

[Chairman: Mr. Bogle]

[1:18 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll officially declare the meeting open, and before Bob hands out the numerous pieces of paper he has, there's one item on the agenda from our last meeting. It relates to a request Frank made, that prior to going back to our respective caucuses, we attempt to have something in a written form so there's some kind of continuity, if I recall the thrust of your concern correctly.

MR. BRUSEKER: My concern was that what I'd like to see happening is that at the end of these three days we have scheduled this week, we have something written so that when we go back to our respective caucuses, we're each coming from the same playing field and saying, "Well, here are the points." Perhaps we can have a list of points we've agreed upon, a list of points that are still up for discussion or . . . I'm not sure how quickly things are going to go along, but what I'd like to see us doing at any rate is setting an agenda over these next three days so that perhaps by that time we can work towards a particular goal. Ideally, it would be to have perhaps even point form; not necessarily a report even written but perhaps an outline of what we're going to try and put into it kind of thing. Maybe if we even set that as a goal - I'm not sure how quickly things are going to go; I know none of us really does, but I'd like to see us at least work toward getting a framework established by the end of these three days, by the end of Friday's hearings, so that we can go back to our caucuses over the course of next week when we don't have a meeting and have discussions with our caucuses.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For clarification, we'll be meeting with our caucus on Thursday of this week, so I'm assuming we will attempt to report then rather than waiting until mid to late October. I don't see that as a problem. I think we'll have a pretty good feel after tomorrow's meetings, but it just happened that we have a caucus meeting scheduled.

Stock, I don't know if there's anything you want to add to that as our Whip? Okay.

Pam.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, I assumed that someone did phone Bob Pritchard - I hope so - to say that I wouldn't be available for the meeting on Friday. I'm with Frank on the notion of having some recommendations ready, but in the event that recommendations are not ready before Friday, I'd just like to give intention of notice to move a motion that would enable, if necessary, decisions to be made with one person absent as long as that person knew that a particular vote was coming up and could register her or his perspective prior to that vote being made. Okay? Because you remember we have already a rule that says no decisions without all of us. I'm sorry - I can't believe I'm going to get on an airplane - but I've got to go to Ottawa and so I can't be here for Friday. I'm not sure if any formal motion will be necessary to bring anything to our caucuses in any event, but if it does become necessary, I'll move the enabling motion to allow that to happen prior to my leaving this committee this week.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, really where we're at with regard to going back to our caucuses is whether or not we do it in a fashion where each of us takes down some notes and reports back, right over to the more formalized approach where there is an outline, as Frank has mentioned, where we're able to list

areas where there may be agreement and areas where there are still uncertainties, and possibly a third area where we know there are differences of opinion.

MS BARRETT: Gotcha. Thanks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Anyone else on this topic?

MRS. BLACK: Well, I don't know how formal you want to make the outline or whatever Frank's suggesting, but I certainly will be keeping my own notes as the days proceed, because there will be things I'll want to reflect back on. I'm sure that everyone will be keeping their own notes.

MS BARRETT: Oh, sure. If I can hop in . . .

MRS. BLACK: I don't know if it's necessary to have a formalized outline. I think that, you know, everybody has the obligation here to make sure they pick up the pertinent points that they want to make sure their caucuses are aware of.

MS BARRETT: Right.

MRS. BLACK: So I don't know that it's necessary to have something as formal as that.

MS BARRETT: I don't know if your comments were directed at me, Pat . . .

MRS. BLACK: No, no.

MS BARRETT: . . . but all I was getting at was: if it had to be very formal, to enable that to happen in my absence. That's all I was getting at. All right? And maybe Frank - when it's his turn again - could just sort of explain further what it is that he wants. I think I understand. It's not something formal; it's something that we all understand is clear in terms of where we're headed. And if we're headed in the same direction, we take the ideas back to our caucuses; they tell us yes or no.

MR. DAY: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, that was my concern. I thought I understood Frank. I guess I didn't, and just need clarification. What degree of formality are we talking about here? I'm not comfortable with something being printed up that we all trot back with. I'm sure there'll be a concurrence of understanding of the issues, and because there's an embargo on our discussions, this releases us from that to go to our caucuses and present a picture. Is that not right?

MS BARRETT: I think so.

MR. DAY: Yeah. So I'm leaning to the informal reporting rather than a formalized written . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, there's even some question as to the purpose in going back to caucuses. A moment ago it was mentioned going back with something we can get approval from them on. Others may view this as an opportunity merely to report progress in our discussions, because the ultimate decisions will be made here. Again, we're drawing fine lines on it, and it depends on the interpretation.

So what's the pleasure of the committee regarding the process we follow?

MS BARRETT: Could I suggest that what we do is come back to that around 4 or 4:30 this afternoon? Let's see how far we get and then see if we're together or not together. It might help a lot if we go into some of the hard stuff first.

MR. BRUSEKER: That's a good suggestion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Remember, we've got a lot of things that Bob will be passing out today relative to the . . . We're going to do that, I presume, next.

MS BARRETT: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I could. I have a report out of Quebec which I would like to give. It is the reason I'm late. May I?

MR. DAY: Just on going back to our caucuses. Given that we have an embargo and also that media aren't present, for reasons stated in previous meetings, I'm hoping that when we go back to our caucuses, we're making clear to them the constraints we're under in terms of publicity and that that constrains them from making any comments on our deliberations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which leads into a topic which can either be dealt with now or later today. We had an agreement at our last meetings that we would have an embargo, but we do require a motion to that effect. Bob has reminded me that if we do choose to go with an embargo through a motion, we need to decide how strict that is. Does it mean that copies of the transcripts are sent to each member on the committee? Does it mean that if you wish to review the transcript, you go into the office? We do have resource people, through Bob and Ted, in the office. I'm not suggesting we deal with it this moment, but we need to deal with it in a formalized sense sometime today.

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Chairman, maybe we should deal with it at the same time that we deal with the other motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Certainly. Why don't we do that, and come back to it at about 4:30 in the afternoon? At that time we'll deal with Frank's original suggestion on the outline, and we'll also deal with the question of the embargo.

All right. Now, do you wish to give us a report on Quebec?

MS BARRETT: You might be interested, I think. It'll only take a minute. I was just going to do some calculations.

An article appeared in a French newspaper yesterday, and I was called this morning by somebody in Ottawa who knew that I was on this committee and told - I think I've got this right - that the chief electoral officer has filed an interim report, with his recommendation that ridings be changed to reflect the new growth areas and the declining areas relative to population. I'm only going to give round figures because I didn't have time to write them down. The smallest amount, the lowest number, per riding would be a population of 28,000 and a few, like one or two hundred, and the maximum would be 47,000 and a few.

MR. BRUSEKER: This is population?

MS BARRETT: Population.

And, more interestingly, he recognized in the report that 104 out of the 125 ridings would be affected by this report. The only other thing Yves told me was that the government, or a representative of the Bourassa government, has responded by

saying that they wouldn't like that; the Liberal government wouldn't like the changes that have been recommended. And, finally, I understand they're going into a public hearing process.

Now, I found this interesting, and obviously a friend in Ottawa thought it was interesting enough to phone me and interpret from a French newspaper, which I wouldn't have even known about. I thought I would report that because it's the latest of what's going on in the country.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Possibly what we could do is: once the information is public, Pat Ledgerwood could come back to us with whatever information he's able to gain.

MS BARRETT: It is public. It was in this French newspaper yesterday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is public?

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, are we sure the report has been filed, or was there a leak?

MS BARRETT: Oh, that I don't know. I have no idea. It was in a newspaper called *LaSalle*. Is there a paper called *LaSalle*?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yeah.

MS BARRETT: It was in *LaSalle*; that's all I know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there anyone else, or are we comfortable to leave this in Pat's hands?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Okay, I'll undertake to contact my colleague in Quebec City. It's my understanding that there would be a press conference and a news release in conjunction with the announcement, and I will attempt to get a copy of that news release.

MS BARRETT: Okay. Thanks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Anything else on this issue?

MR. DAY: Just for further detail, we're talking the chief electoral officer of the province of Quebec?

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR. DAY: And they're going through their electoral boundary revision right now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the process in Quebec is quite different than it is in Alberta.

MS BARRETT: To tell you the truth, I kept saying, "I've got to go; I've got to get to Calgary." So I said, "Just give me the round numbers; I've got to run."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Possibly Pat can give us a fuller report when he comes back on the authority of the chief electoral officer in terms of mandate and responsibilities and the process.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, that would be fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Any other matters before we go into the material which we've requested?

So our timing is all right for today and tomorrow morning? And then on Friday unfortunately Pam won't be with us, and we'll proceed on.

MR. BRUSEKER: Friday is 9 until 1?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nine until 1, I think.

MR. PRITCHARD: Or is it 8:30?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tomorrow is 8:30 to 11:30. You'll have to get a wake-up call, Pam.

MS BARRETT: Uh huh.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will too.

MS BARRETT: I need a few of them actually.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And we'll have lunch here tomorrow.

MRS. BLACK: Behave yourself, Pam.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have dinner this evening as a group.

MS BARRETT: Oh, do we? Oh, okay.

MR. PRITCHARD: At 5:30 till 7 in the Owl's Nest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I may have to swipe Bob's jacket, then I'll be able to come. Or Tom's.

All right. I think we can proceed then.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah, if we said both of them sewn together.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Aw, get out.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thanks, Bob.

MR. PRITCHARD: The first thing I'm going to hand you is the framework for building the report that we discussed last weekend: the three points – just review those – plus the mandate statements, the seven mandate points plus the one that was added.

If that's okay, we'll then go to the 20 research questions that came out of our last two meetings. The first ones were regarding the Charter: a copy of the Charter and a copy of the legal opinions. The legal opinion sections are highlighted, and I'll give them to you for your reference. Ted will hand those out. I've highlighted three places in this material on the Charter. I talked to Michael Ritter, and the two sections highlighted are the sections that people usually go to court over when they want to challenge things like electoral boundaries. Overriding the two sections that are marked with the yellow tags, Michael advises me that a key word is the word "reasonable" highlighted on the very front page. It's the word "reasonable" that gives rise to so many interpretations of the two sections marked with the yellow tags.

The side question to that was the dates of the McLaughlin and Meredith decisions and also the question as to which provinces have had redistribution since those decisions. The answer is that

the only province is British Columbia. I'll just give you a copy of that for your reference with the dates.

Mr. Chairman, what do you want to do? Have it discussed after each thing goes out, or do you just want me to continue on?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's get all the material out first and then . . .

MR. SIGURDSON: Yeah, I think that's a good idea.

MR. PRITCHARD: The second question, a research question, is: if the 41 rural areas were maintained, how many divisions would it be necessary to add to the urban? You were considering plus or minus 25 percent. We did that based on enumeration and on population. I hope this is self-explanatory.

To move ahead to number 3 with the summaries of presentations. What we've done with all the presentations for the purposes of creating minutes: each presentation has been summarized into about three lines, as this sample here. I did not make copies of this for everybody, because there's a significant pile of paper, but if somebody wants a copy, I'll make it for them. Or if they want to just use this as a reference that they come and have a look at it in the office or now – I've got the whole set here. You can just let me know what you'd like.

MR. BRUSEKER: I'm sorry. What is this again?

MR. PRITCHARD: This is basically every presentation. It's a three-line summary of each of the presentations, taking out the key highlights. It's for the purpose of the minutes. In fact, these will be the body of the minutes that will be produced for this committee. So those are available now. As you can see, it's a substantial pile of material. I can make a copy for everybody, if that's what you'd like. You can perhaps think about that one.

MR. DAY: That is including written and oral?

MR. PRITCHARD: No, that's just all the presentations that came to the public hearings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, Ted. You're passing out now a transcript. That's still in question 2?

MR. EDWARDS: This is in question 1.

MR. PRITCHARD: Those are still legal opinions, because there were a number of them asked for: Chivers, Lammi, Dixon, the two professors, and Johnston, et cetera, et cetera.

Question 4 relates to written submissions that came in. There was a large section that referred to "other". This is where people have mailed submissions in, and this is a breakout of what all those other comments were. They're varied.

Five isn't a handout. A request was made to combine the presentations that were heard at the public hearings and the number of submissions that were mailed in and then to look at where there were duplications: somebody who mailed a submission in and came to a public hearing. So there were 514 if you total the presentations in the mailed-in; there were 27 that were the same individuals. I looked at about four or five of them. I don't think anybody diametrically changed their position from their write-in to their presentation. The only thing that would be different is that the presentation would probably have a little more detail, and certainly the question and answer period

at the end. But there were 27 that were the same. So in actuality, if you take those 27 out, there were 487 different stand-alone presentations and written submissions.

Number 6. There was a request for a breakdown of presentations by individuals and groups at public hearings. There were 105 individuals. There were 90 people that represented councils. There were 19 people that represented school boards, 29 political organizations, 15 hospital boards, and 40 that were others: irrigation, beet growers, Bashaw cheese . . .

MR. DAY: Bob, 90 councils. That's municipal councils?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes, that would be anybody that had "council" in their name.

MR. DAY: Okay. So if that's 90, we don't know how many separate councils we're talking about there?

MR. PRITCHARD: No.

MR. DAY: Okay. Can we get that at some date?

MR. PRITCHARD: Well, actually we could break it out and give you the whole 90 names, if you'd like. Sure.

MR. DAY: I'd just like to know how many separate councils.

MR. PRITCHARD: How many separate ones there were. Sure.

MR. DAY: I don't need it now.

MR. PRITCHARD: No, but we can get it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Was there much duplication? You're talking about two briefs from the town of Bashaw council?

MR. DAY: Right. Was there any of that? Do we know if that's 90 councils?

MR. PRITCHARD: Well, I don't know that for sure. I can check that.

MR. DAY: All right. Thanks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But that's an impressive breakout.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: It may be, looking at the numbers, Mr. Chairman, that those are 90 separate councils.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah, we'll check that out. We did type it. Ted's going to hand you something with the numbers broken down there and also a breakout of individuals and groups from the written presentations.

AN HON. MEMBER: So we can have both.

MR. PRITCHARD: Question 7 is the number of municipalities in each constituency. These are broken down by towns, summer villages, cities, villages, improvement districts, Indian reserves, counties, and special areas. It's also broken down by population groups of zero to 500, 500 to 2,500, and over 2,500. As well, we have one that actually breaks out the numbers of those entities and another one that breaks out the population figures. These

were prepared by Tomislav Milinusic from the program he developed.

Did I give you two?

MS BARRETT: No.

MR. PRITCHARD: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. DAY: Bob, just for clarification, on this one where it says "presenter," citizen presentation is blank; therefore, we are saying Brian Anderson was representing this group?

MR. PRITCHARD: Exactly.

MR. DAY: Okay. Here at the back the X means they were speaking as a citizen.

MR. PRITCHARD: For themselves, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When you've finished passing this out, would you go over it again for me, please.

MR. PRITCHARD: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll use Athabasca-Lac La Biche, at the top, as an example.

MR. PRITCHARD: Okay. On the first one, Athabasca-Lac La Biche, the total number of enumeration areas is 101. As you'll remember, all of Tomislav's system is based on enumeration areas. There are five municipalities, seven towns, and 12 summer villages. There are no cities. There are two villages, 32 improvement districts, three Indian reserves. There are 40 counties. There are no special areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Forty counties? What does that mean?

MR. BRUSEKER: That seems rather high.

MR. CARDINAL: There are four counties.

MR. PRITCHARD: There are four counties?

MR. CARDINAL: Well, they overlap. It wouldn't be four even. It would be the county of Athabasca . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can't be. Something's wrong in the statistics.

MR. CARDINAL: . . . the county of Thorhild, and then the MD of Westlock. If MDs are included in that, then . . .

MR. DAY: I'm just looking at Red Deer-North here, Mr. Chairman. They say I've got 36 villages. I've got a lot of campaigning to do if that's true. Is that correct?

MR. PRITCHARD: I don't know.

MR. SIGURDSON: I've got 52 cities.

MR. PRITCHARD: You've got what?

MR. SIGURDSON: Fifty-two cities.

MRS. BLACK: You do?

MR. SIGURDSON: Yeah.

MR. BRUSEKER: In Edmonton-Belmont.

MR. PRITCHARD: Well, this is interesting. You've got 52 enumeration areas.

MRS. BLACK: Well, don't feel bad. I've got 41 cities.

MR. BRUSEKER: I've got 49. That number is the same as the enumeration area number.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes. Okay, then . . .

MRS. BLACK: You must default to it or something.

MR. BRUSEKER: At least it is for some of them. For Banff-Cochrane it doesn't hold true, nor for Barrhead or Bonnyville.

MR. PRITCHARD: I'll have to review it with Tomislav.

MR. CARDINAL: Athabasca is the same.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, that's wrong. I've got 17 summer villages – I don't have any summer villages – three improvement districts.

MRS. BLACK: Are we paying for this program?

MR. PRITCHARD: We've paid for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So we'll hand this back.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes; hand this back.

MR. SIGURDSON: Well, this was a useless piece of information.

MR. DAY: We should keep a copy just for . . .

MRS. BLACK: Hold the last cheque.

MR. DAY: I'd like to show the mayor of Red Deer.

MS BARRETT: Do you want them both?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah. I'll take both those back.

MR. DAY: I'm sure it's just a technical error.

MR. PRITCHARD: I'm sure it is too. I'll take this one back too.

MRS. BLACK: Well, so much for that one. I mean, I had 41 cities.

MR. CARDINAL: How many cities?

MRS. BLACK: Forty-one cities.

MR. PRITCHARD: Okay. The next piece of misinformation we'll try is extra services for MLAs. I got some information on

fax machines: what it costs, what computers cost, and what toll-free lines cost, which is the Canada-wide system. When I got this information from Kathy Bruce-Kavanagh's area, she said that RITE lines are just about into all the constituency offices. That is the Alberta toll-free line. Computers are being and can be hooked into them if the constituencies have a computer and have the modems. They're available to the constituency offices now. Also, I made a . . .

MR. BRUSEKER: So really the only thing you're saying that needs to be addressed in that particular area is fax machines.

MR. PRITCHARD: Well, fax machines as well are available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Members now can use their constituency service allowance for the purchase of a fax machine, and a number have. It's not part of the equipment provided by Leg. Assembly; it's optional to the MLA.

MR. BRUSEKER: All constituencies eventually are going to be computerized. Isn't it by the end of this year?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes.

MR. BRUSEKER: With computers that wouldn't be a per annum either.

MRS. BLACK: That's total price.

MR. BRUSEKER: That'd be total price.

MR. DAY: I'd just like to suggest, too, that you can do a lot better than \$3,000 for purchasing a fax.

MS BARRETT: Hear, hear.

MRS. BLACK: About half that price.

MR. PRITCHARD: These figures came from Kathy Bruce-Kavanagh's area, and I don't know if they're an average or if this is just a code or a number that she handles. It's not dead on; it's to give an idea.

I've also taken out the sections in the Members' Guide that relate to what MLAs can have. It addresses air travel, including the northern charter flights, and the things you know already: the miles per kilometre, plus what you're allowed with offices and all sorts of things. I highlighted anything that related to telephones, computer communication . . .

MR. BRUSEKER: So how much per kilometre are we allowed?

MR. PRITCHARD: I think it's 21 cents, isn't it?

MR. DAY: I was wondering what one of those toll-free lines costs.

MR. PRITCHARD: Okay. The next one, item 9, is interesting. It's a chart that was made up and recently updated by information that Pat Ledgerwood brought back from a trip to – I forget where it was – Newfoundland where the chief electoral officers met in the last months.

Now, this addresses the last commission, chairperson, number of members, composition, electoral boundaries commissions, number of seats, enumeration or population base, and general

guidelines such as plus/minus 25 and the urban/rural mix, that there is a rule pertaining to that.

MR. BRUSEKER: A question on the sheet you just passed out. The chairperson is selected by whom? I'm not quite sure. Is it in the legislation that it says the chairperson of these committees shall be these people, or are they elected by the commission once it's established?

MR. PRITCHARD: There used to be one or two, and it was written out where it was appointed or chosen by the committee. I think these are all in the legislation. There are no exceptions to that.

MR. BRUSEKER: That's set right in legislation.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah.

This was another question relating to the printouts on the written submissions. It's basically a breakout of the ones that were indicated as special considerations. You'll see what these are. Most of these are where they ask for actual boundary details. It's what was placed under "special considerations."

This item coming up, number 12, is taking a look at the written presentations and breaking them out into geographic origins. So the charts basically show written submissions and how they're broken down, from composition of a commission, the number of electoral divisions, et cetera, et cetera, and then the areas they came from. Edmonton/Calgary is blocked together as one.

MR. DAY: At 4:30 there'll be a multiple choice test on all these items.

MR. PRITCHARD: Oh, I'm sorry. I got ahead of myself. I've handed out the stuff that pertains to number 12, written presentations and geographic. This is a written presentation of the issues raised and broken down geographically. I skipped the ones from the presentations that show the number of electoral divisions, where there are other percentages discussed, and a rural/urban mix. Ted's going to hand out those now.

The next item, number 13, is the kilometres of highways per constituency, which was the question asked. Basically this tells highways and railways in Alberta and mileage, and it's based on rural . . .

MS BARRETT: My car is going to weigh a ton when I leave.

MR. CARDINAL: We'll have to build another pulp mill.

MR. PRITCHARD: I think so.

MR. BRUSEKER: Bob, can I just ask for an explanation on this one that says "percentage factor issues"? It says, "19 Submissions" and then says "lower, agree, disagree, and higher." Could you explain what that means? I'm not quite sure I understand that.

MR. PRITCHARD: Okay. It means that on the percentage factor issues there were 19 submissions, and of the 19 . . .

MR. BRUSEKER: This is throwing out the idea of here's 25 percent as a possibility. Do you agree with it? Do you disagree with it? Should it be higher, should it be lower, or whatever?

MR. PRITCHARD: But what are these numbers down the side? Those are the numbers of the . . .

MR. EDWARDS: Any time you see a number on the written submissions, it's just a file number of ours.

MR. PRITCHARD: Oh yeah; right. Sorry. These are the 19. Ignore the numbers that are printed down the side. Those refer to our index numbers. Actually, with the written submissions we can go back to number 101 and find out it was Fred Smith. So ignore those. So the 19 submissions - this breaks down: one person said plus or minus 5 percent; one person said, "I agree with plus/minus 25." You'd have to add up how many said they wanted it lower.

MR. BRUSEKER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. PRITCHARD: Question number 14 was a kind of fun question to ask: what is the shortest distance from the Leg. Building to the various constituencies? The initial response was to get a piece of string and tie it to the Leg. door and start walking. But eventually we got an answer.

MR. BRUSEKER: Who's the farthest?

MRS. BLACK: Medicine Hat?

MR. BRUSEKER: Medicine Hat looks like the farthest, doesn't it?

MRS. BLACK: How could it be farther than Cardston?

MS BARRETT: Well, not by much. One kilometre.

MRS. BLACK: But Cardston is farther down than Medicine Hat, isn't it?

MS BARRETT: Because the road that you have to take . . .

MR. DAY: Cypress-Redcliff is 507.

MR. BRUSEKER: Lethbridge-East doesn't make any sense.

MR. DAY: Lethbridge-East is 517.

MR. BRUSEKER: But how can Lethbridge be 517 and Cardston closer, according to this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is this to the residence of the current MLA, or is it to the edge of the constituency?

MR. PRITCHARD: It's just to the edge of the constituency. Sorry if I didn't explain that. It's to the edge of the constituency. It's from the Leg. Building . . .

MR. DAY: The farthest edge?

MR. PRITCHARD: It'd be the closest edge to . . .

MR. CARDINAL: To Edmonton. Yeah.

MS BARRETT: And Cardston runs a little bit north. The top edge of it runs a little bit north of Lethbridge.

MRS. BLACK: I don't believe it.

MS BARRETT: It's true. Look it up.

MRS. BLACK: All right.

MR. PRITCHARD: It was done by the department of transportation. They have some sort of machine that calculates it on maps.

MR. CARDINAL: That's close enough.

MR. PRITCHARD: I presume it's relatively accurate.

Also, in relation to that, I have a chart here with the square miles per constituency and the population as it's broken down.

MRS. BLACK: Is this in miles or in kilos?

MR. PRITCHARD: Fortunately it's in miles.

MRS. BLACK: Good.

MS BARRETT: Good? I can't think in miles.

MR. BRUSEKER: Taber-Warner has the most number of highways to go on, the most different numbers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think I've ever taken the route they've suggested. Alan Hyland and I compared notes. I'm farther away from Edmonton than he is because of where he lives in the riding and where I live.

MRS. BLACK: Not according to this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's to the edge of the constituency. He has to travel through Bow Island.

MR. PRITCHARD: Maybe you'll want to try it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that's something you might do. You had a hard enough time staying on number 2 coming down to see us.

MR. PRITCHARD: Okay. The next research was on the number of community leagues. Community leagues are interesting. Edmonton, Calgary, Red Deer, Sherwood Park, St. Albert, Medicine Hat, and Lethbridge were contacted and they had different ways of looking at it. We have a map from Edmonton where they've broken it down with firm boundaries. We were advised by Calgary that they weren't thoroughly divided geographically, so they gave us the number of their federation of communities, with 122 members. Red Deer is not divided into community leagues at all. Sherwood Park has 214 organizations but isn't divided into community leagues. St. Albert isn't, Medicine Hat isn't, and Lethbridge isn't. So basically the way of handling community leagues is going to be difficult to pinpoint because it's handled differently in these different areas.

We have some more information coming from different spots on their community leagues. When we get that down the road, maybe we can take a look at it and see if there isn't something we can do to address that question a little better.

The number of schools. Nobody has it by constituency, and we just received a book that gives all the schools in Alberta. The only way we could do it is to sit down and manually put

them in the right constituency. If you want that done, we'll do it. It's . . .

MR. CARDINAL: A lot of work.

MR. PRITCHARD: It's a significant piece of work – take Ted about an hour and a half.

MR. DAY: I think we could each pull from that if we wanted to look at a specific area.

MR. PRITCHARD: It's a major piece of work. Actually, the cities would probably be the hardest to do, I'm sure, with their boundaries and that sort of thing. But if you want it, we'll do it. I'll sort of leave that with you for a while.

Okay. The next question: mode of MLA travel, with the number of trips, time, and mileage. We got some information from Kathy Bruce-Kavanagh's area, and we got some information from the respective MLAs. If you are a rural MLA, you got a memo asking for some detail on time and mileage. We have about half of those back. I want to wait until they get them all back before we do an analysis and hand them out, if everybody is agreeable to waiting a little while on that.

MS BARRETT: Agreed.

MR. PRITCHARD: They're coming in really fast, so it won't be too long.

Item 18 is the maps of ridings since 1905 and a breakdown of the changes. We went through the gray booklet that originally came out from the chief electoral office detailing 1905 to, I think, 1982, plus we've added on the years since. We've done an analysis of the changes. It's messy, to be frank with you, because of name changes and boundary changes and those sorts of things, but we've done our best with trying to make an analysis of each year as the changes occurred, since 1905. Again, that's an area – after you've had a look at it, if you have questions, we can do more.

MR. DAY: This is number 19?

MR. PRITCHARD: That's question 18.

MR. DAY: This fits under 18?

MR. PRITCHARD: Right. Maps of the ridings since 1905 and then a breakdown with all the changes.

I want to make a note of thanks to Harvey Ford from the Alberta Bureau of Statistics, who gathered the information for us on the next question, which is growth patterns in Alberta. He and his staff were very helpful. They apparently put in a lot of time. I'm sure they did put in a lot of time to do this documentation I'm going to hand out. They're a little bit worried about it, and they've stamped it "Experimental" and "For Internal Use Only" and asked us to use it in the strictest confidence because it is projections that cannot be validated. It's their best extrapolation. However, it's not for general distribution. They did as many areas as they could, which you'll see on here. It doesn't go down to villages. It certainly doesn't cover all the centres in Alberta, but they did the best they could with whatever they had.

Harvey and his staff also sent over a book on population projections from 1987 to the year 2001 that breaks things down in a lot of different ways, by groups, ages, and that sort of thing.

If anybody wants to have a look at it, they're welcome to, or we can get you copies if you want more of them.

The very final question, number 20: unsettled areas for constituencies. The work is still being done on it. Tomislav Milinusic is working on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's settled area.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah. Settled and unsettled in each constituency.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But the question was for the settled area.

MR. PRITCHARD: Okay. Well, basically what he is doing is he has to chart out in the computer all the unsettled parts, and then he'll have a printout that will say . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, as long as we know what we're talking about. We're talking about the areas that have been surveyed and where people are living.

MR. PRITCHARD: It'll answer both.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Bob, we're going to need an organizer. We should have some kind of loose-leaf binder or something that can put the material in 20 sections, with a heading for each question. We can't possibly keep all this material straight.

MR. DAY: That's what I was going to ask, Mr. Chairman. If we could have each item - I should have done it when we started. There's the fabulous job of collecting the information, but as we refer to it as a group and I say "provincial electoral division paper," we're all going to be shuffling through the pile. If we can get those tabs and mark them, that would be great. Then I could just say, "Could we please look at item 6?"

MR. CHAIRMAN: You've done a mammoth task since our last meeting.

MR. DAY: Yeah, a formidable job and very well done.

MR. PRITCHARD: I'll get some folders with sections.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Possibly while Ted and the rest of us are at the Owl's Nest tonight, you can do that.

MR. PRITCHARD: Right. Except I can't count up to 20, so how would I get the numbers on?

MR. SIGURDSON: Take your socks off.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah. Thanks, Tom.

We have the *Hansards* from last week and the Dear Albertan letter. I don't know if you want that to add to your pile of material, but we've got them here if somebody wants to refer to them during the next - what? - three days.

MRS. BLACK: Could I suggest that we take a few moments, a little bit of time, to organize our files in front of us and have a look at what we've just been handed out?

MR. DAY: If we could do that, I'd support that too.

MS BARRETT: Even if we just number the stuff.

MR. SIGURDSON: Order them in the same fashion?

MS BARRETT: Actually, what would be helpful now is if somebody would stand up and flip that thing over and give us a minute and tell us which Charter issue is now item 1.

MR. PRITCHARD: What we're going to do is see if Ted can go to the stationery store downstairs and buy something right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But you know, what might help even Ted is what Pam is suggesting. If we can go back and go to the documents you gave us, under item 1, Charter, we'll put number 1 there.

MR. DAY: On our own. We can all do that together.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'd at least help get the material back where it belongs and identified.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. Because it'll take a while before we can put it into packages.

MR. PRITCHARD: Okay. If I read it out, then we you can mark it.

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MRS. BLACK: Well, make sure you call out the document, because I've got mine all muddled up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, why don't we work our way back? Would that be easier?

MS BARRETT: Yeah, it might be.

MR. PRITCHARD: Starting with the yellow stickies and green ink, and then you've got a pile of documents, including some *Hansards*, that are copies of all the legal opinions.

MR. DAY: That's the Legal Memorandum on Electoral Boundaries by Vaughn? That's number 2?

MR. PRITCHARD: No. That's still number 1. It's this with two yellow tags sticking out, plus it's a set of *Hansards* and copies of legal opinions.

MR. SIGURDSON: I have seven of those legal opinion things. Is that about right?

MR. PRITCHARD: That's right.

MRS. BLACK: How many *Hansards*? Four *Hansards*? It looks like four.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah. Four *Hansards*.

MS BARRETT: One memo from Vincent Lammi.

MR. PRITCHARD: Vincent Lammi, Barrie Chivers.

MS BARRETT: One from Vaughn Myers.

MR. PRITCHARD: Vaughn Myers; right.

MR. DAY: Is this number 1, Bob? February 26, Monday, *Hansard*: that goes under number 1?

MR. PRITCHARD: I really didn't have those in order.

MR. DAY: No. That's fine. I'm just checking.

MRS. BLACK: That's the only thing we got *Hansards* for, wasn't it?

MR. PRITCHARD: No; because they have the opinions in like Elton and McCormick.

MRS. BLACK: But it's the only thing we were handed out the *Hansard* for, for number 1?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes. Sorry, Pat.

MR. SIGURDSON: We'll put them in chronological order?

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. SIGURDSON: So you'd have Calgary, November 28, 10:05 a.m.?

MS BARRETT: That's 1(a).

MR. DAY: Okay. If we hold tough then, since we're going to do that . . . Okay, 1(a).

MR. SIGURDSON: Calgary, November 28, 2:45 p.m.

MS BARRETT: That'll be 1(b).

MR. DAY: What was the date on that?

MR. SIGURDSON: November 28, 2:45 p.m.

MR. DAY: Okay.

MR. SIGURDSON: Then Lethbridge, February 9, 1990, at 8:50 a.m., 1(c).

MS BARRETT: As you're recommending, why don't you keep going?

MR. SIGURDSON: Edmonton, Monday, February 26, 1990, 10:03 a.m., 1(d). The Vincent Lammi paper, only because its presentation was dated February 26 as well, that's 1(e). Then we've got two that are undated, so I just put them alphabetically: 1(f) is Barrie Chivers, and Vaughn Myers, 1(g).

MRS. BLACK: Then the Constitution at the front?

MS BARRETT: Yeah, the Constitution is just item 1 by itself.

MR. PRITCHARD: Thanks, Tom.

The second one, maintain 41 rural, is a page that's headed up Statistics Re: Number of Urban Additions Required and Feasibility of Two-Tiered System.

MR. DAY: That's item 2?

MR. PRITCHARD: That's item 2. It's a one-pager that looks like this.

Three, summaries of presentations: you don't have anything. That's the pile of presentations I have in front of me that you can look at if you wish.

Four is review of "other" submissions and other . . . It just says at the top "Other" Comments from Written Submissions in bold printing on top.

MRS. BLACK: Got it.

MR. DAY: That's number 4?

MR. PRITCHARD: That's number 4.

Item 5 wasn't a handout.

MR. DAY: Number 5 you didn't hand out, you said?

MRS. BLACK: No, no. It's called "other."

MR. DAY: Oh, that was just information. Okay.

MRS. BLACK: What was number 5?

MR. PRITCHARD: Number 5, there was no handout.

Number 6 was two pieces. It's Presentations: Individuals/Groups.

MR. DAY: So number 6 is two pieces, 6(a) and 6(b).

MS BARRETT: Well, 6(a) would be the single sheet, and 6(b) would be the one that's seven or eight sheets. Right?

MR. DAY: That starts with Brian Anderson?

MS BARRETT: Yup.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And the other one was . . .

MRS. BLACK: Over there. That's 6(a).

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MR. PRITCHARD: Number 7. I'm having trouble finding it in my pile, but it was the number of municipalities in each constituency.

MR. DAY: Isn't that the one we rejected?

MR. PRITCHARD: Oh, right; that's the one. Thanks.

Eight, extra services for MLAs . . .

MR. SIGURDSON: It's entitled Support to MLAs.

MR. PRITCHARD: That's two pieces. One part is highlighted in green.

MR. DAY: So Support would be 8(a) and the green would be 8(b). Is that right?

MR. PRITCHARD: That'd be good.

Item 9, frequency of redistribution and other questions, is these long sheets. There are four of them. It's a chart format. There's a breakout for other provinces.

MS BARRETT: Oh, it's just a four-pager. There are not four separate things?

MR. PRITCHARD: No.

MR. DAY: Can I see item 9 again, Bob? That's this one here?

MR. PRITCHARD: You've got it. That's it.

Okay, 10 is headed up Special Considerations - Written Submissions.

Number 11. I'm having trouble finding that in my . . . It's the number of electoral divisions and other percentages and Urban/Rural Mix.

MS BARRETT: I know what that is. I saw that. That was the one that Frank said: "What the heck is this one?"

MR. BRUSEKER: Yeah. I asked a question about it.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Nineteen submissions.

MR. DAY: Percentage Factor Issues is the title?

MR. PRITCHARD: Okay, with the numbers down the side.

MR. DAY: What's the one here that says Rural/Urban Mix then?

MS BARRETT: They're both the same.

MR. DAY: Okay.

MS BARRETT: Is it just two sheets of paper that we're looking for in this one then?

MRS. BLACK: One or two.

MS BARRETT: One is called Rural/Urban Mix.

MR. PRITCHARD: That's one of them.

MS BARRETT: One is called Percentage Factor Issues. Is there another sheet?

MR. SIGURDSON: Number of electoral divisions. Where is the number of electoral divisions referred to?

MR. DAY: Is that this one here?

MR. PRITCHARD: Whether people agreed or disagreed with the numbers; should there be more or should there be less?

MR. DAY: So are there three separate items, Bob?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes, I think there was on that one.

MR. DAY: So what does "number of electoral divisions" look like? Is that this one? Is this the one you're talking about?

MR. PRITCHARD: No, sorry. Stock, that's the next one coming up.

MS BARRETT: Well, why don't we say Rural/Urban Mix as 11(a), Percentage Factor Issues as 11(b), and then if we find a third one, we'll put it in as 11(c)?

MR. PRITCHARD: There should be an urban/rural mix. Sorry about that.

MS BARRETT: That's all right.

MR. CARDINAL: This one?

MR. PRITCHARD: Oh, that's it.

MS BARRETT: Which one is it?

MR. PRITCHARD: Urban . . .

MS BARRETT: No, that's the one I'm saying is called 11(a). The one that says Percentage Factor Issues is 11(b).

MR. PRITCHARD: Okay. Then the one we're missing is number of electoral divisions.

MS BARRETT: Well, we might not be actually missing something. I suspect we're not. But if we are, we could find it at the very end by the process of elimination.

MRS. BLACK: We'll make it (c).

MS BARRETT: Yeah, exactly.

MR. DAY: Or 11(b)(ii).

MR. PRITCHARD: That's number 12 that Stock just held up: written presentations, geographical. It's a chart . . .

MRS. BLACK: The two-page one?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Well, I think if you check, there's one that's marked Issues by Hearing (Presentations) that should be 11(c), and the other one is marked Written Submissions and should be number 12.

MS BARRETT: Oh, I see. You're right, Pat.

So 11(c) would be Issues by Hearing. Then Written Submissions is number 12.

MR. PRITCHARD: Okay. Thirteen is kilometres of highways and railways per constituency. That's a one-pager.

MRS. BLACK: Okay. Next?

MR. PRITCHARD: Fourteen is the miles from the Leg. to the constituencies. You'll notice it's got the route markings.

MRS. BLACK: That's this little job?

MR. PRITCHARD: That's it.

MRS. BLACK: Just a minute. There were two parts to that, and this is the second part.

MR. PRITCHARD: You're right, Pat. Yes, that was the second part. I handed that out with the population per square mile.

MR. DAY: That's 14(a).

MS BARRETT: Oh, I see. So 14(a) is the distance . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: And 14(b) is the population . . .

MS BARRETT: . . . per square mile.

MRS. BLACK: Okay. Here we go: 14(a) and 14(b).

MR. DAY: Pam, did you say it in that order?

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

You know, can you imagine how much fun it's going to be to read this section of *Hansard*?

MR. DAY: Who in all of Alberta is going to read it, do you think?

MS BARRETT: Not even us.

MR. PRITCHARD: Next is the number of community leagues. It's a one-pager that just listed four places.

Number 16 was the number of schools, which was not a handout; it was the book I showed you.

Seventeen is the mode of MLA travel. There was nothing handed out; I'm still working on it.

Number 18 was the maps of the ridings since 1905, with a breakdown of changes.

MR. DAY: That's that big, clunky one.

MR. PRITCHARD: Number 19 is entitled growth patterns.

MS BARRETT: The experimental document.

MR. PRITCHARD: An experimental document, internal use only, a two-pager.

Number 20, unsettled areas, is not done yet.

If we can get some folders this afternoon, I'll come around and help you.

MR. BRUSEKER: I only have three pieces of paper left over. That's not bad.

MR. PRITCHARD: It's sort of like when you put a barbecue together.

MRS. BLACK: You have extra parts. You think they sent spares.

MS BARRETT: Or stuff from Ikea.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah. The two key parts are missing, and there are 14 extra [inaudible].

The extra pieces of paper you probably have are the three points to consider for the framework and the eight points for the mandate.

MR. DAY: What's this one I've got? It has this on it: McLachlin-Meredith.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that goes in number 1, doesn't it?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah, it goes in number 1, and it was the dates of those decisions. The only province that had redistribution after the judgment date was B.C.

MR. DAY: So these other two we're not numbering. The eight points and the framework aren't numbered?

MR. PRITCHARD: No; it's just a piece of information.

MR. DAY: Great. Fabulous.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I think Bob prefaced the remarks on number 19, the growth patterns. For example, the city of Edmonton is shown by 1991 to have 598,000. They currently have over 605,000. So his remarks about taking it with a grain of salt . . .

MR. DAY: Ditto with the numbers for Red Deer, so it's just backing up what Patrick says.

MRS. BLACK: Well, that's quite a pile of information, Bob. You have done a wonderful job.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And Ted.

MR. PRITCHARD: Well, I hope it's useful. And yes, you'll have to thank Ted.

MRS. BLACK: And Ted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bob was away on holiday.

MR. PRITCHARD: Ted for a good deal of it. Ted will get all the credit from this guy.

MRS. BLACK: It's quite a pile of information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is.

MR. PRITCHARD: Actually, we had fun collecting it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As you were calling back from Lake Louise. "Ted, how are you coming? How's the work going? What do you mean, you're going home to bed?"

MRS. BLACK: This week?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's only 10:30 at night.

MRS. BLACK: It's only Wednesday.

MR. SIGURDSON: Let's grab a coffee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, good idea.

[The committee adjourned from 2:24 p.m. to 2:31 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MS BARRETT: So now what?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We now have the material. Are we ready to proceed with the framework for building the report, or were there other ideas that members had? We do have the three points that were presented by Pam at our meeting of September 6; we reviewed them on the 7th. Three basic questions: the percentage variance between ridings, the urban/rural split, and the commission structure. Are you ready to go into that at this point in time?

MS BARRETT: Yup.

MR. BRUSEKER: Yes.

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Chairman, we asked some questions at our last meeting pertaining to our seven mandated areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MRS. BLACK: We had some discussion, some of which was coming as a result of information that was being handed out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. It's the document from the September 7 meeting, Mandate: Eight Points.

MS BARRETT: Uh huh.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MRS. BLACK: I'm wondering if a starting point might be to revisit those seven mandated areas, and then clarify as an approach some of the information. We've been given a ton of information here, and I don't know that we've . . . I mean, we took a five-minute break here, but I don't know that anybody's been able to look at the results of the information that has been passed out. I think there's a lot of very valuable information here. So possibly we should review the information that we've got as it pertained to some of the things that we questioned on our mandated items at our last meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Where would you like to begin?

MRS. BLACK: Well, for me, I guess number one is the Constitution.

MR. SIGURDSON: Do you want to walk through all eight points again, or do you just want to try and focus in on one particular point, such as the commission structure or something, so that we can get going? I mean, we do have some free time, and maybe this . . .

MRS. BLACK: Well, maybe that would be . . .

MR. SIGURDSON: I would like to take something that I think is possibly noncontentious and just focus in on it and start there for today. I hoped maybe we could start with the commission.

MS BARRETT: That would be great.

MR. SIGURDSON: The structure of the commission, the makeup of the commission, and then maybe move on to the number of seats.

MS BARRETT: It's probably a more logical way to go, I would think, if we can get some things off the table and then get down to the hard stuff. The more we can get off the table, the easier it is. It's a process of elimination.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair is in your hands. Do you wish to talk about the commission structure?

MR. DAY: I need just some clarification. In the framework for building the report – and, Pam, you had brought these three main points forward at the last meetings – you're envisioning, then, a report that is broken down basically into these three areas . . .

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR. DAY: . . . as opposed to being broken down into seven or eight areas, and then maybe summarizing and focusing in on these three?

MS BARRETT: No. I mean, the greatest questions that we must answer are those three questions, and on the commission structure you would also be asking how frequently the commission would be struck. But if you answer those questions, then after you come to your decision, you put them in the context of the eight points when you're doing your introductory comments or your executive summary or what have you. I mean, the issues boil down to those three questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think what you're really saying is that the eight points we have are all contained in one or more of the three points. The three points are the three critical issues that we're wrestling with.

MS BARRETT: Yup.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When it comes time to develop our report and our recommendations, we can go back to the points and so on, but for terms of discussion.

MS BARRETT: Right.

MRS. BLACK: I think it's just important that we do answer those seven mandated points directly.

MS BARRETT: I don't mind that; I just think that a lot of the answers will emerge as we go right into the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think Pam's looking for a starting point then, thinking that the structure of the commission, the makeup of the commission, might be an easy point or a good starting point.

MS BARRETT: I agree.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not necessarily easy. If we're going to do that, an excellent starting point, then, would be the document that Pat Ledgerwood provided for us which gives the breakdown across Canada. Are members comfortable with that?

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR. SIGURDSON: Yes.

MR. DAY: Well, since the mandate was formulated at the outset, it would seem to me logical that the mandate questions are discussed. I guess that's a question of the chick and the egg, Pam. The three would be directly answered once these seven are dealt with?

MS BARRETT: Yes.

MR. DAY: They would be directly answered.

MS BARRETT: In terms of efficiency, if you ask yourself seven questions or ask yourself three, which is more efficient when it comes to bottom line?

MR. DAY: Going from the seven to the three, but that's my narrow view and there seems to be consensus otherwise, so I'm going to defer to the collective wisdom around the table.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, let's start and see how far we get with the three points. Then we'll decide, based on progress or lack thereof, whether we continue with that process or go back to the mandated seven points plus the one additional point that we added. The additional point was to ensure that we could look at the triple E Senate and its ramifications for us provincially, keeping in mind that we have a unicameral House rather than a bicameral House. Pat, that was your point.

MRS. BLACK: Yeah.

MR. DAY: So we're looking at sheet 9?

MR. CHAIRMAN: So we're looking at sheet 9.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I have an observation already, and that is that when you have a look and see when the last commission was drawn - which basically implies the last time that it was reviewed usually, as well - what you'll see is that the tendency throughout Canada is now to go towards three on the commission as opposed to five or even seven. If you look at the dates, for instance - I mean, like New Brunswick hasn't drawn a commission since '74; they've still got five - all the ones that have been done in the '80s have gone down to three. Nova Scotia's still got five, but that's, like, nine years old already. The more current ones are all down at three now for members on the commission.

MR. BRUSEKER: The other observation I would like to make is that as I went through the electoral boundaries commissions, including Canada, most of them do not have elected members, whether they're MPs or MLAs or MNAs or whatever they call them. I have a question, really of Pat, regarding New Brunswick. It says that the composition of the commission is five members appointed by the Premier, and my question really was: does "appointed by Premier" include or does it exclude or does it say anything about elected members at all?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: The last commission originally had two elected members. However, once the commission started work, the two members resigned, and they were replaced by two citizens.

MR. BRUSEKER: So, similarly, what about Prince Edward Island, where it says "appointed by the Legislative Assembly"? Are those five members appointed by the Legislative Assembly

from the Legislative Assembly or from the population at large? Or do you know?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I should tell you that the last time they had a commission was in 1963.

MR. BRUSEKER: I noticed that.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: There aren't many good records available on that particular commission. I should also share with you the fact that once the commission did its work, the changes were reversed by the Legislature. It had to do with Charlottetown, where they put a seat in Charlottetown and took it away from one of the counties. What they did is they left it in Charlottetown and then gave it back to the county. So they went from 30 members to 32 members, as I recall. Remember that they have two-member ridings.

MR. BRUSEKER: So, in other words, with the exception of Alberta, all of the 1980s-vintage commissions were . . .

MS BARRETT: MLA-free.

MR. BRUSEKER: . . . MLA-free, if you want to call it that way. No elected members: I would support that for our . . .

MS BARRETT: So would I.

MR. BRUSEKER: So I would support that our commission should be MLA-free.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, let's focus on that question. We're talking about the composition of the commission and whether we follow the practice we've historically followed in Alberta of having current members sit or not.

Stock, then Mike.

MR. DAY: I appreciate wanting to focus on the question, Mr. Chairman. Could we just exhaust any other questions in general?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, sure. Fair enough.

MR. DAY: I wanted to ask Patrick - one of the reasons we're looking at this cross-Canada survey is to see if there's any wisdom we can glean that might help us. I gather that's why we're doing this. Is there anything we can learn or should look at in New Brunswick? Why would they have as a constant the vice-chairman from New Brunswick Telephone? Are you aware of any of the rationale behind that?

MR. BRUSEKER: That's 16 years ago.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Well, he was chairman of the commission; he just happened to be a citizen, and you'll notice that that was back in 1974.

MR. DAY: Okay. So they're not mandating that the vice-chairman . . .

MR. LEDGERWOOD: No, no. The chairperson at their '74 commission happened to be the vice-chairman of N.B. Tel., as a citizen.

MR. DAY: Okay.

Where it says "appointed by Premier" – has this been asked? – is that with concurrence by the House, the opposition parties? Is the history there that the Premier just appointed it and then there's a big fight, you know, a lot of hue and cry? What degree of concurrence do they work with; do you know?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I'm sorry; I don't have the answer.

MR. DAY: I realize these are sort of technical.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Anything that was that old, before the Charter, we didn't do a lot of research on.

MR. DAY: Okay, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Any other general questions on the chairperson, number of members, composition? Let's hold off on the later questions of enumeration or population and so on and stay right with the composition of the commission.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if maybe I should answer any direct questions people have for me, and then, because the Chief Electoral Officer may or may not be a member of the commission, possibly I could excuse myself for the detailed discussion.

MS BARRETT: Yeah; good idea.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Questions of clarification, then, directed to Pat.

Okay. Let's do that, Pat, and then Ted will give you a call. Will you be in your room?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: No, I'll just be out in the hall. It shouldn't take you very long.

MR. DAY: A man of great faith.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have any other work to do, any calls to make or anything?

MR. LEDGERWOOD: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You don't.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I'll be in room 1408.

MR. BRUSEKER: Just before you go, would you like to make a comment about the number of members of the commission? You were on the commission last time with a seven-member commission.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: It was a very awkward commission, but remember, it was very politically oriented.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the seven who were sitting members.

MR. BRUSEKER: Yes, I realize that.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: I was also on the federal commission as one of three commissioners, and I can tell you that it's much easier with three members than it is with seven, when you look at the logistics: trying to get three people together vis-à-vis

trying to get seven people together for your public hearings, for your meetings, and also to reach consensus. Really, what you need are individuals who have the necessary expertise: the knowledge of Alberta, some appreciation of just what the commission will be about, common sense. They really need to have a lot of common sense because there's a lot of give and take. I think we've discussed the nine factors, and you have to weigh some of those factors when you're drawing some of the lines.

MR. CARDINAL: And time. They've got to have time to do it, and not everybody has that.

MR. LEDGERWOOD: Uh huh. Time to do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, anything else of Pat? Thanks very much, Pat.

All right. Composition.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, well, I don't know where you want to begin, but I think it's clear that we need to decide whether or not the Chief Electoral Officer is on the commission. I don't know if you want to do motions, because I think we're trying to operate on consensus, but I would be inclined to support that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd rather we not try to deal with motions until after we've had a chance to report to our respective caucuses.

MS BARRETT: That's fine; that's what I'm saying.

I would certainly suggest that the Chief Electoral Officer be on the commission. I don't think there's any question.

MR. CARDINAL: Just a quick comment. You know, listening to presentations both from rural and urban presenters in the past year, I think people are asking for us to try and design a system that will provide an opportunity to have fair representation for all Albertans. We have to keep that in mind, move around that, make sure we try and meet those objectives. It seems to come across that the urban and rural municipalities want to participate this time, and I think we need to consider that seriously. They're interested. Both organizations represent a large body of people, and I think they should definitely be considered to participate in the whole process.

Now, I suspect that if that were to happen, we'd have to look at generally around five members maximum.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's deal with that next, okay?

MR. CARDINAL: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll deal with Pam's point first of all.

MRS. BLACK: Which is?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That the Chief Electoral Officer be a member of the commission.

MRS. BLACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that's difficult until you know what the size of your commission is going to be. You know, we've heard a lot of representations, as Mike has just said.

MR. CARDINAL: You should decide on the commission's size first.

MRS. BLACK: Depending on how much you're going to put as far as representation and, as Frank said at the last meeting, the strong urge to have urban and rural representatives on the commission, there may not be a spot for the Chief Electoral Officer. So I think that's a difficult issue to deal with until you know . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you rather talk about numbers at this point then?

MRS. BLACK: Well, I think numbers are important. I don't know; it's the wish of the committee, of course.

MR. BRUSEKER: Just in response to Pat's point, I would beg to differ a little bit. I think the Chief Electoral Officer, whoever he or she may be in the province, should have such a working knowledge that he's got the position in the first place. He's a logical person. I'm assuming "he" because currently we have a he; no offence here, ladies, but I think currently we have a male. I think the Chief Electoral Officer, if Pat Ledgerwood continues to be the Chief Electoral Officer, should be a member of the commission. I would argue that point regardless of whether we come up with a three-, a five-, or a seven-member commission.

MS BARRETT: I agree.

MRS. BLACK: Well, I guess my response to that is that I think he's a logical person, but I don't want to see the rest of the province eliminated from the process because of a given, because we're deciding who is going to be on the commission. So from my standpoint I'd like to see us talk further on the size of the commission first before we start plugging in players.

MS BARRETT: Okay. Well, if you want to talk about size, I think we come back to my point: all of the commissions that have been struck most recently, particularly in this decade, are down to three. Most of them are chaired by a judge or a chief justice or a retired judge. Most include the Chief Electoral Officer and one other person. It obviously seems to be a workable format, because people aren't changing and reversing that tendency. If they had been reversing that tendency, it would show already. What you have is a consistent trend towards three people whose positions I've described. If that were not the case, you would see the 1986 to 1989 commissions elsewhere in Canada growing in size as opposed to shrinking in size.

MR. DAY: This is an important discussion. Can I ask for a two-minute washroom break? Would that be possible?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Certainly. Okay.

[The committee adjourned from 2:49 p.m. to 3:35 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now we've reconvened. There have been some informal discussions during the coffee break, and I should also note that the Chief Electoral Officer was not in the room during those discussions. There is a consensus that the Chief Electoral Officer should be a member of the commission.

MR. BRUSEKER: I think we should continue our discussions with respect to the size of the commission, and we should do so in camera, so I move that the committee move in camera for the discussions about the makeup of the commission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. We have a motion that we move in camera. All in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried unanimously.

[The committee met in camera from 3:36 p.m. to 4:32 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're back into our general meeting, and we'll revert, Frank, to the first agenda item we dealt with today.

MR. BRUSEKER: Okay. Just reflecting on what has happened today, I'm wondering if we have - I'll just throw out a suggestion here. We've spent most of today talking about the commission: commission structure, the operation of the commission, and so forth. From our September 6 meeting we have this brief framework which talks about three points, and I'm wondering if perhaps what we should do is select tomorrow to discuss one of the other two points and see if we have some consensus, and then on Friday go into the other one. Then what I would like to see at the end of all of that is if we can have consensus points like this written out and sort of talk about some of the discussions that have occurred, and therefore we'll have some commonality when we go back to our caucuses. Because we've spent a fair bit of time on commission, I'm sure we're going to have a similar fair bit of discussion on the other two points. That might then give us something to go with from there, and maybe that's all the outline we can go with at this point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, if members are comfortable with that process, I see nothing wrong with it.

For the record, we should read in, on the makeup of the commission, that in addition to believing that the Chief Electoral Officer will be part of the commission, we've agreed that no current MLA would be part of the commission. Again, these are consensus points; members are not bound by them. There may be other factors which cause members, after sleeping on the issue, to believe that an issue should be brought back to the table and discussed again prior to any formal motions being made and passed. All right?

Then I think we're ready to move on to the second point, which was the transcripts and the embargo to be placed on the transcripts until we complete our work, recognizing that once our work is complete and a report made public, then all of the transcripts would become part of the public record and available to anyone who desires to check. Are we ready for a motion on that matter?

MR. PRITCHARD: If I could just ask if it could be quite detailed, because I want to know who I can give these things to. Can I give them to just you personally, your staff? Is it just for the seven committee members? Those sorts of details.

MR. SIGURDSON: I would move that transcripts stay in your office and committee members that wish to access them go to your office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're speaking of the seven members of the committee?

MR. SIGURDSON: The seven members of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. That's the motion. Any further discussion? Ready for the question? All in favour? Carried unanimously. Thank you.

Well, we've completed those two items very quickly. We still have almost half an hour before our intended adjournment time. Are there any other matters you'd like to deal with before we go back to the framework for building the report? Any other administrative matters, Bob, we should deal with before we rise today?

MR. PRITCHARD: No; I think that's fine.

MS BARRETT: If everybody was agreeable and there's nothing else for this part of the agenda, I'd sure be in favour of sticking around and getting into the substance of the other two matters prior to 5 p.m. That would be very efficient.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. DAY: Excuse me; I was in conference here. What was that, Pam?

MS BARRETT: Basically what I was saying is that if at this point we've done all the stuff that we need to do, I would be in favour of going in camera again and getting into the substantive issues that we've not yet dealt with and getting started on them until 5 p.m. or so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that a motion?

MS BARRETT: Yeah, sure, I'll so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Ready for the question? All in favour? Carried unanimously.

[The committee met in camera from 4:36 p.m. to 4:54 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. We're back into our general meeting, and there is a consensus on the question of whether we use the enumerated list or population list for the basis of redistribution. The consensus is that we use population, the most recent federal census figures available, and at the present time that would be the 1986 census.

We've also discussed the number of seats. While we have not come down hard on it, there seems to be a strong desire to either stay at 83 or, if there is an adjustment necessary, that it be a small adjustment upwards from that figure.

Is that agreed to?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other business to be brought forward today before we adjourn, recognizing that when we reassemble tomorrow morning at 8:30, we'll go right into the question of when the next redistribution should occur and the variations thereof.

MR. PRITCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to mention that our meeting tomorrow is in the Waterton Room, on the 17th floor.

MS BARRETT: Oh, really? So we can't leave our junk here?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, take everything out.

MR. PRITCHARD: You can take your stuff back to your room with you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Any other announcements? Arrangements for tonight are made, Bob? We're meeting for dinner this evening.

MR. PRITCHARD: That's right; 5:30 till 7 in the Owl's Nest, and everybody here is invited.

MRS. BLACK: Motion to adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion to adjourn: Pat.

MS BARRETT: Seconded.

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

[The committee adjourned at 4:56 p.m.]