to your point, Pam, of whether a specific . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: The other is during the question and answer sessions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. BRUSEKER: Another question I had in mind – the people who said no change presumably are not endorsing the plus or minus 25 percent concept. I would be interested in knowing what other percentages were proposed and how frequently. Some people said strict adherence to an average, and it should be zero variance. Some people said 5 percent, some said 10 percent, and some said 35 percent. I'd like to know how many people talked about other percentages.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You see, a lot of this information I think will be valuable in the background in our report in whatever we decide to . . .

MR. BRUSEKER: The preamble.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In the preamble to our recommendations, showing the kinds of things that we heard and did consider.

Anyone else think of anything on meetings? One of the things we can do is spend just a few minutes in the morning going back if someone thinks of something overnight that was missed.

Have we exhausted the list for today? Are we ready, then, to move on to other matters that we would like information on, matters that may or may not have been raised in the discussions? I'm trying to get a reading from you. Yes?

MS BARRETT: Well, I think we are ready. I'm just trying to think what the people are trying to think now. What else do we need?

MR. BRUSEKER: Yeah, exactly.

MRS. BLACK: Why don't we take a 10-minute coffee break, because we're kind of going through a . . . Can we do that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Take a quick break? Sure. Let's stretch and come back.

[The committee recessed from 2:31 p.m. to 2:47 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. We'll reconvene.

Was there anyone who wished to add anything to the list of questions re the presentations? Are we ready, then, to move on to the next section, which is the general questions we'd like to pose to Bob?

Yes, Pat.

MRS. BLACK: I was going to ask one other question. When you're reconfiguring the information and you're doing it by organization or group, can you also do a sort by geographical location within the province so that we can determine if there's a geographical concern that was predominant throughout the province?

MR. PRITCHARD: Uh huh.

MRS. BLACK: Maybe north and . . . As close as you can.

MR. PRITCHARD: I'll find out what I can do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. For instance, distance from the capital would be a greater concern in the north and in the far south than right around Edmonton. I would think that would show up in the briefs.

MR. BRUSEKER: I also had one more that I thought of. When we were talking about urban/rural mix, there were some that supported it and some that opposed it. I'm wondering again if we could get a breakdown on how many were in favour of urban/rural and how many opposed that concept when it was raised. This doesn't distinguish it here in this list.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's valid.

Anyone else? Did anyone else have questions?

MRS. BLACK: We can go back at a later point, can we not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, sure. We'll do that in the morning.

I have a series of questions, some of which I think you've been working on, Bob, and one is the total square miles of each constituency.

MR. BRUSEKER: Pat Ledgerwood has that already, does he not?

MR. PRITCHARD: He does, yes. There's a couple of versions.

MRS. BLACK: The only thing he doesn't have is the urban sizes. He has Calgary all in one, and Edmonton.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, well, that's irrelevant.

MRS. BLACK: Not really.

MR. PRITCHARD: Well, I'll put "including the urban areas." It must be available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then to break out of that, Bob, the total square miles of settled area.

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. SIGURDSON: By constituency?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. You look at Dunvegan, for instance, and you can see that roughly 40 percent of the riding is surveyed. So I'm assuming that that ties in with what we generally call settled.

Go ahead.

MRS. BLACK: I was going to say: could we also have – I'll probably phrase this wrong – by riding the number of communities that are, say, 2,000 or more in population and 2,000 or less, do it on a sliding scale, particularly the rural?

MR. BRUSEKER: You're talking about towns and villages?

MRS. BLACK: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MRS. BLACK: Towns, municipalities – whatever they call them – hamlets.

The other thing, because accessibility was a major item, is the major roads, like secondary highways, that connect up or go through the constituencies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Let's deal with that first point first.

MR. PRITCHARD: The number of MDs, towns, villages – whatever – per constituency. Over any particular population?

MRS. BLACK: Well, I'd like them, say, by 2,000 and 5,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why don't you do that as a separate one, Bob? What you've got is fine. Really you're talking about the number of municipalities in the constituency. Pat's question, though, related to the number of towns of 2,000 population or greater per constituency.

MRS. BLACK: Towns, hamlets: gatherings of people.

MR. SIGURDSON: Can I just suggest that maybe we go a little lower than 2,000? I would go to 500, and the reason I suggest 500 is that the population to enumerated voter ratio is usually

60-40. So a number of 500 would give you 300 voters in a town, which is about the size of a poll.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. It's easy to do every village. There is a criterion which Municipal Affairs uses before a community can convert from village to town status. There's a population threshold. You want to look at 500 or some figure in that range, but I think it'd also be helpful to in addition look at another figure of about 2,000 or 2,500. I go back to the riding of Chinook. The one thing that's unique about Chinook is that it doesn't have a big town. You know, you go down to my constituency, Taber-Warner, and I've got Taber and Coaldale. There's almost 12,000 people living in those two towns.

MS BARRETT: So I should tell Shirley that Hanna isn't a big town, right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shirley knows Hanna's not a big town, and the people in Hanna told us that when we were there.

MR. BRUSEKER: So did the railway when they stopped sending trains through.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hanna is – what? – 2,500 people or thereabouts.

MS BARRETT: How big is Taber?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sixty-four hundred.

MRS. BLACK: And then the road system, like a secondary highway.

MR. PRITCHARD: Pat, how do you want the road system?

MRS. BLACK: Well, what secondary highways go through the various ridings.

MR. BRUSEKER: Are you talking about total mileage?

MRS. BLACK: No, no. Just which ones.

MS BARRETT: Well, can't you look at the map? Come on.

MRS. BLACK: You know, there's 83 ridings.

MS BARRETT: So? You can tell.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll bet Tomislav can pull that out of the computer work he's done for us to date.

MR. PRITCHARD: I'll certainly find out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Check on that.

MR. SIGURDSON: Take the transportation maps – they're all coloured – and you'll know which ones are primary and which ones are secondary. We can probably get an overlay that shows the constituencies.

MRS. BLACK: Even if we could get an overlay, it would be fine.

MR. SIGURDSON: Couple that with an overlay and we should be all right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A question I'd like an answer to, too, is the distance from the capital building to the closest edge of the constituency. When Shirley McClellan's coming in, what's the distance then? Not highway miles but as the crow flies from Chinook to Edmonton, to the capital building. We can easily do that with a compass, figure that out.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah, right. I'll get up on the roof.

MR. BRUSEKER: About a yard.

MR. CARDINAL: As the crow flies, Bob.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This boy has a sense of humour, hasn't he?

MR. PRITCHARD: You can challenge anybody to disprove what I come up with.

MR. SIGURDSON: Eighty-three homing pigeons.

MRS. BLACK: That's an idea.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What about the number of community leagues in the urban constituencies? We've spent a lot of time talking about rural municipalities. At some of our meetings there were points made about urban leagues, and I'd be interested to know, for instance, how many urban leagues you deal with in your various constituencies.

MRS. BLACK: What if we share them?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you're sharing one, you're still expected to be there, are you not, if it's like one of our rural municipalities?

MR. BRUSEKER: Let's face it. We have a lot of duplicate counts in the urban areas as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure you do.

MRS. BLACK: I suppose.

MR. BRUSEKER: If we're going to talk about that, then perhaps something else we should talk about: while we don't have school boards, we've got a heck of a pile of schools. I deal with 21 schools, so maybe we should consider that as well. But that kind of information I think is going to be pretty difficult to get.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. I hadn't put it beyond school boards.

MR. BRUSEKER: It'll require very specialized knowledge.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that to date, though, the questions asked relate to municipalities. If you want to go to schools, that's a different level.

MR. BRUSEKER: The reason I raise schools is because we had a lot of people say, "I have so many school boards," but some of those school boards are maybe one or two schools. So

even though I may only deal with one or two school boards – actually I have four because I've got some private – I have more buildings, and when you've got those buildings there's just as much to be concerned about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Put it down.

MR. PRITCHARD: I'll see if I can get it somewhere.

MS BARRETT: I just want to hop in on a comment here. The issue is further complicated because of agencies. We don't have recreation boards, for instance, but I counted 20 agencies within five blocks of each other a couple of weeks ago when we were sitting in one of our hearings. So you're never going to be able to get the comparable information. You know how we heard about dealing with X, Y, Z and how many numbers of whatever different types of board or agency. It's impossible to do a count of the comparable bodies from within an urban riding. I think it is.

MR. BRUSEKER: It's pretty tough, but it's a valid point all right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Anyone else?

Okay. I've got a couple more: how the current MLAs travel to the capital and the time it takes. That information, Bob, I think we can easily get through Leg. Assembly because we keep a record, so it would all be there for the last fiscal year.

MR. PRITCHARD: How far or how long?

MR. CHAIRMAN: How many trips? How do the current MLAs travel?

MRS. BLACK: Mode of travel.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Some it's strictly plane; some it's strictly car; some it's a combination of plane and car.

MR. PRITCHARD: Did you want the time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: And time, yeah.

MRS. BLACK: Some it's chasing cars.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Some it's what?

MRS. BLACK: Brooms.

MR. CARDINAL: Dog team.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I also wanted a map of the ridings from 1905 to the present time, and I think this is probably all contained in the book that Pat Ledgerwood put together. I'd like to see how dramatic were the changes at redistribution. We all know that the easy way is to add more seats. Okay, how many times did we lose seats, and where were they lost? So really by looking at the changes that occurred in past redistribution of ridings . . .

MRS. BLACK: Do we have any access to projected growth within, say, the next four to five years that may have been filed through the urban and rural municipality groups?

MR. SIGURDSON: You got that in the last Electoral Boundaries Commission, the urban planners.

MRS. BLACK: Well, I was at a function just the other day in Calgary, and they're now talking that Calgary instead of being 690,000 in another year will be 750,000, a massive spurt because of the economics that are going on in Calgary.

MR. BRUSEKER: Part of that is the trans-Canada pipeline coming on.

MRS. BLACK: Yeah. There are lots of reasons, and I'm wondering: do we have current . . .

MS BARRETT: It's a good point.

MRS. BLACK: . . . basic information, I think both urban and rural? Because we saw in one of these submissions – I think it was Lacombe – where they said there will be a minimum of 5 percent increase.

MS BARRETT: It was Wetaskiwin.

MRS. BLACK: Was it Wetaskiwin? I think that kind of current future planning that the municipalities, whether they're urban or rural, are doing, because you'd hate to go through all of this and find within a year that it's out of sync.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, I agree. In fact, I think that would be a very critical one to look up. I'd put that as a priority if the various organizations that do that have current and projected information, like the last city census, for example, and what Municipal Affairs says.

MR. SIGURDSON: And where they are coming from.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, exactly.

MR. SIGURDSON: If you can figure that out.

MRS. BLACK: Well, it doesn't hurt to look at it.

MR. CARDINAL: It's available. I got a copy a while back from Municipal Affairs, and it's all there.

MS BARRETT: If it's all there, let's get it.

MR. CARDINAL: See if growth is projected not to be too rapid.

MR. SIGURDSON: Including where the migration is.

MS BARRETT: Exactly. Because it was in Wetaskiwin-Leduc where they were saying they were expecting . . . And they had reasonable figures that were recently accumulated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anyone else? Okay. It sounds like that's the list for now, Bob.

MS BARRETT: You'll have it done by tomorrow night?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah. What will I do after tomorrow night?

MR. SIGURDSON: Go on holidays, of course.

MRS. BLACK: I'll have some more in the morning.

MR. PRITCHARD: Ah, thanks, Pat.

MRS. BLACK: I dream about this every night.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Are we ready to begin our general discussion?

MS BARRETT: Sure.

MR. SIGURDSON: I wonder if we might be able to set up an agenda so that we can look at topics and then note that on the 25th we're going to discuss the composition of the commission and on the 26th we might discuss a different matter.

MR. PRITCHARD: Sure.

MS BARRETT: I would really like that.

MR. SIGURDSON: I would like to have that agenda so that I could prepare for those dates.

MS BARRETT: Right on.

MR. SIGURDSON: That, I think, would be an appropriate use of an hour or two.

MRS. BLACK: Could we maybe expand that a bit, Mr. Chairman, and possibly look at – you know, we've got a whole lot of information out there – how we could maybe build a plan of attack for building the report? One suggestion certainly is to set an agenda. That could be one item, but maybe we should build a plan for building this report, and then we have an idea of where we're going.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, let's just do some brainstorming. I think those are both excellent suggestions. Let's go around the table and see what we can pull together. Maybe just jot those down on the board, Bob.

MR. PRITCHARD: Sure.

MS BARRETT: You mean jack-in-the-box?

MRS. BLACK: This is for the week after next.

MR. PRITCHARD: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've got setting out the agenda.

MRS. BLACK: I think build a framework for developing the report so that we know which direction we're going in before we start going in the wrong direction or off the topic. I think we should make a decision as to how we're going to build this report and build some form of a framework for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tom's is a separate point. It's setting out the agenda so that on a particular day we would deal with a particular topic. I'm assuming that what we want to do is ensure that by September 28 we have touched on all of our mandate responsibilities, have discussed pros and cons with various

approaches so that when we go back to our respective caucuses, we've dealt with all of the points.

MS BARRETT: Absolutely.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then when we come back on October 9, hopefully we can start firming things up.

MS BARRETT: The refined work, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sound reasonable?

MS BARRETT: Sounds good to me.

MR. CARDINAL: Agreed.

MR. SIGURDSON: I don't think that has to be so structured that, you know, we set aside the 25th to discuss the commission or the 26th to discuss the number of seats.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, but by the 28th the ones in principle.

MR. BRUSEKER: The seven points, wasn't it?

MS BARRETT: So that we have an idea of where we're heading with all of them.

MRS. BLACK: Yeah, but I don't think you can do all seven at once.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no.

MR. BRUSEKER: No. I think what we could do in terms of setting out the agenda is that those seven points could be our guideline and we say, "Okay, today we're going to discuss point one." I forget which one is point one. Let's talk about that in light of all of the information that Bob's going to dig out for us by tomorrow morning, that we just asked him to dig out, and talk about those things in point one and then go on to point two and so on and get a bit of a framework for each one of those before we go on. It doesn't have to say that we'll just spend an hour on this, because it may take five minutes or it may take two hours.

MRS. BLACK: It might take two sessions.

MR. BRUSEKER: Entirely possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We might find that the item we expect to take two days will take 10 minutes and vice versa. All right.

MRS. BLACK: So that's why I think we need a quasi-structured framework of how we're going to attack each of those things.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that's good. Let's keep building.

MR. BRUSEKER: I'm wondering if one of the approaches we could possibly take is – and this is where I think the information that Bob is going to get out for us will be useful – discuss first of all those issues which we perceive to be less contentious and perhaps get some of the more generally easily agreed upon things – for example, I don't think there was much contention on the makeup of the commission. I think that is a topic that perhaps we could deal with fairly easily. But when we get down

to should we go with the plus or minus 25 percent, I think that's going to take a fair bit more discussion. So perhaps what we could do in our meeting tomorrow would be to identify those issues which we think will take lots of time, those which are more contentious, and those which we perceive to be less contentious and solve some of the things that way.

MR. SIGURDSON: Can we not run through that today rather than wait for tomorrow? I think we probably pretty much know today which issues we feel would be contentious. We've got two hours.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bob will get a copy of the original letter setting out our mandate.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, I just did that, the "Dear Albertan."

MR. CARDINAL: I was just going to say that it's okay to discuss the makeup of the commission, but I don't think we should make the decision on, you know, the actual makeup of the commission until we determine our terms of reference as to how the commission will operate in the province. We'd be appointing the people before we knew what they were going to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The other thing: on the 25th, 26th, and 28th in Calgary, while we will have touched upon all of the areas and we may think there's a consensus, no final decisions will be made until we get into our October meetings.

MR. SIGURDSON: What can also happen is that we might just say five, seven, or nine people on the commission, no politicians, and let the House . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I hope we don't do that.

MR. SIGURDSON: You hope we don't?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I hope we come in with as clear and concise a recommendation as possible. If the House wishes to vary, that's the House's business. But why load onto their shoulders a difficult task that we can't handle?

MRS. BLACK: We will have consulted with our own caucuses, so we should have a fairly good idea.

MS BARRETT: Well, can I hop in here? It seems to me that the three critical questions are really not addressed in plain English in the "Dear Albertan." I mean, it's in plain English all right, but it doesn't really get down to the three critical points, which are: the percent variance between ridings, the urban/rural split, and the commission's structure. I would say those would be the three critical decisions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to jot those three down, Bob, please?

MR. PRITCHARD: Would you say those again, Pam?

MS BARRETT: Yeah. Percentage variance between ridings, urban/rural split, and the commission's structure. I mean, there are other things that come out of those, but those are the three, I think.

MRS. BLACK: These are the most contentious, you feel?

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think Pam is saying that they are the three big ones, and others flow from them.

MS BARRETT: Correct.

MR. BRUSEKER: Is it not also – and this is going back to my perception of the hearings too – the factors used in determining the percent variance? Or maybe that's a subpoint of number one.

MS BARRETT: Yes. That's what I would suggest.

MR. BRUSEKER: But that's the big issue. If you want to talk about focus, what you're really asking is: where do you stand on these three points? In your debates you say, "Well, I draw on this information." Another one says, "Well, I use other factors."

MRS. BLACK: I think there's one more that could be contentious, and that is the interpretation and implications of the Charter of Rights. That's a separate issue again because of the cases that are currently going on even today, like the Saskatchewan situation. Again it's an interpretation. So I think that's a contentious thing as well.

MS BARRETT: I agree, but I think what that relates to very specifically in the application of this committee's work is the percentage variance between the ridings and whether or not the rural/urban split exists as a concept and, further, in what proportion. That's the application of the Charter debate one way or the other.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One of the reasons that I asked Bob to pull out for us the historical overview of the redistribution from 1905 to the present time is to show that there has been a change taking place. I think it's most unfortunate that our committee was given this task at a time when the split between urban and rural Alberta is 42-41, because a lot of people seem to have the impression that it's always been 42-41. Of course, we know that's not the case. I think that added to the argument, "Don't change the balance."

MS BARRETT: Yeah, I know. What I'm getting at is that if by the time the end of the month rolls around we want to have things to bring to our caucus, those are the three areas of focus. I mean, that is what this is all about. All the other stuff is related but not critical. This brings it down to the basic fundamental mandate of this committee. That is what we need to have discussed – probably not agreed upon but possibly discussed – by the 28th. N'est-ce pas?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's go over it again in the morning. It'll give us time to think about the three points. But as one member of the committee, I'm certainly comfortable with the three the way they're described. I think they're the three key points.

MR. SIGURDSON: Isn't number two almost a sub of one?

MS BARRETT: Well, that has everything to do with which way you interpret the Charter. I'd leave it as a separate item for consideration.

MRS. BLACK: Would that include the overall representation throughout the province?

MS BARRETT: Well, I assume so. I mean, that's what this is all about. Our committee is to strike some principles from which legislation or amendments can be derived.

MR. BRUSEKER: Isn't there perhaps a fourth point we should be adding and considering here, which is services to the members? Because we had a number of people talk about it, and it is one of our points.

(f) the impact of the determination of the constituency boundaries on the ability of Members . . . to fully discharge their duties.

I think there we talked about things like fax machines and so on and a toll-free line.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, sure. But again that's stuff that goes into the arguments on the percentage variance and the urban/rural split. I mean, those are the factors, that's the information that you draw on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just for consideration, we may wish in our report to deal with each of these seven points in the body of the report, because clearly the ability of members to serve their constituents and any recommendations we make to the Members' Services Committee could be in the body of the report but would not be in whatever recommendations we're making back to the full Assembly on what should be in the legislation.

MS BARRETT: Hear, hear. Fair enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it's a valid point, Frank. I just think it's how we address it.

MRS. BLACK: Then maybe we should be addressing each one of these as . . .

MS BARRETT: Well, they're all going to come into play whether you like it or not. On any given point they're all going to come into play.

MRS. BLACK: Sure they are, but I think we should maybe pick these off. We were given a mandate to deal with these seven items. Possibly we should just go down the seven items and see which ones we want to deal with first. Certainly these factors are going to come under each one. That would keep us in tune with the mandate we were given as a committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MS BARRETT: Well, I'll tell you what. I certainly have no objection to that, but speaking from the point of view of looking at what it is that you really have to do and the natural process – I mean, let me put it this way and make no mistake: if we decided that we wanted to simply focus on the three points that I asked Bob to put up on the board there, you would be considering all these factors in any event. If you want to go

through them one at a time, the (a) through (g), I have no objection as long as by September 28 we have also directly asked the questions on percentage variance between the ridings, rural and urban split, and the commission's structure. See what I'm getting at?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we'd already agreed to that.

MS BARRETT: Oh, okay; you had.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'd agreed to the fact that by the 28th we want to be in a position . . .

MS BARRETT: Okay; I thought that what Pat was saying was something a bit different.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. We want to be in a position by the 28th so we can go back to our respective caucuses, share with them the general tone of our discussions, where we seem to be at, receive input from caucus members so that when we come back on the 9th, we're in a decision mode.

MS BARRETT: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, we may change the three points that you put on today. Tomorrow we may vary one of the three points; we may add two more to the list. Once Stockwell joins us on the 25th, he will obviously want input and may have other ideas that we haven't considered.

MS BARRETT: Now, that worries me. A guy who wasn't around for the summer hearings: that worries me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What you're saying to us is that you want to ensure that by the 28th we're all in a position to go back to our caucuses and say, "We've discussed all the main points that are contained within our mandate, and while we haven't reached any conclusions, here are some thoughts." Am I reading you right?

MS BARRETT: Yeah, and especially on those three points.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there anyone who disagrees with that concept?

MRS. BLACK: No. I just think it's easier to take each of these and then sit around and discuss how the statistical data we've been provided with relates to, say, "(a) the appropriateness of the provisions of the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act." Now, it may not relate to it at all, and that's fine. So that's been dealt with. I think you want to deal with all those factors, which in fact are these factors.

MS BARRETT: Okay. Yeah.

MRS. BLACK: And then you've answered each of the seven criteria that were given, based on the information gained and the discussions within the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why don't we ask Bob if there are some things we would like to have for our discussion tomorrow; for instance, on number one, "the appropriateness of the provisions of the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act." Obviously we

should have the portions of the Act in front of us that we think we need.

MR. SIGURDSON: Do we already have copies of the Alberta legislation?

MR. PRITCHARD: I think originally, but I'll get it again and make some copies.

MS BARRETT: By the way, I'm not here tomorrow. Tom is, but I'm not. I've got caucus. We might even trade places.

MR. SIGURDSON: I think caucus will probably still be on by the time I get there.

MR. CARDINAL: Bob, I have one thought in looking at those three main areas. I personally agree; I think those are important. But if we're trying to design a system that's fair for all Albertans and work for Albertans, we should somehow – and no doubt it'll come up anyway through the process – look at other provinces in Canada and what doesn't work and what has worked, to make sure we don't get into the same mess they may have.

MRS. BLACK: That's (d), you see, and I think . . .

MR. CARDINAL: I think it's quite critical that we look at it overall: how Alberta would fit in in the future in Canada, if we focus on what B.C., Saskatchewan, and Manitoba have done and what's happened, positive or negative.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we focus tomorrow morning on these points, as Pat has suggested, and go through them one by one, we will have the *Hansard* record for Pam and Stockwell, who will miss tomorrow morning's discussion, but we'll still have a kind of opening overall discussion on our mandate so that when we get together in Calgary, we can begin to focus more directly on the three points or whatever variation we have at that time. Are you comfortable with that approach?

HON. MEMBERS: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, then we should ask Bob: are there any other matters on which we want to ensure he has background material for us tomorrow? I mentioned the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act.

Yes?

MRS. BLACK: Could I make a further suggestion? If we focus on these seven items, could we leave an eighth item open for potential new input or something like that, something other than what was dealt with?

MR. CHAIRMAN: By all means. Sure. Let's keep in mind, too, that we'll get . . .

MRS. BLACK: Keep this open ended.

MR. SIGURDSON: That's (g).

MRS. BLACK: No. I think things that really don't even fall into that area, that maybe didn't pertain directly to our current situation but to maybe our future situation – I'm thinking of just leaving it open even further than what (g) is.

MR. SIGURDSON: Okay. I think it's covered in (g), but that's fine, if you want to add an (h) in there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For instance, we'll have a discussion on (b), the implications of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. We won't have pulled out for us the various positions taken by the many lawyers we met with, but we'll use the discussion tomorrow as a basis so that when we come back and talk about it further, we've got that.

MR. PRITCHARD: Do you want me to add Pat's point about adding one more item . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, she wants another at the bottom of that list for our discussion tomorrow.

MR. PRITCHARD: But you'll remember that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, we'll remember that. What I wanted to focus on: are there other matters that we want Bob to pull some information on for us in preparation for tomorrow's meeting so that at 10:15 we don't suddenly say, "Gosh, Bob, we need a document and we don't have the document here"?

MRS. BLACK: Possibly we should have the Charter of Rights and Freedoms sitting in front of us – the excerpts that pertain to our mandate – and a copy of the McLachlin decision and the Dixon. I don't know if everybody got that.

MS BARRETT: Well, that's all in that first package we got.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think so.

MR. PRITCHARD: Dixon, McLachlin, and Fisher: copies of that. I could pass that out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Bring that back, Bob, and we'll go through it.

MRS. BLACK: If we're going to sit and talk about it, let's have it in front of us so we're not second-guessing words.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. When we get to composition of commission, we'll pull out the composition of the immediate past commission and the composition of the three commissions – I think they were fairly simple – B.C., Saskatchewan, and Manitoba.

MR. BRUSEKER: I know we traveled to the other three western provinces, but I'm wondering if it wouldn't be useful to have information from the other six provinces.

MR. CARDINAL: That way we could get the positives and negatives.

MRS. BLACK: And even the federal body.

MS BARRETT: The feds we do have because we got that in the original package. But I wouldn't ask for that for tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll get as much as we can for tomorrow.

MR. BRUSEKER: No, but I'm thinking down the road.

MS BARRETT: Oh, yeah, for down the road; fair enough. I just wouldn't ask for it for tomorrow.

MR. BRUSEKER: Bob doesn't need to sleep tonight.

MS BARRETT: That's true; he looks pretty healthy, doesn't he? We'll give him a key to the Leg. Library. No sweat.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don't get carried away, Pam.

MR. PRITCHARD: Actually, I'm going on holidays right after this. It's going to be a surprise for you.

MRS. BLACK: Do you want to hear the other surprise? You're not.

MR. BRUSEKER: I thought you were going to say no cheque. That always gets people.

MRS. BLACK: Well, you can go without money if you want.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah.

With Frank, I should actually put that on my list: to get some comparable data from the other provinces.

MR. BRUSEKER: Yeah. I guess what I'd be looking for in particular, Bob, would be: have they gone with a percentage variation? Somebody at one point mentioned, I think, that Nova Scotia has a 30 percent variation, if I remember correctly. It came out at one of the presentations. I think Pat Ledgerwood talked about it. If we could find out if they have a variance, what is the percentage variance they're using, and a little bit of information about the makeup of their commissions as well, it would be useful, I think.

MR. PRITCHARD: Sure; we can get that together.

MR. SIGURDSON: In addition to Frank's, can you find out, if they've got that variance, if it's pre or post Charter?

MRS. BLACK: Yeah. That would be based on when they last did their review.

MR. SIGURDSON: Not necessarily. We had a review in 1983. The Charter was 1982, and we just didn't have any challenge. We have not had any challenge to the existing boundaries. So I guess it's actually: is their variance pre or post the McLachlin decision rather than the Charter?

MS BARRETT: Yeah, good point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Anything else for tomorrow?

MR. PRITCHARD: I'll just get the dates. So basically for tomorrow you want some material from B.C., Saskatchewan, and Manitoba on their electoral boundaries commissions, copies of our Electoral Boundaries Commission Act here, and copies of the Charter, Dixon, McLachlin, and Fisher.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The original package you gave us. Anything else today?

MR. BRUSEKER: I was just thinking that I've noticed that, I'm sure, in the original package.

MS BARRETT: I do too. It's still the biggest thing in the whole file.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that it for today then?

MS BARRETT: It is as far as I'm concerned.

MRS. BLACK: Can we have a motion to adjourn?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we do, what's your pleasure with regard to *Hansard* tomorrow? We will be getting into thoughts. Do you wish to have *Hansard* record and then we put an embargo on it? I know at the beginning of the meeting, just before you came in, Pam, I mentioned . . .

MS BARRETT: I know, I heard. Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I mentioned that we need to make a decision when all members are present how we handle ourselves in the meetings: whether we want it all recorded, whether we want part of it recorded, or just what our process is. What's your pleasure for tomorrow morning?

MR. SIGURDSON: I haven't got any problem with *Hansard* being here. I suppose that until we have a final report, we might want to embargo the distribution of *Hansard*. But I think it would be worth while having *Hansard* here so that at the end the stuff can be released for the people that want to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Might we leave it, then, as a consensus, because we can't make any motions unless we're all here, that we will follow that recommendation and deal with it formally once we reconvene on the 25th in Calgary?

MRS. BLACK: Does that imply that the press will not be in our room then?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, it does.

MRS. BLACK: I would prefer that because I think we should throw some ideas around, and I certainly wouldn't want to read about it on the front page of the *Calgary Herald* before we get into the process. That would be unfair to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we're forced to, we can go in camera, and we can go in camera with *Hansard* rolling. Is that correct?

MS BARRETT: That's true. That's right.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah, you can, but as they advised this morning upstairs, it's better not to have *Hansard* recording, because if that is then released and you've gone in camera, that causes a breach of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll cross that bridge when we come to it, but if it's understood that we want an embargo on our discus-

sions . . . I had spoken with one reporter earlier, and I advised him that as far as I was concerned, our meetings were open until the committee decided they wished either to go officially in camera or make other arrangements. But, clearly, once we're discussing various options, that should be in confidence until we've finished our work.

MR. PRITCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the advice I got today was basically that if you didn't have everybody here to make a motion, you could do something like call a coffee break or just call a break. *Hansard* would then leave, and then, of course, your discussion is informal and you can go ahead discussing whatever you want, with nobody in the room.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But I think Tom's point is good: if we can keep *Hansard*.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, as much as we can have on record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MR. SIGURDSON: There's enough suspicion about what we do as a group of folk anyways. I don't think we need to add to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Great. Well, let's wait until tomorrow morning.

MRS. BLACK: That sounds good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll take the least obstructive approach.

MR. BRUSEKER: Before we adjourn, what is the agenda for tomorrow morning?

MR. CHAIRMAN: To deal with the seven points.

MR. CARDINAL: Read the paper first to see what we said.

MR. BRUSEKER: Are we planning on going through all of them?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Start with (a). We'll also look at the three points and decide whether we want them varied or added to or deleted from.

MR. BRUSEKER: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion to adjourn?

MS BARRETT: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pam. All in favour. Carried. Thank you.

[The committee adjourned at 3:30 p.m.]

