



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission
Public Hearings

Peace River

Thursday, January 19, 2017
9:30 a.m.

Transcript No. 7

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

Electoral Boundaries Commission

Justice Myra Bielby, Chair

Gwen Day
Laurie Livingstone
W. Bruce McLeod
D. Jean Munn

Support Staff

Robert H. Reynolds, QC
Shannon Dean
Aaron Roth
Shannon Parke
Tracey Sales
Janet Schwegel

Clerk
Law Clerk and Director of House Services
Administrator
Communications Officer
Communications Consultant
Managing Editor of *Alberta Hansard*

Electoral Boundaries Commission Public Hearings – Peace River

Public Participants

Barry Anuszewski

Veronica Bliska, Councillor, Municipal District of Peace

Peter Frixel, Councillor, Clear Hills County

Debbie Jabbour, MLA, Peace River

Sylvia Johnson, President, Region 6, Métis Nation of Alberta

Bryan Taylor

Brian Wincherauk

9:30 a.m.

Thursday, January 19, 2017

[Justice Bielby in the chair]

The Chair: Good morning. I think we'll get started. Thanks very much for coming out.

I'm Justice Myra Bielby. In my day job I'm a judge of the Court of Appeal of Alberta, but at the moment I'm also chairing the provincial Electoral Boundaries Commission. I'd like to introduce the other members of the commission: on my far left, Jean Munn from Calgary; Laurie Livingstone from Calgary; on my far right, Gwen Day from Carstairs; and then Bruce McLeod of Acme.

Someone mentioned just a moment ago that this seems to have come up suddenly. We've been on the road and actively engaged for a few weeks now, but I must say that since our advertising started going out, many people have approached me and said: "What's this all about? Why are you doing it?" So I thought I'd start by just giving a thumbnail of the purpose of the Electoral Boundaries Commission.

It's been created to research and make recommendations to our Legislature as to where and how and whether our provincial constituency boundaries should be changed to ensure effective, proper representation by our MLAs in future provincial elections. It's needed at this time in particular because Alberta has experienced a huge increase in population since the time of the last Electoral Boundaries Commission, about eight years ago. Our population has increased net by more than 20 per cent since 2010 even taking into account the recent economic downturn.

Alberta has 87 provincial constituencies – that's set by legislation – and on this occasion the Legislature hasn't seen fit to increase that number. Sometimes in the past with a previous Electoral Boundaries Commission there have been additional constituencies created. In 2009-2010 four new constituencies were added, raising the number from 83 to 87. But this time the number of 87 has been left, and we, the commission, have no power to increase or decrease that number. We're obliged to make recommendations as to how the province should be divided into 87 areas. If you think of it as a big pizza, we're slicing that into 87 pieces, not all the same size but with the same general plan or goals in relation to each piece.

As we all know, each constituency elects a single Member of the Legislative Assembly. Each voter has the right to vote in a constituency and, thus, votes to select that one MLA. Our population has increased by 20 per cent, but – and this gets down to the core of it – the 800,000-plus people who have moved into Alberta in the last eight years have not moved equally or proportionally into each of the 87 constituencies. Rather, more of them have moved into some constituencies than into others, but I think it's a testament to our phenomenal rate of growth that virtually every constituency in Alberta has grown by some amount in the last eight years.

If you look at our wall map there, the one to the farthest left – those are all the constituencies in Alberta – you'll see that each constituency has two numbers on it. The number in blue is the constituency size in 2009-2010, the last time the boundaries commission did its work, and that was the basis on which the current constituency boundaries were set, the basis for the setting of the Peace River boundaries, for example, which are on the map immediately to the right of that. Above that are the numbers for the constituency as it is today, based on estimated figures.

If I can just look behind me, Peace River in 2010 had 35,963 people in it, and now it's estimated to have 41,400 people in it. The provincial average the last time was about 40,800 people, achieved by dividing 87 into the population of the province. This time we're estimating that that number is going to be 48,884 exactly, based on

estimates given to us by the Alberta Treasury Board. However, those figures will be adjusted on February 8 to refer to the actual census data because we're promised the release of the 2016 census data by Statistics Canada on February 8. I don't expect there will be big changes, but our total population figures for both the province and for this constituency will be based on those figures.

So we can see that the average population here of 41,000 and some-odd is below the provincial average. Some constituencies are above; some constituencies are below. Here the amount of difference, sometimes called the variance, has increased. Last time you were 12 per cent below the provincial average, and now you're 15 per cent below the provincial average. That, in and of itself, isn't the be-all and end-all, but it kind of defines what our work is.

In 2010 85 per cent of the provincial constituencies fell within 10 per cent of the provincial average, but because of the increase in our population, we now have a much wider swing between our smallest constituency population, 25,192, and our largest, 79,034. Again, that's happened largely because the people who moved into Alberta have moved more into certain constituencies – Edmonton, Calgary, Fort McMurray, Grande Prairie, Red Deer – than perhaps into other parts of the province. The commission's job is to make recommendations as to how, where, and when constituency boundaries should move to ensure that Albertans continue to have effective representation in the Legislature. That doesn't mean that your boundaries are going to change here, but it means that they might change.

Our goal is to have clear and understandable boundaries – that's an umbrella goal – and we consider the following factors. We start with population figures, just as I've talked about, relative population densities. We also take into consideration common community interests and community organizations, including those of First Nation communities and Métis settlements. We take into consideration boundaries for existing communities and neighbourhoods. In the bigger cities, Edmonton and Calgary, they have different neighbourhoods pretty clearly delineated. We're going to try to avoid cutting through specific neighbourhoods, and we're going to try to avoid cutting through municipal, city, county, town, village boundaries if we can so that the entire community is within one constituency. But it's not just formalized communities we're looking at. We're also looking at communities of interest, different groups that have a slightly different culture, different faith-based groups, what have you, in our journey. It isn't just municipally defined groups.

We're also taking into account geographical features that might suggest natural boundaries. Sometimes within the province you'll look and you'll see a river defining the boundary of many constituencies; for example, in Edmonton and in Calgary. Also, major roadways can be taken into account because, maybe intuitively, people understand that if they live on one side of the road, they're in one constituency and on the other side of the road, the other. So that's another consideration.

But this list isn't closed, and that's one of the reasons we're having these public hearings. There may be other factors that you think should be taken into account in determining whether your MLAs can continue to provide effective representation for your constituency.

Over these next few weeks our commission will hold public hearings throughout the province – there's the province map; that's just a reproduction of the one on the wall – to seek community input in developing our recommendations. Thanks very much to everybody who's come today and particularly to those who have registered to make presentations.

In addition to these oral hearings, we're considering written submissions as to where constituency boundaries should be set. I'm

gratified to say that last time, in the entire year of the commission's work, they got 500 written submissions. This time we got 300 written submissions in the first two weeks of our work. That is, I have to say, in part because we've made it much easier to make a submission. Our very first submission that we got was from somebody's iPhone sending, actually, a really great idea for moving a boundary to reflect a county line in a constituency, and he just did it in two sentences on his iPhone. So we range from that to people who've sent in longer, written formal submissions, et cetera.

9:40

But we invite anybody who's here who has thoughts after today or what have you to make a further written submission or a written submission. Just go to our website at abebc.ca and follow along, and it will describe how those submissions should be made.

After we are finished our hearings, the commission will be meeting together and going through each one of the 87 constituencies, one after the other, and considering all of your submissions and the criteria set out in the legislation, in the Electoral Boundaries Commission Act, that I've just gone through, and we'll come up with a draft recommendation or an interim or tentative recommendation for each of the constituencies. That will be filed with the Legislature before May 31 of this year, and it will be made public. We'll publish it on our website, and I'm sure that it will be publicized in other ways as well.

At that point we hope that the public will look at our recommendations for their constituency, and at that point they may have thoughts that they didn't have at this time, or they may want to comment on a recommendation. So we'll be inviting further written submissions, and we'll have a second round of public hearings, which will likely be held in late July or early August. We'll then reconsider our recommendations, decide if any need to be changed as a result of what we've heard, and we'll file our final report with the provincial Legislature no later than October 31, 2017.

At that point the Legislature will consider whether those recommendations should be adopted and introduced into provincial legislation. That's always happened in the past with the Electoral Boundaries Commission, so we're hopeful that that will happen on this occasion as well. The boundaries for the next provincial election will be set on the basis of the recommendations which were made in part on the basis of your submissions.

Just to go through our process, equality or parity of population is a consideration but not our only consideration. The Supreme Court of Canada, in looking at electoral boundaries legislation, has stated that it means that each citizen has the right not to have the political strength or value of their vote unduly diluted. But, that said, our legislation permits variances from the provincial average population, where necessary, of up to 25 per cent above or 25 per cent below average and, for a maximum of four constituencies, up to 50 per cent below average. Now, that's, I think, probably of particular interest here in the north because we have two constituencies in Alberta – we could have four, but we have two at the moment – that fall into the latter group and are more than 25 per cent below the provincial average: not Peace River but your neighbours Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley, which has a population about 50 per cent lower than average, and Lesser Slave Lake, with a population 38 per cent below average.

We're here to receive your input because you'll be the people who are directly affected by changes to your constituency boundary. Know that even though the legislation allows variances of up to 25 per cent generally in the province, past commissions have tried to reduce the amount of variance as much as they could to assure that voters had relatively equal weight given to their vote. In

2010 the report that was adopted contained recommendations that saw 85 per cent of the constituencies in Alberta come in at a variance of less than 10 per cent from the provincial average, and that is consistent with what's been done in the past. So it may well be that we'll be aiming at that type of goal on this occasion or even to reduce variances beyond that.

We start our task by looking at the actual population in a constituency, in your constituency, based on the StatsCan data released February 8, comparing that to the average for the province, again based on StatsCan data – at the moment we're estimating it at 48,800 people – and then deciding if there's an acceptable reason not to move the boundaries in or out to change constituency size so that a number closer to the provincial average is reached.

If you think there's a good reason not to do that here – for example, because you are well below the provincial average – it would be terrific if you were able to tell us that today. Also, if you have a view as to why your constituency boundary should be moved because of what it's like to live in your constituency, particularly near a boundary, if you have an idea as to communities that should be included but for some reason, you know, are orphaned into the next constituency or whatever, that's been particularly helpful. What we've found as we've gone around the province is that people who live in certain areas have been giving us really helpful ideas as to how to, you know, on a small level change their boundaries to improve life in their constituencies, and we're certainly here to welcome that as well.

With that in mind, we've got a laminated map of the Peace River constituency over there, so if anybody has an idea as to how a boundary should be moved, during their presentation we're going to welcome them to go up to that map. We'll give them a marker, and they can show exactly what they think. Then our clerk will take a photo of that, and that'll be part of the record so that we'll have that photo in front of us when we are making our decisions.

All that we're saying today here is being recorded by *Hansard*, so just be aware that everything you say is going to go on the public record. That will be posted on our website in written form in a couple of days. Also, there's an audio form, so if you want to listen to the hearing, you can go to the website and do that.

With that in mind, I think we'll move to calling on our first presenter, Bryan Taylor. Well, there you go.

Mr. Taylor: May I approach first?

The Chair: Please.

Mr. Taylor: Okay. I brought some copies of my presentation.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Taylor: Sorry. I'm two copies short here.

The Chair: No problem. Okay.

Mr. Taylor: All right. Okay. It's working.

The Chair: So you reside in the Peace River constituency, I see, Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Yes. I reside in the town of Peace River as well.

The Chair: Okay. All right.

Mr. Taylor: Okay. Good morning, Madam Justice and commissioners. Thanks for having me here today, and thanks for having me here first as well.

The Peace River constituency currently includes a wide swath of land stretching as far south as Nampa all the way west to the B.C. border and as far north as the Northwest Territories itself. As you probably already know, it includes a wide variety of communities both in the Peace Country as well as up in the Mackenzie region: High Level, Rainbow Lake, those communities. But even though the Peace River itself goes all the way north into the Mackenzie region, that doesn't mean that people in this particular region are always recognized.

When a great number of people that I talk to in the area think of Peace River, they usually think, well, of the town, not always the water. So, in fact, until our current MLA took office, there has never been an MLA who's set up an office anywhere other than in the town of Peace River. Now Ms Jabbour there has offices in both High Level and in Peace River, which I think is a good start. But more can be done, obviously. I realize that no actual decisions are being made today, but when they are, I'd like to see a possible name change considered for the constituency.

I do have a couple of options for your consideration, those being either Peace River-Mackenzie or North Peace-Mackenzie. The former would include the biggest town to the south of the constituency as well as the region up north including, of course, High Level, La Crête, Fort Vermilion, and Rainbow Lake, all of which are surrounded by a county known as Mackenzie county. As for the latter, the reasons for Mackenzie are the same as above, and for North Peace it not only includes the town of Peace River, but it also encompasses communities like Manning, North Star, Dixonville, and various Métis settlements in the area. Of course, in Peace River our junior B hockey team is actually called the North Peace Navigators, not the Peace River Navigators.

The Chair: Okay. If I could interrupt you . . .

Mr. Taylor: Oh, go ahead.

The Chair: Your two suggested name changes again: Peace River-Mackenzie and . . .

Mr. Taylor: North Peace-Mackenzie.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Taylor: Yeah. And it's on the sheet I gave you.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Taylor: All I ask today is that you take my proposal into consideration. This is a short presentation, so I thank you for hearing what I had to say, and if you have any questions, I'm here.

The Chair: Okay. Thanks very much, Mr. Taylor. I think we probably do have some questions. This isn't suggesting we've got an idea in mind or we've set our view, because we haven't. We just started on this process a few days ago.

Mr. Taylor: Fair enough.

The Chair: But we're asking ourselves these questions in regard to each constituency. When we come to Peace River, we look at it and it's estimated to be about 7,000 people shy of the provincial average. If we found we had to increase the size of the constituency – and I'm not saying we will, but if we had to – do you think that we should go east or south?

Mr. Taylor: Probably more west than south, I would say. If you go much further east you'd hit – there aren't that many towns in the

northeast part of the constituency that we don't already have, but in the southeast there are a few like High Prairie, for instance. In the west and south part, well, Grimshaw is an obvious one, and we're five, 10 minutes away from there, the town here. Then, of course, Fairview is only about an hour away. Yeah. I would say more southwest would be the better idea.

9:50

The Chair: Okay. Just looking at the map now, that would take in a bit of the northeast of Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley and some of Lesser Slave Lake.

Mr. Taylor: Some of it. Yes.

The Chair: Okay. Of course, we'll be looking at those constituency boundaries as well. This is a trick question, but because you're here and we're not going to be sitting in those two constituencies – we're talking about the whole province, really, in every one of these hearings, but we're particularly interested in these two constituencies because they're the exceptional ones. Do you have any thoughts as to maybe if we had to move down into Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley to increase the size of Peace River? We would presumably have to then increase the size of that constituency – that's our smallest constituency – by moving that boundary as well. If you want to, I'm inviting you – you don't have to – to go up and look at the map and see what's immediately south of Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley, but I'm guessing we're getting close to Grande Prairie there.

Mr. Taylor: Yeah, some of the Grande Prairie communities. Yes.

The Chair: Okay. Any thoughts as to how we might move the boundaries in those two constituencies if we had to do it?

Mr. Taylor: Well, I haven't really looked at the map that closely in that part of the constituency, but, yeah, it does get pretty close to Grande Prairie.

The Chair: Okay. All right.

Any questions?

Do you have any questions for us?

Mr. Taylor: I think I covered them when I interviewed you for the radio station.

The Chair: Okay. All right. Well, thanks very much, Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Oh, you're welcome.

The Chair: I invite you to stay, and maybe you'll get some more information for your radio station. That would be terrific.

Mr. Taylor: All right. It will be nice to see some of the other presentations today.

The Chair: Absolutely. I think some of them are going to be very interesting.

Now, I've just got a note here that our presenter for 10:10 is going to be a few minutes late, so, as I spoke earlier, we're so lucky to have the hon. Debbie Jabbour here this morning, the Deputy Speaker. She indicated a willingness to answer questions, so if she still has that willingness, I'd invite her to come up to the microphone if you have anything you'd like to say, and then we can ask you some questions. That would be terrific.

Ms Jabbour: Well, good morning, everyone. Thank you so much for coming to Peace River. It's always a pleasure to host visitors

here. I'm fascinated by the whole Electoral Boundaries Commission process. I was privileged to view most of the previous one. It's really interesting but challenging work that you guys have ahead of you, so I appreciate you taking that on.

This constituency, of course, is the largest one in the province physically, and it represents a few challenges to get coverage across that. I've been giving the matter a lot of thought about, you know, whether we'd have to increase the size and how the challenges would be met. One of the ways I've done that, of course, is having the two offices. That's made a big, big difference. It's really nice having the office up in High Level where I can connect. That's where I actually live, and I can connect better with all the communities up there. My assistant does a lot of active outreach. He gets out to the communities. He represents me, and I think that's key if you're trying to have a large rural constituency.

Actually, Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley and Lesser Slave Lake both have two offices as well, but the problem that we have encountered – and we will be making a joint written presentation, the three constituencies, because we have some ideas about things. The challenge is that we don't have enough funding. I realize that you have no control over this, but there isn't enough funding to really effectively manage two offices. I've only got enough funding to manage one full-time staff and then a part-time, and I believe that's the same for the other two constituencies. You know, I look at the big picture. It would be more expensive to have an extra MLA, so I think it's better if a little more funding was directed to help us manage what we've got. That's one of the considerations.

You know, now our technology has made things a lot easier, so, again, we can do things like a travelling office. I know some of the constituencies in the province have got an assistant with a laptop who travels around to the communities and sets up kind of the mobile office, which I think has some great potential. Again, you know, you need the funding to support that and mileage costs and so forth. So I think it's doable to make them a little bit bigger, but we would have to really think about how we support that.

The Chair: Okay. The previous speaker just suggested maybe going into Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley. Do you have any thoughts on that as to how that might work?

Ms Jabbour: Well, again, I think we'll cover some of those in our joint submission. But, certainly, you know, there are some logical – I know I get people from Grimshaw coming into my office here in Peace River all the time because it's just natural. They gravitate here. I get even communities like Little Buffalo, those areas across that way, that tend to come into Peace River for services. On the other side I've got the Tallcree. They go up to Fort Vermilion. That's their natural place where they go to do their business and their affairs.

So I think those are all important considerations because, you know, these are people who need representation, and if it's difficult for them to access that representation by having to do significant travel or whatever, I don't think that that's right. I think that for us I believe that's going to be kind of our key guiding – I can't think of the right word but help guide us in our decisions on what we would suggest.

The Chair: Sure. Aside from Grimshaw and Little Buffalo are there any other communities that just come to mind that might fall outside of this constituency but are close enough that those folks come into Peace River to shop and go to the doctor or whatever?

Ms Jabbour: I think that once you get further south – yeah, they start to go down into Valleyview if you get too far south, so I'm not sure that we get a lot much further south than that. Fairview: there

is an office in Fairview, of course, so I don't know that many of them come this direction. Lots go to Grande Prairie for their services. I mean, High Level: for doctor appointments, hospital that's kind of where they have to go. People up here are used to travelling long distances.

The Chair: Right.
A question?

Mr. McLeod: Yeah. In some of the presentations that we've had over the last number of days, there have been discussions about the rural-urban, and some are in favour of that. Like, we heard in Fort McMurray that it works very well. Obviously, it sounds like it works very well up here. But in other areas there is really an angst with that. They say, "Don't do it," you know, all this. What's your opinion on the rural-urban kind of blending, if you want to call it that?

Ms Jabbour: I think it depends a lot on the nature of what the makeup of each area is. For me one of the bigger challenges is that I've got such diversity. You know, I've got the First Nations; I've got the Métis settlement; I've got Peace River, which is very urban in many respects. Then you've got High Level, which is a completely different makeup. You've got the oil towns, Rainbow Lake and Zama. So it's those unique, distinct kind of needs that I think can create some issues, where – it doesn't have to be unsurmountable. I think that there are differences, certainly, but I kind of like having both types. It keeps my job interesting. It gives me a much wider perspective when I can hear both of that, the urban and rural pieces. I don't mind it for me personally. I know it doesn't work for everybody.

Mr. McLeod: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Just picking up on that, do most of the people in your riding have access to the Internet to e-mail you, for example?

Ms Jabbour: That's a good question. When you get further north, it's pretty iffy. Most of the First Nations up there really struggle with access. They have e-mail, but in the schools they have to – that's really the only place where they have reliable connection. Cellphones are pretty iffy. We've got long stretches when you travel where there's absolutely no connection whatsoever. It's something we're all aware of up here and we're working on. I also happen to be chair of the Northern Alberta Development Council, and something that's very high on our agenda is to work towards more reliable broadband access up here. It's really important that we have that up here, in the north.

10:00

The Chair: That's interesting to know. Do you have any projections in that work or otherwise that might give you an idea as to the rate of improvement in Internet delivery? I remember as a judge sitting in Grande Prairie and having to wait till high school got out before we could send an e-mail to Edmonton. You know, even within my time, as long as it has been, there have been significant advances. Do you see that continuing to occur in the north?

Ms Jabbour: I think so. You know, we're having a lot of conversations about it, and there's enough impetus, I think, right now to really get this moving forward. Hopefully, in the very near future, I think, we're going to see some improvements.

The Chair: Within the next eight years, before the next Electoral Boundaries Commission, for example?

Ms Jabbour: I think so, yeah. I might be being very hopeful.

The Chair: Okay.

Mrs. Day: If I may. Thank you for your presentation. I'm curious. We've heard a number of different speakers talk about the distances in the large ridings especially. How would you share about the desire for people to have, like, face-to-face one-on-ones as opposed to sending an e-mail if they could or phoning and about just getting out to those small rural communities, with your schedule and with getting to parliament in Edmonton, et cetera? How do you find that in this large riding?

Ms Jabbour: Definitely it's a challenge to get a lot of face-to-face connections, but I find that the culture is kind of shifting. You know, there's still a segment that really enjoys that face-to-face, but more and more I'm finding that people are quite comfortable – we've got technology that allows us to do face-to-face on your phone, right? Skyping: again, that's tied back to having reliable broadband access up here in a lot of respects.

But we're used to – in the hospital in High Level, for example, we do medical consultations by video conference. Doctors' appointments sometimes can be done that way as well. These are things that we're looking at as ways that people can connect. Again, for me, I think if I was going to do more of that kind of virtual – ideally, I would love to be able to do video conferences with constituents if they had access to that kind of technology, and I think people more and more are starting to see that as a good alternative. People up here understand. This is a huge constituency, and they know that I'm just one MLA and I can't get out there, but my assistants have been really good about connecting with the community and making sure that their concerns are heard. I think there are ways to make it work.

Mrs. Day: So your constituents would feel they have had adequate access to you personally via these different modes, and you get out into the community for events that have some expectation around them, too, I suppose, to attend?

Ms Jabbour: Based on the feedback I've heard, I think so, you know. Most of them. Maybe not everybody, but most people seem satisfied that they can find me.

Mrs. Day: Yeah. Okay. Great. Thank you for your comments.

Ms Munn: Good morning. Thank you for coming. The question that I have for you is – you know, this is Alberta. We can't underestimate the importance of the rural voice in government, not historically, not currently. It's a very important voice. What I'd like you to comment on is whether you think that voice would be less heard, would be given less importance if there were fewer rural ridings in Alberta?

Ms Jabbour: I don't think so. You know, I don't think it would diminish the rural voice. Again, I think it depends on the individual MLA and the responsibility. We have a responsibility to make our constituents heard in the Legislature – and we all take that very seriously – and bring those concerns forward. Realistically, the population has migrated to the cities. I know we have to find that balance, but to me the rural voice is extremely, extremely important.

Ms Munn: It depends on the quality of the representatives as opposed to sheer numbers.

Ms Jabbour: Yeah. I hate to say “the quality of representatives” because it's not really a quality issue, but it's the job that we do and the responsibility that we hold, that we have to make sure that we are bringing those concerns forward.

I mean, even those, I think, have changed. I happen to be very fortunate that I've got a very large agricultural community with a lot of farms and that kind of thing whereas other areas of the province have kind of – I've got lots of family farms whereas other areas, I think, have kind of gravitated to the larger companies taking over, and they're not so much that small community farm anymore. It's kind of different.

Ms Munn: The rural voice is diverse in itself.

Ms Jabbour: It really is. Yeah, it really is.

Ms Munn: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. I'm going to try to avoid sounding presumptuous by asking this question, but somebody raised this in Fort McMurray yesterday. You mentioned the number of First Nations people who live in your constituency, so I want to ask you whether you've talked to First Nations members, whether they have any interest in this, whether they thought it would be a good idea or unnecessary.

This is a big, different idea, but it's offering a seat or two seats to First Nations people. It would be, realistically, virtual; in other words, there would be no land attached to them. Presumably, First Nations people and Métis would be given the opportunity to register or choose to vote in that constituency rather than in the constituency in which they physically reside so that there would be a guaranteed First Nation MLA, at least one of them, in the province. Have you any sense of whether your constituents would think that's of value, to think about that sort of thing? Or is it just not going to work because of the diversity of where everybody lives and the distances and so forth?

Ms Jabbour: That's a very interesting concept. It's hard for me to make a comment because I hadn't even really thought about that before. I think one of the challenges is that each First Nations community has its own distinct culture. They've each got their own councils, and they don't always have the same – you might assume that there's some commonality of interests, but that's not necessarily true, so I think you may find that that would be a bit of a challenge. I certainly can't speak for any of the nations. I don't know where they would fall on an idea like that. We have a long path ahead of us to try and work on better relationships and respecting their own sovereignty as nations. It could be an interesting concept. I just have no idea whether it would work.

The Chair: We're not the people to make that decision.

Ms Jabbour: Absolutely not.

The Chair: We are, in a way, the people to at least have a bit of a conversation about it.

Okay. In your experience as Deputy Speaker and because you're not just representing Peace River but you're representing all Albertans to a degree in your work in the Legislature – you've made some interesting and helpful comments about the perception of competing rural and urban interests – is there any other change you can specifically identify, other than wanting a larger budget, which I respect completely, that would help you do your work as a representative in Alberta?

Ms Jabbour: Well, again, staff support is the big one. You know, you've got to have people that can help you out and be there for you

and make sure that you're hearing what's going on in every corner of your constituency if possible. That, for me, is kind of the main one. I can't think offhand of anything else that really would be . . .

The Chair: Okay. Holding your feet to the fire here . . .

Ms Jabbour: You really are. I wasn't prepared for all these questions.

The Chair: No, I know. But sometimes recommendations are more effective the more specific they are. I'm sure that any money would be welcome, but what kind of percentage increase in your budget would allow you, for example, to hire somebody full-time rather than part-time for your secondary office?

10:10

Ms Jabbour: My costs for a full-time: it runs to about \$60,000, \$70,000 for one full-time staff for a year. That's not extravagant by any stretch. At the very least if I could have a full-time staff in each office so that I could have them – you know, that would be a big difference. So I don't think we're talking a lot of increased funding. The other increase that would be affected would be for mileage so that they could travel around and get from one place to another.

The Chair: Okay. Do they get a certain number of cents per mile, or is it that they have a cap that they can't exceed?

Ms Jabbour: No. The way it's done is that MLAs – it's a little bit different – have an allotment. We can go up to 80,000 kilometres, I believe, in a year, but any mileage incurred by my assistants comes out of my constituency budget. The government rate, I believe, is about 54 cents per kilometre, something like that. For my assistant to travel, say, from High Level to Fort Vermilion would cost something in the vicinity of about \$80 back and forth, so it can add up quickly. Again, we're not talking huge amounts of money but a little bit. I understand. I've heard, you know, the comments in the city that they have to pay a lot more rent for a single office than we do for two offices, but really it's the staffing component that makes the difference.

The Chair: It's the biggest percentage of your budget. That would be true in the city as well?

Ms Jabbour: I think so. But when you've only got one office, you know, you don't necessarily need two full-time staff.

The Chair: Right. Okay. Any other suggestions, ideas, thoughts for us?

Ms Jabbour: Not at the moment, but, as I say, we will be doing them in writing as we get through this process, for sure.

The Chair: Yes. And we'll look forward to receiving that.

Ms Jabbour: I know we have some more. In commenting with my colleagues, you know, I think our biggest concern is to make sure that our constituents have access to their representative and that they feel that their voice is being heard, so whatever decisions are made and however boundaries are drawn, that always has to be at the heart of it.

The Chair: Okay. All right. Well, thank you so much. Thanks for coming out and being willing to be spontaneous with us.

Ms Jabbour: No problem. Thank you.

The Chair: All right. Now, the next speaker is scheduled right now, and we got a note here that he's going to be replaced by Barry Anuszewski. Is Mr. Anuszewski here? Okay. Well, he may not be here quite yet.

But I understand that Peter Frixel is here. Would you come forward, please. Welcome. Do you reside in the Peace River constituency?

Mr. Frixel: Yes. Thank you for coming up here, by the way. I live on the very west border, close to B.C., in Clear Hills county. I'm also a councillor for Clear Hills county. I wasn't going to speak today, so I don't have a fancy speech, and I'm very not politically correct. It's not my job, so I hope you understand that. I'm trying to speak from my heart.

You know, I came up here as a – something that Bruce McLeod said really triggered me off, and that's why I went back to register. I came from a place, a heavy urban area. I did the university thing and the big three-piece suit thing and Mr. Important through the financial community. That was in my younger days, and then I moved up to the Peace River country by choice. I don't live here because I was born here and didn't leave. I came here by choice because I saw something I didn't see anywhere else in Canada. I saw women work – I never saw that before where I lived – running heavy equipment. I saw guys go out in the bush, risk their lives. Yeah, every once in a while I heard that somebody got killed.

I guess I could go on and on, but in a roundabout way I'm trying to respond to Bruce McLeod's point. There is a major, major cultural difference between urban and rural, to the point where when we drive to Edmonton, when I see highway 16, I just want to turn around and go back home. We say: how do these people live? When they come up north, they say: how do you people live? I could go home today, it might look great, but if I get drifted in and do something stupid and get stuck on a secondary coming home, there's no cellphone. If I phoned 911, they'd go: you're where? That happened to me when I phoned the RCMP several years ago: you're where? You know, it's such a different culture. I'm going to leave that one at that, and I'm going to relate something that happened as quickly as I can.

I started a beekeeping operation. The rural environment allows us to create GDP, which makes all your salaries and probably part of mine – it makes the money go round and round. We had a viable beekeeping industry up north – everyone envied it – until political will decided that it should be shut down because we were bumping into something else. My point is that our Member of Parliament at the time went to Ottawa and stood up and said, "We've got a serious problem here with our beekeeping industry," and he was told to shut up and sit down.

The reason I bring that up is because there is a real feeling amongst the rural people that we're losing voice. We are losing population, we're losing our kids, even, that are going to the city for the easier life maybe or whatever reason, and I think there's a real fear that we are losing political clout. I'm just going to be really honest with you on that.

I don't know. Maybe I should just stop there and say that that is one of the big issues, the difference between urban and rural.

The Chair: Thank you. I'm going to ask you the same question that I've asked everybody else, and that is: if we found that we had to change the boundaries of the Peace River constituency, not that we've made up our minds, because we haven't and, in particular because you're in a unique situation, surrounded by these special constituencies, but all of that said, do you have anything to add or differ with the previous speakers on how they thought that might work out, by going down into Grimshaw and other areas?

Mr. Frixel: Can I exercise my right to not be politically correct?

The Chair: I have heard nothing not politically correct so far, so . . .

Mr. Frixel: I'd have to respond that I feel that I'm very much in sync with the people that chose me to represent them. When asked a question like that, I'll just be perfectly honest. We've gone through a change of government. I really don't care whether the government is NDP, Conservative, Liberal; it makes no difference to me. My response to that is: I think there are a whole lot of more important issues to deal with than this. I mean no disrespect to this commission, really. You guys have a job to do, and it's a very difficult one, but from the viewpoint of the people, there are a lot of more important things.

I'll give you one little example; I always like giving little examples. The minister of transport, his name was Ed Stelmach. That was about 20 years ago. When we travel at night – we have long winter days, a lot darker than Calgary would, so we travel a lot at night. The government has since that time not paid any attention to or spent any money on putting lines on the highways. Most of the time it's a free-for-all out there. If you want to do a free-for-all with a log truck, a loaded one, and he doesn't know where he is, and I don't where I'm at, and we're coming at each other at 100 clicks, it's no fun. That's just one example of one little thing.

You know, they force you to wear a seat belt, they hide behind places to nab you for speeding, but there are no lines on the highways, so nobody knows where they're at. That's the kind of common-sense thing that people look at, and they really look at this and say: "Why are we discussing this boundary thing? There are a million other things that we want dealt with."

The Chair: Okay.

Ms Munn: If the constituency of whatever it's going to be called – Peace-Mackenzie or North Peace or the Peace River constituency – had more people in it, do you think it would have a louder voice? You know, you talked earlier about losing population in the area, losing voice, losing your children. If the land mass were greater but it had a greater population so there were more people, do you think that would help with voice, with representation?

10:20

Mr. Frixel: Not necessarily. Maybe I don't fully understand your question. I have to say that I think it matters on the quality of the member who represents us as well. I should maybe mention that it takes about three hours to drive from one end of our county to the other, and that's just a county. I've always said that there should be two representatives, two elected representatives: one that stays in Edmonton and deals with the business of government there and the other one who stays here just to deal with the local issues and have contact with people.

I agree with what the MLA said. I think she correctly identifies that there are not resources to run two offices, to have a receptionist or somebody to answer the phone. In the same way, I think the electoral boundary right now is huge. I honestly don't think an MLA can with good conscience say that he's really representing it that well. A lot of us would like to talk to our MLA. It's very difficult, and they have a lot of things to do in Edmonton.

The Chair: Just building on that because that is one of the themes that we've been hearing elsewhere in the province, have you actually e-mailed your MLA? Lots?

Mr. Frixel: Oh, I don't think we want to go there. I'm quite vocal. If I really want her, I'll find her. But, I mean, that's not how it

should work. A person, if he has an issue, should be able to phone and be able to get some pretty good, call it, service. I'm not saying that, you know, it doesn't happen, but again it's one of those things: there's not enough of an MLA to go around such a huge area.

Ms Munn: But if we are limited to the number of MLAs that we can have – and we are by the legislation; we can't add MLAs – do you think that adding more support for that MLA, so that you could at least talk to the assistant, would be the answer?

Mr. Frixel: Certainly. Yeah. I think our constituency also has two offices. Well, it's a good two and a quarter hours from my place to the far office, just to give you an idea. That's driving time, probably a little over the speed limit. Then the other one would be, you know, in my case, only about a half-hour away. So the placement of those two offices does work, but a lot of the time you phone there and there's just an answering machine.

The Chair: You'd like to hear a voice on the end of it, right?

Mr. Frixel: Well, yeah. Yeah.

The Chair: Okay. Anything else?

Ms Munn: A quick question. Maybe it puts you on the spot, but the young fellow earlier today presented a couple of ideas of a couple of names. I'm assuming you heard those. Do you have any opinion on that?

Mr. Frixel: No. It doesn't matter to me what . . .

Ms Munn: Just get some lines on those roads. Okay.

Mr. Frixel: Maybe to somebody else it would. Just lines, yeah. Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. Thanks very much.

Mr. Frixel: Okay. Thank you very much for coming up here to listen to us.

The Chair: Oh, no. Our pleasure.

All right. Is there anyone else here who would like to come forward and share their views, whether they've registered or not? Now, you're all here for a reason. You must have some interest in this process. This is a big democracy piece.

Please come forward, ma'am. Welcome. If you could give us your name and tell us whether you reside in the Peace River constituency.

Ms Johnson: Yes. Thank you for coming to the Peace River country. We love this country. I was born and raised here . . .

The Chair: Sorry. Your name?

Ms Johnson: Oh, my name is Sylvia Johnson.

The Chair: All right. You live in Peace River?

Ms Johnson: I live in Peace River. I'm also the region 6 Métis nation president. My area is also from Valleyview to the Northwest Territories over to the B.C. border to past Cadotte Lake.

I'd just like to say that I've heard today that it's about numbers. Numbers of people: we're low on numbers of people. But we are the vast area of the Peace Country and, as the gentleman was saying, to travel – and I'm sure our MLA can attest to this – from one function to another, to travel to meet people from one town to another, from one place to another takes over half a day, maybe, to

get there. Then you've got to take half a day to get back. That should be taken into consideration when we are trying to enlarge our area here of boundary lines. The boundary lines are all based on population. Boundary lines are all based on the number of people living here, so even though our MLA and the rest of us have to travel twice as far as any MLA in Edmonton or Calgary, we should, though, have a bigger area so it takes us not half a day to get there but a whole day to get there. Of course, I believe they should be increasing the amount of dollars to the MLA to travel, but I don't believe that we should be increasing in this northern area to represent the people.

I don't believe we should be increasing the boundary lines, but I think we should be dividing it in half, having two areas. I believe that we should have Mackenzie north have an MLA, and we should maybe have a Peace River constituency area MLA. I believe that would make a lot more sense in my view because I travel the same distance. I believe that would be a lot better representation for the people. I don't believe that just because you live in the north, just because we live out here, we should be getting less services and we should be getting less attention, and maybe we should have our MLA stretch farther and more just because we're here in the north.

We're not as visible as maybe the people in the city and maybe we're not as Internet savvy or whatever so we can contact our MLA. Some of our people in the north – and I'm talking not only aboriginal people, people that just live in the north – don't have Internet service all the time. It's intermittent. They don't have cellphone service. We don't have the services that we do in the north, and that is, again, with the hospitals, with medical, with things like that. As you heard the MLA say, we have to travel four hours, six hours to see a specialist, to see a doctor. None of that has been taken into consideration when you're trying to service the people from the north, but you're trying to, because of a census that told you that there are less people up here than in other areas, that we should maybe have our boundary lines expanded so that we have less and less opportunity to talk to our MLA.

I don't believe that our MLA does not work and doesn't do a good job. She certainly does, and she certainly spreads herself through the north. But, hey, take that into consideration to somebody that lives in the city and has – what? How big is their area? There might be 50,000 people in that area but to get to those 50,000 people and to contact them and to deal with them is a lot easier than up north here. You travelled up here. You came in freezing rain. You came on icy highways. You came over here to experience what it is for us here in the north.

That's just my thing. I agree with the gentleman there. There are more important things that we need here other than our boundaries expanded.

Thank you.

10:30

The Chair: All right. Well, thanks. Would you mind answering a couple of questions?

Ms Johnson: Oh, okay.

The Chair: I have several areas that I could ask you questions on. This is terrific. Now, starting with the geographic area, you're the president of the region 6 Métis nation.

Ms Johnson: Yes.

The Chair: I was trying to follow mentally the boundaries as you described them, but obviously they're not an exact overlap of the Peace River constituency.

Ms Johnson: No, it isn't.

The Chair: Is it roughly the same area you represent, just differently configured?

Ms Johnson: Yeah, I guess. It's not exactly the same. We do include Valleyview. We do have Fairview. We include Grande Prairie. So ours is a little bit more.

The Chair: A bit larger?

Ms Johnson: Yeah.

The Chair: All right. In your work you have to travel to meet people, obviously.

Ms Johnson: Yes.

The Chair: All right. How does that work for you? Obviously, there's lots of time on the road that other people don't have to spend, but you're also going to more southerly communities if you're going to Grande Prairie. So what would make, just for example, your life better in your work for the Métis nation in regard to travel time, if you have any ideas?

Ms Johnson: Well, of course, everything is a cost. You know, we have the same problem up here in the north with the region 6 Métis nation as with the whole MNA of Alberta. There are some regions that have a very – well, maybe it's a more dense population, a larger population, but again they only have to travel an hour to get through their whole region, an hour north to south, an hour west to east, which makes a lot of difference when you're meeting with people. We here – like I said, for me to go to Valleyview, well, I would have to start out this morning to have a meeting with them, you know, at a decent time this afternoon and then come home again. So we have a lot of area where we're travelling, a lot of that.

The Chair: Do you have a central meeting place that you have regular meetings always in that place?

Ms Johnson: We do. That's also Edmonton, Alberta. It's the MNA of Alberta, so we have the same thing. We also have to be in Edmonton. We have to be in Calgary. Sometimes we have different places that we have to be. Again, that's less time that we have for our own constituents here, too, our own people here that are my region 6 people. So I'm just comparing what our MLA does and the kind of the work that I do, and to reach absolutely every person every time that we want to is very difficult.

The Chair: Sure. Now, I'm delighted that you're here and have some familiarity with the aboriginal issues. So don't feel that you have to answer these questions, but we don't want to ignore First Nation issues. The legislation directs us specifically to try to find out about those, so I'm going to ask some questions in that spirit.

I know you were here when I asked the question about the virtual constituency of the previous speaker, the Deputy Speaker. Do you have any thoughts on whether this would help your people have a voice in the larger community, to have a constituency that didn't have a land base but that any First Nation or Métis person could choose to belong to rather than the place where they lived? Any thoughts on that?

Ms Johnson: Well, I do know also that the farther north you get and even in our region here – I'm just talking for our elections – it's difficult for our people to go to vote. They have to travel to a different community. They have to travel 80 kilometres or a

hundred kilometres to vote not only for our election but probably for the Alberta and federal elections. So, of course, you have to take that into consideration. “Hmm. Let’s see. How badly do I want to go vote? Do I want to spend a tank of gas to go and vote for this person? I don’t know if I’m going to or not.” There are things to consider. Then there are also our seniors or our elders that are, like: “I don’t have a vehicle. I have to find somebody to bring me into town so I can go vote. I have to give that person \$40 for gas. Again, do I want to vote that bad? Maybe I don’t want to vote that bad.”

It all hinges on dollars. You think that it would be nice if it didn’t, but it does. It’s not like the vote can come to you. You have to go to the election. For that, I don’t know, maybe it would help if people could vote – well, it would help if they could vote in their own area. That is for sure. But, then again, there are also people that have said: well, let’s just have it all online. You could vote online, whatever. What online? You know, that’s the thing. Voting online is fine, things like that, but we’re kind of hooped up here in the north, whatever you do. We’ve got to keep in mind that we’ve got the miles and kilometres to travel, and that’s not going to change, I don’t think.

The Chair: Okay. Well, just on this last point – and this is blue skying, for sure, but we do have the ability to make recommendations to improve democracy in Alberta to a degree. So in that spirit, what do you think about some effort being put into that to create an Internet access or making the school available so people could come in and vote online in a secure way? I’m sure Internet gurus could create privacy or whatever so that security of voting could happen so that your remote people could vote at their local school. Do you think that would pick up the percentage of people voting?

Ms Johnson: It might. But then you have to keep in mind, too: so if I don’t have Internet service, I’m not savvy on the Internet or with a computer because what good is it? It’s collecting dust in the corner because I can’t do that much with it. More people have a cellphone, and then, of course, they use their cellphone more for communication, and Internet – if they can get Internet, whatever. With that said and done, you know, access to equipment isn’t as great either.

I would just like to make my one big point to be here, that even though we live in the vast northern area of the province, which we’re very proud of – we love the north; people of the north love the north – that does not mean that we should have less service because of population. I think it should be considered that – well, let’s face it. Without us people in the north, what would the people in the city do? To me, I always think: where are they going to go visit? Where are they going to go camp? Where are they going to go travel? We here in the north feel that we should have the same service, I believe, or attempt to have the same service as people living in urban centres, whatever, as much as possible.

The Chair: Thank you.
Any other questions?

Mrs. Day: Maybe just back to the young fellow again. I’m just curious of how people feel about the name change suggestions he brought forward.

Ms Johnson: Well, how can you suggest the name change before you set the boundary?

Mrs. Day: Oh, well, I mean with the existing boundary, stay the same.

Ms Johnson: You’re just talking about the existing boundary.

Mrs. Day: Yeah. Say that it stayed the same. The suggestions he had were Mackenzie-North or Mackenzie-Peace River.

Ms Johnson: Well, my thing is that whatever you make a name change over, something that we’ve had here for years and years and years, something that has been here, traditionally, for years – this is the name. This is the Peace area. I think before you can change the name, you’re going to have to ask a lot more people than the five people that came to this meeting. You’re going to go out and ask the public what they want and what they think. I think a lot of them would hesitate to have a name change because when you’re used to a name and you’re used to your area, I think that whenever there’s change, it’s not comfortable.

Mrs. Day: Yeah. Traditionally, leave well enough alone.

Ms Johnson: Yes, traditionally, and it’s also respect to our past leaders and things like that. Then you’d have to be saying: “Oh, yeah. Well, oh, he used to be with the Peace River constituency area and that Peace River area. But, oh, no. There’s been a name change in 2017, so now it’s called the Peace-Mackenzie,” whatever, that kind of thing. I think that history is history. We like to retain as much of it as we can.

Mrs. Day: Okay. Fair enough. Thank you.

Ms Livingstone: Just one question, and it’s one I probably should have asked the MLA as well, but I just thought about it afterwards. We heard some submissions earlier this week in other areas where people were talking about the complexity of issues that urban MLAs in Edmonton and Calgary have to deal with, with many cultural communities and many different issues. The comparison was kind of being made: well, MLAs in outlying areas have a lot of travel, but we have a lot of, you know, complex issues in our workload. As someone who lives in the Peace Country and does a job that has you representing a number of people, do you find that there’s a complexity of issues you’re dealing with? Or do you think that’s a fair characterization, I guess, that urban MLAs are dealing with more complex issues than MLAs in outlying areas are?

10:40

Ms Johnson: No, I don’t think that’s a fair comparison. We have other people here in our area. It’s not like there’s – we have mosques here. We have different communities here. We have the Filipino community here. Plus, we have the First Nations communities, of course, the First Nation reserves, and, like the MLA said, some are Cree reserves and some are Dogrib reserves and some are different – Dene. There are different reserves that are not comparable to each other. They all are unique in themselves. We also have the Métis people that live in off-Métis settlements as well as the ones that live on Métis settlements.

We also have, you know, the people that come in to the region to work, people that are here, we call them – you know, the people that are the temporary workers here. They’re people that came to work before the economic downfall here. We had a lot of people that would come in to Peace River, come in to High Level, come in to work in camps, come in from New Brunswick, come in from Edmonton, come in and work with the oil and gas industry. So there are those people also. There’s a lot of diversity here of people, and it’s because of the oil and gas.

Then, of course, there are the farmers. Of course, there are the agricultural people. There are the people that have lived here all their lives. There are a lot of things to deal with, to me, in the north

because the north is always changing and people are always coming in. So I don't think that there's more of a problem with meeting different nationalities and cultures of people in the cities. I think we have that here just as well.

Ms Livingstone: Thank you.

The Chair: Anything else?

Okay. Well, thanks once again for coming out and being prepared to speak off the cuff, as it were.

Ms Johnson: Thank you. Oh, well, I wasn't prepared, so thanks.

The Chair: You were very prepared, actually.

Mr. Anuszewski, I understand, is here. Good morning.

Mr. Anuszewski: Good morning. I'm very pleased to be here this morning. My name is Barry Anuszewski. I am from the Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley constituency. It's a rather large constituency as well. Sorry, my throat is not very good this morning. It's also a very large name as well. I was not to present this morning, but I am in the place of Bryan Woronuk, who was unable to attend this morning. I only found out at 9 o'clock, so I will be brief. I mean, it's just going to be more or less in point form. I'm certainly open to the questions as Bryan had alluded to the concerns and the situation that that would make, maybe, staying in the Peace as far as having to make some potential boundary changes.

As we know, representation to population is a very valid and important matter, that we should be concerned with. But, also, we have to look at the vastness of the region, being vast meaning that we're concerned with many services, the diversity of services throughout this region. Increasing the size of an already large region only encompasses more of those concerns and more of the difficulties with making those arrangements and making those cost-reflective of the need.

It definitely is something that, you know, we should look at in terms of: is this an Alberta situation, when we have to look at the directions that we should take here, or is it a rural situation?

Doing a little bit of back-checking on this, I mean, the population diversity between two major cities, Edmonton and Calgary, is nearly reflective of the balance of the province of Alberta, almost split directly in half. So if we take those two regions out and let those ridings be divided amongst what they need to look at in terms of their size, population, and density and then look at the rest of rural Alberta, maybe those numbers can be expanded. As you alluded to, our particular riding has already gone past the 50 per cent mark.

If this becomes a rural question, rural Alberta can make that decision for rural ridings. Is it necessary to increase large ridings here just to facilitate that number if the rest of rural Alberta is fine with that? Again, we're not representing only just people; we're representing all of the infrastructure, all of the need, all of the industry, all of the different diversity of groups, as has been discussed here this morning. That was one of the main points that was here.

Also, on name changes, one of the concerns here is that we've got several ridings – and it's been over, you know, a hundred-year history – that have been named in reflection of the contributions that some very distinguished individuals have brought towards the province. Calgary-Klein and Edmonton-Decore come to mind. These are individuals with different backgrounds, different diversities, but, also, they reflect and recognize an affiliation, a political affiliation. Is that something that our elections should necessarily be connected to? The impartiality of an election is important here, so when you're voting in Calgary-Klein, is that not

something that might be part of your thoughts, especially for a voter that may not be politically aligned, connected but who sees that affiliation? She recognizes that: I remember Mr. Klein, but I don't know the other candidates. So is it fair? When we're looking at the fairness that we must be facilitating across the board, should we then recognize that our elections need to be impartial?

I guess that pretty much summarizes what I was brought here to say today. I do apologize that I've been brief – maybe that's refreshing – and very informal as well. As I say, I was not prepared to do this, but I appreciate the opportunity to present.

The Chair: Well, I must say for myself that I'm delighted you came because you're our first speaker from Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley and I fear you might be our only one even though we're going to Grande Prairie today. You know, there's a possibility that that might be the case.

I've got a couple of questions, and I believe our other panellists might, as well. First of all, you've talked about rural Alberta having about 50 per cent of the population, a population equal to that of Edmonton and Calgary, and I've heard or read other speakers say the same thing. However, if you count all of the incorporated cities in the province, which means that you count the population of not just Edmonton and Calgary but also Fort McMurray, Peace River, Grande Prairie, Red Deer, Lethbridge – I'm sure I've missed out incorporated cities – you get more like an 80-20 split. So even though you're labelling half of the province urban, many of the people in that half of the province, in fact, live in cities.

Do you think the residents of small cities are more aligned in their community of interest – in other words, what's important to them – with people who live in truly rural areas versus the people who live in Edmonton and Calgary? That's a long question, but I think you know what I'm getting at.

Mr. Anuszewski: Yeah, I certainly do, and thank you for the question. I believe that many people have connections inside small cities, small centres and some connection to the large centres and cities as well from the rural standpoint. I believe that people within the smaller cities as well as somewhat from the larger cities have connections to rural as well. I'm going to go out on that limb and say that there perhaps is more connection from the smaller centres. There's more interaction in the smaller centres, most certainly. I mean, I frequent Grande Prairie not only because it's somewhat closer for me but because it's still a centre where I can get many of the things that I need that Edmonton supplies and supports. But I find less need to be in the centre of the city, and I don't feel that I need to be there, so that connection does become less. Therefore, when you look at it from a standpoint of population connection, I think we find ourselves more supporting our smaller cities and centres and vice versa.

We find that many people that work within the centres in Grande Prairie perhaps are living outside of Grande Prairie – so their concerns are straddling – but there are very, very few people in the large cities that work outside of the large cities. Therefore, the population movement is generally somewhat intermixing when you look at much of our small centres.

10:50

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

Now, I know you weren't here for our introduction. Basically, our job is to look at all information before we start making any decisions, and we haven't made any decisions yet, for sure. You're one of the special ridings that is allowed to have a larger deficiency from the provincial average in population than most because of the unique character of your community, because of your remoteness,

essentially. That said, based on population estimates that were given to us by the provincial Treasury Board, which will be updated with the Statistics Canada census information when it becomes available February 8, Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley, as you just said, may be below the 50 per cent variance that's allowed and very far away from the 25 per cent maximum variance in other parts of the province. So it is possible that we'll have no choice but to try to change the boundaries to increase the population in your constituency or make recommendations to that effect.

If we had to do that – we've already heard a speaker suggest that, well, maybe if we found we had to increase the size of the population in Peace River, we move the boundary somewhat into Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley to include Grimshaw, for example. Then that would mean that your boundary would, of course, for that reason as well have to move south or east to compensate. Changing boundaries has a ripple effect. If that were to happen, do you have a view as to what might be properly included in Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley that would make the communities who live in that broader area or that different area still have the same community of interest and values?

Mr. Anuszewski: Again, that's a very interesting concept, having to enlarge a boundary, because as boundaries increase in size, they may increase in the regional aspect, if I would. That might be a term that's somewhat ambiguous, but it lends to the fact that now you have to take into consideration what's happening in that specific community, how they've been reflected, who they're familiar with in terms of governance. Again, it becomes a much larger district in which to have to travel. I mean, if you look at the Central Peace region, it is a very lengthy region. Therefore, when you're travelling that region, the longer the region is, the further the distances no matter what you want to do.

The Chair: If I can interrupt this . . .

Mr. Anuszewski: Oh, certainly. Most certainly.

The Chair: . . . just to have a little bit of a conversation here. If we went south, you would get part of Grande Prairie. You'd either get part of Grande Prairie-Wapiti or Grande Prairie-Smoky. Let's just say that this was going to happen. What part do you think would be best to take into Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley?

Mr. Anuszewski: Well, it's not fair to choose either/or. It should be looked at in terms of accessibility.

The Chair: Okay. Which would be more accessible? They're more urban. The distances, in fact, might shrink in Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley. You might become smaller geographically as a result of this. Duration of travel can't be our only consideration. It's totally okay to not have a view, but your view is probably an important one because you actually live there. I just wanted to make sure we didn't fail to ask you that.

Mr. Anuszewski: That's where we don't want to also see another riding have to increase in size as a result of us having to increase the population. That is a delicate matter. I mean, it was brought up much before.

The Chair: You don't have to worry. Grande Prairie is way over the provincial average. Like, way over.

Mr. Anuszewski: Yeah. I do get that. Again, you know, accessibility: to be able to see an MLA have the opportunity to travel that region and be effective throughout it, because, you know,

as was brought up earlier today – that was discussed – there is much difficulty in encompassing a large, large region. So, yes, I mean, definitely, we've got look at perhaps something like that.

I would not like to be able to say directly: well, we should choose this, or we should choose that. But, I mean, in looking at it, where we could possibly correct the problem most efficiently populationwise without changing many of the transportation logistics of covering a region would be the most efficient and methodical way of approaching the subject.

Ms Munn: In that vein, with people who live in Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley I suspect that there's a point – and we have to ask this question because we don't have any idea of how it really works on the ground. I suspect that there are people in Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley that, when they need to come in to an urban area, will come in to Peace River. There are others who will go to Grande Prairie. Or am I wrong? Will everybody go to Grande Prairie?

Mr. Anuszewski: No. It depends on need.

Ms Munn: Okay. On need. What kind of needs would bring them to Peace River, and what kind of needs would take them to Grande Prairie?

Mr. Anuszewski: Peace River is a very good example of a tertiary environment. They provide a lot of goods and services for commercial, but they are somewhat limited to the oil field. I worked extensively in the oil field for a number of years, and our company has now been mothballed due to the downturn and other circumstances. Most of our shopping for our oil field operations was done in Grande Prairie because it was the best service supplier for what we had there. So there is no dissemination of which way we're going to travel in terms of a direction because we're not only just consumers; we're also businesspeople. As to being rural, the consumer is part of it, but our businesses thus dictate it as well.

Ms Munn: For businesspeople, if they want to access their MLA, is it easier or more convenient or more accessible for them to come to Peace River or Grande Prairie, or does that change within Dunvegan? Grimshaw, for example: I suspect it's easier to come to Peace River.

Mr. Anuszewski: Of course.

Ms Munn: Right.

Mr. Anuszewski: I mean, we've got to measure the map.

Ms Munn: Okay. Fairview: I suspect it's easier to come to Peace River.

Mr. Anuszewski: And Fairview to Grande Prairie. I mean, it's an equal distance.

Ms Munn: It is. Okay.

Mr. Anuszewski: Again, it's about distance – right? – and sometimes it can even be road conditions.

Ms Munn: Right. Okay.

Mr. Anuszewski: Again, the weather is not the same in the north Peace as it is in the south.

The Chair: Let's say that you were going to go to the doctor. Is your doctor more likely to be in Peace River or Grande Prairie?

Mr. Anuszewski: Well, now you've got a whole new concept of topic here. As in many circumstances, doctors are chosen by accessibility and level of service and wait times. It's not always about where the doctor is most proximate. I will leave it at that.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

Ms Munn: Are we leaving this at six of one and half a dozen of the other?

Mr. Anuszewski: I'm sorry?

Ms Munn: Are we leaving this at six of one and half a dozen of the other? The people in Dunvegan: to maximize their accessibility, half the time it's going to be Peace River, and half the time it's going to be Grande Prairie?

Mr. Anuszewski: And other centres as well. I think, you know, to be basically honest, because we don't have a major centre in the central Peace to meet and facilitate – I mean, at present the MLA sitting has an office in Falher and an office in Fairview, which are two drastic ends of the district, but there is no central place. So when we say Central Peace, it's much in the middle of nowhere. There is no centre that you can draw as a dot on the map and say: that's a centre.

Ms Munn: Sorry. The offices: one in Fairview and one in . . .

Mr. Anuszewski: Falher.

Ms Munn: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Anything else? Any questions you have – oh, sorry. Go ahead.

Ms Livingstone: Yeah. I just had one question.

Mr. Anuszewski: Certainly.

Ms Livingstone: In terms of people who are trying to give us sort of hints of questions to ask or things to wonder about if we have to make a choice – does this community go here or there if we're moving a line? – one suggestion that we got yesterday was: "Ask people where they shop. That will give you a clue as to who their natural communities of interest are." Are there any other hints like that that you might have for us as to how to identify which would naturally be communities that have more affinity with one another?

11:00

Mr. Anuszewski: Well, I think there's one thing about that, too. Personally, we tend to shop in Falher. Yes, we have to cross a river to do it, but again we do business in Falher as well, so there's that connection. We can also shop in High Prairie and we can also shop in Valleyview because we are within two miles of the perimeter of those towns surrounding us. We make our choices based on what we're looking for in services at the time. If I need to get work done on my GM vehicle, I have to go to High Prairie because there's a GM service department there. It's closer than Peace River is, of course, so I make that choice. If I'm going to pick up my mail, it arrives in the town of Falher, and therefore I'm going to pick up some bread, some milk, some eggs while I'm in Falher. If I'm on my way to Edmonton and I want to pick up a tank of gas for the trip, I will stop in Valleyview, and I will shop there.

So there are certainly vastnesses that change the direction we will travel here. Closeness, proximity to all communities is important to us, so we won't be polarized to just one community as a result of that, but if we are proximate to that community, we're certainly not

going to drive through it and past it or away from it if we can get equal and operative services in all communities.

Ms Livingstone: It might be helpful, then, for us to look at, say, postal codes or see where people's mail is coming into and certainly pay attention to roadways and things like that if we're, you know, having to make that decision – does this community go here or there? – and look at the natural roadways, look at maybe where people's mail is delivered to give us hints as to who would more naturally fit together if we have to make those tough calls.

Mr. Anuszewski: That certainly does do that, yes.

Ms Livingstone: Okay. Thank you.

Mrs. Day: Thank you for coming and travelling to see us today, first of all. My question is more around your topic of inter-dependence on rural-urban existence in, let's say, smaller cities and centres like Grande Prairie and then a remark about not wanting to necessarily say what. For Dunvegan the numbers are looking like there's going to be a change needed even to get to the 50 per cent mark, that we are kind of governed by. There were two areas you mentioned, and you said that it was about accessibility, but also there's that question of culture, which would fit with your MLA's role already and that would be similar to the rest of the culture in the Dunvegan area.

Mr. Anuszewski: When we speak of culture, we live in the Peace. We are Peace region residents. Yes, there are some cultural differences from the past. I mean, I'm a direct descendant of an immigrant to Canada, and there are many others of many other cultures and faiths that live within the Peace. But anybody who chooses to live in the Peace is a Peace Country resident, and that, in itself, is a culture. So any way you divide it up, we are Peace region residents. Yeah, we play hockey against each other, and it's vicious, at times very confrontational, but afterwards we can visit and we can have pizza together. So it's not something where as a region we will be divided.

Mrs. Day: No matter where the boundaries?

Mr. Anuszewski: Correct.

Mrs. Day: That's interesting. Thank you.

The Chair: Anything else? Any questions you have of us?

Mr. Anuszewski: Well, as I said, I was not prepared to do a presentation today. I know I was planning on it, and then my health kind of gave me a bit of a moment, we'll call it, so I'm just rebounding from that. Of course, my colleague was unable to present today, so he gave me a test. I do hope that I've been somewhat helpful in some of the comments that I've brought forward. I certainly recognize and respect the task that you are against here, looking at some of the ridings in the north here, undeniably a most difficult task to look at. I'm certain that without, you know, taking all considerations into context, I would not say that mistakes will be made, but it might not necessarily reflect what should have come out of it.

The Chair: Well, the way people can avoid that – and I'm going to sound preachy here. We're going to have to do the best we can with the information we have. There's still lots of opportunity for your friends and neighbours to send us an e-mail or just make a notation on our website about what they think should happen so that mistakes aren't made.

For example, yesterday, when we were going around Fort McMurray, the guide that was showing us some of the areas affected by the fire said: “Gee, when the federal redistricting was here four years ago, there was this one community, and it should have been included on one side and it wasn’t. That was a mistake that was made, and we didn’t realize it at the time.” I thought: “Okay. Well, we want to avoid that if we possibly can.” Why did that happen then? Well, because nobody mentioned it. We don’t want nobody to mention specific communities that more naturally fall in one trading area or one cultural area than another, so this is everybody’s chance to participate even with a line or two. Send it in by iPhone. What mistakes we should not make: that would be wonderful to hear from people.

Mr. Anuszewski: I have one question.

The Chair: Sure.

Mr. Anuszewski: Will you be bringing some of the recommendations forward to such a setting as this, perhaps a public setting, to give us one more opportunity for input?

The Chair: Absolutely. Alberta has a great system. It’s not available in some of the other areas, and I’ve heard from other judges elsewhere saying: wow, we wish we had the two-stage hearing. We’ll be filing our interim recommendations, our draft recommendations, one for each of the 87 constituencies, by May 31 with the provincial Legislature. That will go on our website as well and will become public. We’ll be then inviting further written submissions on those specific recommendations and having a further set of public hearings at the end of July, beginning of August for anybody who wants to come and present in person in addition to or instead of written recommendations. We’ll then review that commentary, make any adjustments or changes we think should be made, and file a final report with the Legislature no later than October 31 of this year.

Mr. Anuszewski: Excellent. Excellent. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

All right. Is there anybody else who’s here who would like to come forward?

If you’d just start by saying your name and the constituency you live in.

Mr. Wincherauk: My name is Brian Wincherauk, and I reside in this constituency. I’m really glad that you guys came here. It’s quite important because people forget about history. In the British system for a while they had what became called the rotten boroughs. They were represented by MPs – this goes back a hundred years – where the population of that constituency dropped so badly that there were MPs representing basically no one. That is one part of history.

On January 10 we were in the Bahamas because my father-in-law lives down there, and January 10 in the Bahamas is called Majority Rule Day. Fifty years ago the people of the Bahamas finally got majority rule, and what happened is that they did away with a lot of – there were two-member ridings that were appointed, and there were other ridings with MPs that were elected, and they abolished that system. On January 10, 1967, everybody in the Bahamas had an equal say, which is very important. That’s part of the British system, and we have to look at it.

You guys are dealing with a really hard task. The population of Alberta is shifting around, and you have to make sure everybody is represented correctly, and you have to take in the fact that there are northern parts and that there are southern parts. We have to make

sure that we don’t get into a place like the United States, which is a perfect example of gerrymandering. That is going on like crazy down there, and people don’t realize it. In North Carolina there are Congressmen elected in districts that go through black areas. There might be a line in the middle of the street, and there are white areas on each side, but the blacks don’t have any say because of the gerrymandering. Because we very rarely see that in Canada, this is great. That’s one thing about our system. We don’t get a lot of that, which is good.

That’s why you guys are very important, because you’re going out and seeing what people have to say. So this committee is very important to our system because if we don’t pay attention, we’re going to lose a lot of stuff.

11:10

The Chair: Thank you. I think we’re all in favour of democracy.

Mr. Wincherauk: Yes, but we forget about history.

The Chair: And some of the basic considerations, yes. Any questions?

Ms Munn: I do have a question. I hear you speaking about the importance of representation by population and that everybody’s vote means the same. How do we balance that principle with the reality of Canada instead of the Bahamas?

Mr. Wincherauk: Yeah. Well, the Bahamas have a lot of issues, too, because they’re a bunch of different islands that you have to represent.

Ms Munn: Good point.

Mr. Wincherauk: You know, each island is different, right?

Ms Munn: Right. So how do we balance in Alberta . . .

Mr. Wincherauk: And that’s what you do.

Ms Munn: . . . this fundamental principle of representation by population, making sure that every person’s vote means the same, with the fact that we have to deal with vast geographical areas that just aren’t as populated? There are some practical problems related to that. How do we balance that?

Mr. Wincherauk: Well, that’s it. We might have to be looking at changing the system, and that scares people. Change scares people. I mean, in Saskatoon I worked on a civic election. Saskatoon and Regina were on the ward system, and the government in Regina decided: well, the rural areas of Saskatchewan don’t have ward systems, so the major cities don’t have ward systems. What they did was that the provincial government abolished the ward systems, which became a nightmare because in the civic election that year you just had a list of names on a ballot, and some of the ballots were six feet long. Nobody took that into consideration. Saskatchewan has a very high rate of voting in provincial, civic, and federal elections, and it became a nightmare because we had to open up the ballot boxes. I had to get permission from a judge to unseal the ballot boxes for the civic election because these huge ballots, once they’re folded and dropped in the box, would unfold.

So there are all sorts of things that you have to watch out for. It’s very difficult, and it’s hard to deal with. You know, how do you work it so everybody gets a say? We have to accept that it’s time, that we have to start doing change to the system, maybe allowing online voting. Again, that scares people. But we have to make sure everybody has a say. How do you do that?

Ms Munn: Are you saying that everybody should have an equal say?

Mr. Wincherauk: Of course everybody should have an equal say, but how do you balance it? You know, I know some of the northern ridings are allowed a different population, but that's from the Leg. That's set down by the laws of Alberta.

Ms Munn: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.
Any other questions?
All right. Thanks so much, sir.
Okay. We have time for one more. Yes. Please come forward.

Ms Bliska: All right. Good morning. Thank you so much. Another one of those participants that wasn't preparing.

The Chair: Could you just give us your name and whether you reside in this constituency or another one?

Ms Bliska: Yes, I will. Thank you. My name is Veronica Bliska. I am a councillor with the municipal district of Peace, and I'm in the Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley constituency. I think it needed a little more representation maybe today, so I think that's why I appreciate the opportunity to speak. I know that our council will make a written submission, and I was here just to listen today. I've certainly been enlightened, and I think you guys are asking great questions. That was very reassuring to me.

When I came this morning and from the reading that I did prior to this, I was not open really to changing what we have. Understanding that there are some variances, particularly in my riding – I get that. We see the diversity, for the lack of a better word, and the challenges that we have in the north, and we accommodate, we adapt, and we adjust to those things. Sometimes, you know, you have a special child. We have special municipalities. Sometimes that happens. I think the biggest fear would be – and I use the word “fear” because I was asking a few people yesterday before I came – if we got bigger. Our geographic area is a challenge, and we accept it. We live here; we get it. But to create something bigger, a bit of a monstrosity, would really, really dilute us, and we would really feel less a part of things.

A couple of notes from what I heard today. I'm going to tell you that our rural voice would be diminished if we had fewer ridings. I can certainly tell you that we would be less.

You know, people were talking about the quality of the MLA. Well, it's up to us to start to figure that out and start to encourage good people to come forward, but you're not going to get good people to come forward if their boundaries are that huge because they wouldn't have any quality of life. I have been a reeve of a municipality for nine years, and I've been on council for 18 years, and I am driving all over the place. So I can't imagine – when we are approached and presented with, “Hey, do you want to be the MP? Hey, do you want to be the MLA?” I'm going: “No. I love my husband. I want to be home sometimes.” So if you want some good people, don't create something that would make it very hard for some quality people to come forward who genuinely want to advocate and respectfully govern.

I'm okay with some virtual communication, but I'm going to come at it from the seniors' perspective. My dad is blind. He lives in a seniors' home, yet he is one of the most savvy guys. He's 84. He does his books, his banking. He reads the paper. He does e-mails. He's blind, and he can do a lot of things with his technology. I asked him yesterday and some of the seniors in the home that we visited, and they said, “Well, we wouldn't want it to get bigger,”

because they certainly would feel less attached to things. They're not going to get out to things, and not all of them are as electronically savvy.

You know what? All of our libraries are connected all across the province, so it's not just schools; we could use libraries. So there are opportunities, but I think we have to consider certain segments of the population that really do have a lot of value and a voice that needs to be heard.

My children: they're adults now, and one of them wants to live in the north. I want her to have a quality of life. I want her to have, like, good things. My nieces and nephews all live in the peripheral area of Edmonton. I want them to have a quality of life. So I think that you're just trying to create a balance, that they have opportunities and that people up here – they may be different opportunities, but they have opportunities.

I think I covered off some of the things. I'm going to reiterate that I just don't see how you could make Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley bigger. I would just be concerned that we would be diluting ourselves. I would be concerned about that.

But I would be willing to take any questions because I think you guys are asking great, great questions.

The Chair: Well, thank you for that. I'll ask the first question, the same question that I asked of your fellow resident of Dunvegan. If it turned out that the boundaries of Peace were moved south – not that we've decided to do that. It didn't cross my mind before this morning, to be honest – okay? – because right now we're just information gathering. But if we had to do that to meet the obligations under the act, then we would be looking at moving the boundaries of Dunvegan as well. Now, that wouldn't make Dunvegan bigger. It could make it no different or even smaller if you went down into some of the territory covered by one of the Grande Prairie constituencies right now. If it ended up that we had to look at that, not that that would be our first choice or whatever, do you have a view as to what part of the two Grande Prairie constituencies would make a more natural mix with Dunvegan than otherwise?

11:20

Ms Bliska: Yeah. I love it that you put everyone on the spot like that. I want to be very careful. I love that you're asking that question. I have a really good idea of what I think that that would be, but I'm not prepared to publicly say that today. Being the politician that I am, I'm not going to do that. But I would certainly share that with you. I would certainly want to, you know, caucus with my council on that, so I'm just going to say that.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

Ms Munn: What I would hope that you would do is to caucus with your council and your neighbours and put in a written submission on the subject.

Ms Bliska: Sure.

Ms Munn: We've heard you loud and clear on the concern of diminishing the rural voice with fewer seats overall, and that's one of the balances we have to work on. But we do have to look at individual ridings that for whatever reason just don't have enough people in them. Dunvegan actually comes close to not being within the law – we won't know until we see those numbers in February – and we may have to do something, so we would like to hear from the people who live there and work there and deal there. If changes have to be made, where are the best places to make those changes?

Ms Bliska: That's fair, and I will take that back to my colleagues as well. Absolutely, I will help you with that.

There was one thing. You talked about the complexity of issues. You asked a great question on the complexity of issues. I thought Sylvia did a really good job. A lot of the work that I've had to come up to speed with over the years: sand and gravel pits, oil transfer stations – we've had some really contentious issues over the years – the agricultural industry impacts, and forestry. So we're the same but different. We have those cultural diversities here now, and we have a lot of rural industrial impacts that are different from, maybe, the urban issues that they have. We're the same but different. So the complexities are still there; they're just different. I respectfully say that the urbans have some challenges, but – wow – you try to sit with a whole bunch of people at a public hearing on an oil transfer facility, and that's not so much fun sometimes, you know? So I'm saying that we're the same but different. Yeah.

Because my husband and I farm just northeast of Grimshaw – guess what? – Grimshaw is very near and dear to me, so I represent today, telling you that Grimshaw is very central to Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley, like, a hundred per cent. When we have constituency things happening in Fairview or in Falher, well, sometimes I can't get there, you know, because I'm somewhere else and they're an hour away each way. Well, Grimshaw is pretty central. We have a lot of meetings in the Grimshaw-Peace River

area just because of the central location of that. Now, I don't want to take that away from those other two communities either. I'm very respectful of that. But, personally, I know that Grimshaw is very central, and it's a big gathering point for me and my rural community.

The Chair: Anything else? All right.
Thank you so much.

Ms Bliska: Thanks a lot, guys.

The Chair: All right. Well, thank you very much, everyone who's here. It's been terrific to have this level of turnout in Peace River and this level of interest. I'm delighted that you're prepared to engage with us at more of a conversational level than just making an oral presentation. I apologize if anybody has felt put on the spot, but I must say how grateful we are for your willingness to talk to us and give us this information. Thanks very much.

You can follow our activities on our website, abebc.ca, and look for our interim recommendations, draft recommendations, that will come out before the end of May this year and be posted on that website.

Thank you so much.

[The hearing adjourned at 11:24 a.m.]

